



Effectiveness of a Values Education Program for Preschool Students: A Teacher-Based Evaluation Study*

Derya Kayıran^{*a} & Birsen Bağçeci^b

* Corresponding author:

Email: deryakeskinpalta@gmail.com

a. Department of Child Development
Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam
University, Türkiye.

b. Faculty of Education,
Gaziantep University
Gaziantep, Türkiye

Article Info

Received: May 9, 2025

Accepted: September 23, 2025

Published: October 22, 2025



10.46303/jcve.2025.27

How to cite

Kayıran, D., & Bağçeci, B. (2025).
Effectiveness of a Values Education
Program for Preschool Students: A
Teacher-Based Evaluation Study.
*Journal of Culture and Values in
Education*, 8(3), 61-94.

<https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2025.27>

Copyright license

This is an Open Access article
distributed under the terms of the
Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International license.

*This study is derived from the
doctoral dissertation titled "Design
and Evaluation of a Values Education
Program for Preschool Children."

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effectiveness of the Preschool Values Education Program, which was developed in line with the values identified through a needs analysis and prepared in accordance with the Taba Curriculum Development Model. The effectiveness of the program was examined through pre-test, post-test, and retention test measurements, as well as teacher evaluations. The research was designed as a Case Study Based on Program Effects. The study group consisted of six preschool teachers working in a kindergarten and 110 preschool students in Kahramanmaraş, Türkiye. Data collection tools were the Value Acquisition Evaluation Form and interview forms. The interview data were analyzed using the Descriptive Analysis Technique, while data from the Value Acquisition Evaluation Form were analyzed with the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test and the Friedman Test. Findings indicated that teachers considered the Preschool Values Education Program both effective and lasting for students.

KEYWORDS

Values; values education; preschool values education program;
program development; program evaluation.

INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly changing world, individuals, particularly children, are exposed to an unprecedented flow of information through media and social networks. This influx not only shapes cognitive development but also intensifies moral engagement, underscoring the need for awareness of human values. Consequently, values education has become a priority on many national and international educational agendas (Pratiwi et al., 2021; Veugelers & Kat, 2003; Zakiah et al., 2023).

Garry Kasparov's remarks at the OECD Forum emphasized that raising better human beings is more important than creating smarter robots, while China's Social Credit System illustrates the global tendency toward value-based public policies (OECD, 2017). One of humanity's most distinctive characteristics is its inherently social nature. Social life, governed by rules and shared practices, fosters the development of individual value systems within a collective framework (Bradshaw, Healey, & Smith, 2001; Yalar, 2010). Education serving both individual and social functions plays a crucial role in instilling moral awareness and maintaining social order (Cevizci, 2016).

The concept of values has been defined in diverse ways across disciplines such as philosophy, sociology, psychology, and education. Early scholars approached values through ethical and psychological lenses (Thompson, 2009), while contemporary perspectives emphasize their social dimension (Fichter, 2006; Evans et al., 2018; Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000). Znaniecki introduced the concept into the social sciences (Aydın, 2011), and Schwartz (2005) expanded it by integrating psychological and anthropological perspectives. Philosophy addresses the normative foundations of values, sociology explores their social interpretation, and psychology investigates their influence on human behavior (Sönmez, 2008).

The Turkish Language Association (TDK, 2018) defines values as the totality of a nation's social, cultural, economic, and scientific elements. Etymologically, "value" derives from the Latin *valere*, meaning "to be strong or worthy" (Aydın, 2011). Values shape individuals' attitudes, decisions, and daily behaviors (Tunca, 2012; Günay, 2006). They function as internalized filters for interpreting reality (Bruno & Lay, 2006). Individuals align their behavior with the values of their social environment, which serve as moral and behavioral compasses (Beil, 2003). Values also function as a collective conscience, reinforcing what is rewarded or sanctioned through implicit norms (Avcı, 2007). Beyond social regulation, values such as honesty, tolerance, compassion, love, and respect act as cohesive forces in society (Yörükoğlu, 2003).

Kızılcılık and Erdem (1992) describe values as generalized moral principles accepted by a social group to ensure its continuity. They guide evaluations of both tangible and intangible concepts (Kennedy, 2012) and act as internal standards for defining social acceptability (Bahar, 2008). From a psychological standpoint, values operate as mechanisms shaping preferences, choices, and behaviors (Erdem, 2003).

One of the fundamental aims of education is to foster positive behavioral and attitudinal changes. In an era where violence is frequently publicized through the media, children are increasingly exposed to harmful content. This amplifies the necessity of values education. In recent years, values education has attracted significant attention in both academic and policy discourse. A key explanation is the “Double Helix Effect,” which highlights the reciprocal reinforcement between quality teaching and effective values education. This dynamic fosters interpersonal relationships, emotional well-being, intellectual depth, communication skills, self-regulation, and reflective thinking (Lovat et al., 2011).

As Socrates emphasized, the goal of education is to cultivate both virtue and knowledge. Education is therefore expected not only to produce well-informed individuals but also to nurture character and ethical awareness. Societies expect individuals to internalize cultural values. Similarly, the Turkish National Education system emphasizes raising culturally rooted, value-oriented generations (Ulusoy, 2007). Education can thus be defined as the process of transferring societal and individual values, knowledge, and culture to future generations. Philosophers such as Socrates, Plato, and Locke regarded education as essential for cultivating virtuous, rational, and socially responsible individuals. Since humans are shaped by their social environment, values are indispensable for explaining and guiding behavior (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000).

In the information age, values ensure that knowledge is applied ethically and beneficially. Scholars argue that examining values is more effective for understanding human behavior than focusing solely on behavior itself, as values are measurable and evaluable. Foundational works by Rokeach (1973) and Schwartz (1987) advanced theories and instruments for studying values. While values guide individuals, there is also reciprocity: values are transmitted across generations, but individuals simultaneously reshape them through experience (Tokdemir, 2007). Education similarly transforms the individual by fostering consciousness, emotions, and character development from an early age (Memmedzade, 2011; Kagema, 2018). A person’s inner richness and capacity for meaningful goals are closely tied to personal values (Aydın & Akyol Gürler, 2014). Thus, values education supports not only moral development but also social responsibility, empathy, and character formation, contributing to both school culture and broader social order. The literature widely affirms the need for values education programs in formal education (Arslan & Yaşar, 2007; Yeşilyurt & Kurt, 2012), while also highlighting the absence of officially structured curricula in this area (Gökçek, 2007; MEB, 2018). Researchers argue that structured programs are essential for meaningful acquisition (Deveci Ay, 2009; Ravinder, 2006), and that early childhood is a critical period for internalization (UNESCO, 2002). Several studies in the field of early childhood education have examined values and values education from different perspectives. Aral and Kadan (2018) analyzed the 2013 Preschool Education Program in Türkiye within the context of values education and found that the most frequently emphasized values were respect, solidarity, responsibility, love, and trust. Yazar and Erkuş (2013) investigated preschool teachers’ views on the values in the 2006 Ministry of

National Education curriculum and reported that large class sizes and the presence of mixed-age groups hindered the effective implementation of values in classroom settings. Sigurdardottir and Einarsdottir (2016), in an action research study conducted in an Icelandic preschool, identified that teachers prioritized the values of care, respect, and discipline, and defined their role in values education as being good role models, using language effectively, engaging in discussions, guiding, and directing. Einarsdottir et al. (2015) examined the preschool curricula of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden from a values perspective, focusing on democracy, care, and achievement. Their findings indicated that democracy was associated with existence and belonging in society, care was expressed as fulfilling basic needs and establishing emotional and ethical bonds, and achievement was linked to academic success. Emilson and Johansson (2008), in a study with 43 children aged 1–3 and 10 female preschool teachers, observed that values such as achievement, freedom, obedience, non-harm, helping others, understanding and showing love, maintaining good relationships, participation, agreement, and influence were embedded in teacher–child interactions. Ülavere and Veisson (2015) investigated values in Estonian preschool institutions and childcare centers, reporting that principals highlighted humor, pride, and creativity as essential values, teachers emphasized patience, and parents prioritized trust, obedience, and good education. Their study further revealed that group rules, daily communication, activities, and role modeling were the primary methods for teaching values. A general evaluation of these studies suggests that the most frequently emphasized values are love, respect, responsibility, honesty, and fairness, and that values education programs have a positive effect on children’s development and behavior. However, no previous study has developed and evaluated a specific preschool values education program similar to the current research, indicating a gap in the literature and the need for further studies in this field.

In Türkiye, national initiatives such as the 2012 Values Education Project and the 2017 curriculum revision emphasized the importance of values education but did not provide structured classroom programs. At the preschool level, values are mostly conveyed implicitly, leaving teachers unprepared (Çiçekliyurt & Demir, 2015; Deveci & Ay, 2009). Existing curricula also emphasize cognitive development while neglecting social and emotional dimensions. To address this gap, the researcher developed a Values Education Program for preschool children, designed using the Taba Curriculum Development Model, and evaluated its effectiveness based on teacher feedback. The research aimed to answer the following questions:

1. How effective is the developed values education program from teachers’ perspectives?
 - a) Is there a statistically significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores in students’ acquisition of the targeted values?
 - b) Is there a significant difference between the pre-test, post-test, and delayed evaluation results in teachers’ assessments of the values outcomes specified in the program for the children?

2. What are the perceptions of preschool teachers regarding the effectiveness of the implemented values education program?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a mixed-methods research design, combining qualitative and quantitative approaches (Creswell, 2013; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2013). It was also framed as a Program Effects Case Study, which enables the evaluation of educational programs based on their outcomes (Aytaçlı, 2012).

Sample

The study group consisted of 110 preschool students (51 girls and 59 boys) and six teachers from a public preschool in the Dulkadiroğlu district of Kahramanmaraş during the 2017–2018 academic year. Purposive sampling was used, considering the feasibility of program implementation and participant availability.

Data Collection

The Preschool Values Education Program was developed by the researcher. According to Tudball (2007), values education programs should be designed with consideration of both the school and local environment. In this study, the Taba Curriculum Development Model was adopted because it emphasizes the needs of teachers and students. The Taba model includes seven stages: identifying needs, defining objectives, selecting content, organizing content, selecting learning experiences, organizing learning experiences, and designing evaluation processes (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2014).

Based on this model, a program including six values and related activities was developed. Values were selected through a needs analysis conducted with stakeholders. To assess program effectiveness, the Value Acquisition Evaluation Form was created. Separate forms were prepared for each value, with specific learning outcomes defined. These forms were validated by three faculty members from Gaziantep University. Teachers used them to evaluate student acquisition of values at three points: pre-test (before implementation), post-test (after implementation), and retention test (two months later).

Data Analysis

Normality was tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Since p-values were below .05, the data were considered non-normally distributed. Accordingly, the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was used to compare pre-test and post-test results. The Friedman Test, a non-parametric alternative to repeated measures ANOVA, was applied to analyze retention test results.

Limitations

This study was limited to one public preschool in Kahramanmaraş, including only its students and teachers. Findings are constrained by the instruments used and the context of implementation.

FINDINGS

The first research question, “How effective is the developed values education program based on teachers’ perspectives?”, was addressed. The program targeted six core values: love, respect, responsibility, honesty, patriotism, and fairness. A total of 110 students participated, with evaluations conducted by six teachers across six classrooms. The first sub-question examined was: “Is there a statistically significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores in students’ acquisition of the targeted values?”. The findings are presented in tabular form, followed by interpretations of differences across values. Results demonstrated that the program was perceived by teachers as effective in promoting and sustaining preschoolers’ acquisition of these values.

Table 1.

Pre-Test and Post-Test Results Regarding the Sub-Dimensions of the Value of Love Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcomes	Pre-Test			Post-Test		
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be Improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be Improved n(%)
Love 1	32(29.1)	58(52.7)	20(18.2)	75(68.2)	21(19.1)	14(12.7)
Love 2	24(21.8)	55(50.0)	31(28.2)	72(65.5)	26(23.6)	12(10.9)
Love 3	26(23.6)	54(49.1)	30(27.3)	73(66.4)	23(20.9)	14(12.7)
Love 4	27(24.5)	50(45.5)	33(30.0)	80(72.7)	15(13.6)	15(13.6)
Love 5	35(31.8)	53(48.2)	22(20.0)	91(82.7)	10(9.1)	9(8.2)
Love 6	32(29.1)	54(49.1)	24(21.8)	85(77.3)	17(15.5)	8(7.3)
Love 7	45(40.9)	47(42.7)	18(16.4)	89(80.9)	12(10.9)	9(9.2)

Table 2.

Pre- and Post-Intervention Significance Levels of the Sub-Dimensions of the Value of Love Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcome	Mean ± Standard Deviation (SD)	Min	Max	z	p
Love 1-pretest	2.10±0.68	1	3	-5.296	0.001
Love 1-posttest	2.55±0.71	1	3		
Love 2-pretest Love 2-posttest	1.93±0.70	1	3	-6.907	0.001
	2.54±0.68	1	3		
Love 3-pretest Love 3-posttest	1.96±0.71	1	3	-7.051	0.001
	2.53±0.71	1	3		
Love 4-pretest Love 4-posttest	1.94±0.73	1	3	-7.174	0.001
	2.59±0.72	1	3		
Love 5-pretest Love 5-posttest	2.11±0.71	1	3	-7.234	0.001
	2.74±0.59	1	3		
Love 6-pretest Love 6-posttest	2.07±0.71	1	3	-7.021	0.001

	2.70±0.59	1	3		
Love 7-pretest	2.24±0.71	1	3	-6.153	0.001
Love 7-posttest	2.72±0.60	1	3		

*Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test $p=0.000$

Table 1 presents the learning outcomes associated with the value of love. Across all sub-dimensions, the proportion of students rated as “very good” increased substantially. The most notable improvement was observed in Learning Outcome 5, defined as “*Expresses loving words to those around them.*” The percentage of students rated as “very good” for this outcome rose from 31.8% prior to the intervention to 82.7% after its implementation, representing the highest level of observed progress. Teachers reported that the program’s activities designed to promote the value of love contributed to meaningful positive changes in preschool children’s behaviors.

Table 2 provides the pre-test and post-test results for the sub-dimensions of the love value. Statistically significant increases were identified across all sub-dimensions. The largest improvement was found in Love Outcome 5, where the mean score increased from 2.11 ± 0.71 in the pre-test to 2.74 ± 0.59 in the post-test ($p < .05$). These results indicate that the program effectively supported children’s acquisition of the value of love.

Table 3.

Pre-Test and Post-Test Results Regarding the Sub-Dimensions of the Value of Respect Based on Teacher Evaluations of Preschool Students

Learnig Outcomes	Pretest			Posttest			
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	be
Respect 1	35(31.8)	52(47.3)	23(20.9)	82(74.5)	23(20.9)	5(4.5)	
Respect 2	32(29.1)	59(53.6)	19(17.3)	88(80.0)	18(16.4)	4(3.6)	
Respect 3	40(36.4)	51(46.4)	19(17.3)	91(82.7)	15(13.6)	4(3.6)	
Respect 4	44(40.0)	47(42.7)	19(17.3)	90(81.8)	12(12.7)	6(5.5)	
Respect 5	41(37.3)	43(39.1)	26(23.6)	95(86.4)	10(9.1)	5(4.5)	
Respect 6	55(50.0)	38(34.5)	17(15.5)	92(83.6)	13(11.8)	5(4.5)	
Respect 7	38(34.5)	35(31.8)	37(33.6)	89(80.9)	17(15.5)	4(3.6)	

Table 3 displays the pre-test and post-test results for the sub-dimensions of respect, as evaluated by teachers. Improvements were observed across all outcomes. For example, Respect Outcome 1 (“*Provides examples related to respect*”) improved notably, with the percentage of students rated as “very good” increasing from 31.8% to 74.5%. Similarly, Respect Outcome 5 (“*Shows respect for differences*”) rose from 37.3% to 86.4%. All other outcomes also showed consistent gains, indicating overall positive development.

Table 4 presents the mean scores of the sub-dimensions of respect before and after the program. Respect Outcome 1 increased from 2.10 ± 0.72 to 2.70 ± 0.55 , while Outcomes 2 and 3 rose from 2.11 ± 0.67 and 2.76 ± 0.50 , respectively, with statistically significant gains in all

cases. These findings suggest that the program fostered observable improvements in children’s respectful behaviors, as perceived by their teachers.

Table 4.

Pre- and Post-Intervention Significance Levels of the Sub-Dimensions of the Value of Respect Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcome	Mean ± Standard Deviation (SD)	Min	Max	z	p
Respect 1-pretest	2.10±0.72	1	3	-6.733	0.001
Respect 1-posttest	2.70±0.55	1	3		
Respect 2-pretest	2.11±0.67	1	3	-7.440	0.001
Respect 2-posttest	2.76±0.50	1	3		
Respect 3-pretest	2.19±0.71	1	3	-6.867	0.001
Respect 3-posttest	2.79±0.49	1	3		
Respect 4-pretest	2.22±0.72	1	3	-6.336	0.001
Respect 4-posttest	2.76±0.54	1	3		
Respect 4-pretest	2.22±0.72	1	3	-6.336	0.001
Respect 4-posttest	2.76±0.54	1	3		
Respect 5-pretest	2.13±0.77	1	3	-6.828	0.001
Respect 5-posttest	2.81±0.40	1	3		
Respect 6-pretest	2.34±0.73	1	3	-5.656	0.001
Respect 6-posttest	2.79±0.50	1	3		
Respect 7-pretest	2.00±0.82	1	3	-6.959	0.001
Respect 7-posttest	2.77±0.50	1	3		

* Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test p=0.000

Table 5.

Pre-Test and Post-Test Results Regarding the Sub-Dimensions of the Value of Responsibility Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcomes	Pretest			Posttest		
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be Improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be Improved n(%)
Responsibility Outcome 1	22(20.0)	60(54.5)	28(25.5)	77(70.0)	30(27.3)	3(2.7)
Responsibility Outcome 2	27(24.5)	57(51.8)	26(23.6)	82(74.5)	25(22.7)	3(2.7)
Responsibility Outcome 3	15(13.6)	73(66.4)	22(20.0)	90(81.8)	17(15.5)	3(2.7)
Responsibility Outcome 4	20(18.2)	67(60.9)	23(20.9)	82(74.5)	22(20.0)	6(5.5)
Responsibility Outcome 5	19(17.3)	63(57.3)	28(25.5)	86(78.2)	18(16.4)	6(5.5)
Responsibility Outcome 6	18(16.4)	67(60.9)	25(22.7)	94(85.5)	11(10.0)	5(4.5)
Responsibility Outcome 7	12(10.9)	77(70.0)	21(19.1)	87(79.1)	18(16.4)	5(4.5)

Responsibility Outcome 7 (“Assesses oneself in terms of having responsibility”) improved substantially, with the proportion of students rated as “very good” increasing from 10.9% to 79.1%. Similarly, Responsibility Outcome 3 (“Provides examples of responsibilities within the family”) rose from 13.6% to 81.8%. The greatest improvements were noted in Responsibility Outcomes 1 and 3. Teachers attributed these gains to the program’s responsibility-related classroom activities.

Table 6.

Significance Levels of Pre- and Post-Training Scores for Responsibility Outcome Sub-Dimensions Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcomes	Mean ± Standard Deviation (SD)	Min	Max	z	p
Responsibility 1-pretest	1.94±0.67	1	3	-7.459	0.000
Responsibility 1-posttest	2.67±0.52	1	3		
Responsibility 2-pretest	2.00±0.69	1	3	-7.662	0.000
Responsibility 2-posttest	2.71±0.50	1	3		
Responsibility 3-pretest	1.93±0.57	1	3	-8.236	0.000
Responsibility 3-posttest	2.79±0.47	1	3		
Responsibility 4-pretest	1.97±0.62	1	3	-7.640	0.000
Responsibility 4-posttest	2.69±0.57	1	3		
Responsibility 5-pretest	1.91±0.65	1	3	-7.901	0.000
Responsibility 5-posttest	2.72±0.55	1	3		
Responsibility 6-pretest	1.93±0.62	1	3	-6.941	0.000
Responsibility 6-posttest	2.80±0.49	1	3		
Responsibility 7-pretest	2.91±0.54	1	3	-6.659	0.000
Responsibility 7-posttest	2.74±0.53	1	3		

*Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test p=0.000

Table 6 summarizes the pre- and post-test results for the responsibility value. Significant increases were observed across all sub-dimensions. These findings suggest that the Preschool Values Education Program positively influenced the development of students’ sense of responsibility.

Table 7.

Pre-Test and Post-Test Results for the Sub-Dimensions of the Honesty Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcomes	Pretest			Posttest		
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)
Honesty 1	19(17.3)	50(45.5)	41(37.3)	75(68.2)	19(17.3)	16(14.5)
Honesty 2	19(17.3)	54(49.1)	37(33.6)	73(66.4)	24(21.8)	13(11.8)
Honesty 3	20(18.2)	60(54.5)	30(27.3)	82(74.5)	15(13.6)	13(11.8)
Honesty 4	23(20.9)	54(49.1)	33(30.0)	74(67.3)	23(20.9)	13(11.8)

Honesty 5	25(22.7)	61(55.5)	24(21.8)	66(60.0)	40(36.4)	4(3.6)
Honesty 6	29(26.4)	61(55.5)	20(18.2)	76(69.1)	30(27.3)	4(3.6)
Honesty 7	38(34.5)	48(43.6)	24(21.8)	82(74.5)	22(20.0)	6(5.5)

Table 7 presents the pre- and post-test results for honesty. The greatest improvement occurred in Honesty Outcome 3 (“Provides examples from their own life related to honesty”), where the percentage of students rated as “very good” rose from 18.2% to 74.5%. Gains were also observed across all other outcomes, suggesting that the program helped children internalize the concept of honesty.

Table 8.

Significance Levels of Pre- and Post-Training Scores for the Sub-Dimensions of the Honesty Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcome	Mean ± Standard Deviation (SD)	Min	Max	z	p
Honesty 1-pretest	1.80±0.71	1	3	-7.089	0.000
Honesty 1-posttest	2.53±0.73	1	3		
Honesty 2-pretest	1.83±0.69	1	3	-7.443	0.000
Honesty 2-posttest	2.54±0.69	1	3		
Honesty 3-pretest	1.90±0.67	1	3	-8.145	0.000
Honesty 3-posttest	2.62±0.68	1	3		
Honesty 4-pretest	1.90±0.71	1	3	-7.542	0.000
Honesty 4-posttest	2.55±0.69	1	3		
Honesty 5-pretest	2.00±0.67	1	3	-7.091	0.000
Honesty 5-posttest	2.56±0.56	1	3		
Honesty 6-pretest	2.08±0.66	1	3	-6.777	0.000
Honesty 6-posttest	2.65±0.54	1	3		
Honesty 7-pretest	2.12±0.74	1	3	-6.860	0.000
Honesty 7-posttest	2.69±0.57	1	3		

*Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test $p=0.000$

Table 8 shows the mean scores for the honesty outcomes before and after the program. The most significant improvement was observed in Honesty Outcome 1, which increased from 1.80 ± 0.71 to 2.53 ± 0.73 ($p < .05$). This indicates that the honesty-related activities contributed to measurable behavioral change.

Table 9.

Pre-Test and Post-Test Results for the Sub-Dimensions of the Fairness Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcomes	Pretest			Posttest		
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)
Fairness 1	25(22.7)	35(31.8)	50(45.5)	64(58.2)	25(22.7)	21(19.1)

Fairness 2	28(25.5)	36(32.7)	46(41.8)	63(57.3)	24(21.8)	23(20.9)
Fairness 3	30(27.3)	33(30.0)	47(42.7)	68(61.8)	21(19.1)	21(19.1)
Fairness 4	31(28.2)	36(32.7)	43(39.1)	70(63.6)	19(17.3)	21(19.1)
Fairness 5	32(29.1)	53(48.2)	25(22.7)	71(64.5)	31(28.2)	8(7.3)
Fairness 6	30(27.3)	58(52.7)	22(20.0)	67(60.9)	36(32.7)	7(6.4)
Fairness 7	44(40.0)	34(30.9)	32(29.1)	83(75.5)	19(17.3)	8(7.3)

Table 9 demonstrates improvements in fairness-related outcomes. Students' achievement rates ranged from 22% to 44% prior to the intervention and increased to 63%–83% after the program, reflecting consistent gains across all outcomes.

Table 10.

Significance Levels of Pre- and Post-Training Scores for the Sub-Dimensions of the Fairness Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcomes	Mean ± Standard Deviation (SD)	Min	Max	z	p
Fairness 1-pretest	1.77±0.79	1	3	-7.346	0.000
Fairness 1-posttest	2.39±0.79	1	3		
Fairness 2-pretest	1.83±0.80	1	3	-6.682	0.000
Fairness 2-posttest	2.36±0.80	1	3		
Fairness 3-pretest	1.84±0.82	1	3	-6.607	0.000
Fairness 3-posttest	2.42±0.79	1	3		
Fairness 4-pretest	1.89±0.81	1	3	-6.868	0.000
Fairness 4-posttest	2.44±0.79	1	3		
Fairness 5-pretest	2.06±0.72	1	3	-6.621	0.000
Fairness 5-posttest	2.57±0.62	1	3		
Fairness 6-pretest	2.07±0.68	1	3	-6.480	0.000
Fairness 6-posttest	2.54±0.61	1	3		
Fairness 7-pretest	2.10±0.82	1	3	-6.694	0.000
Fairness 7-posttest	2.68±0.60	1	3		

*Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test p=0.000

Table 10 presents the pre- and post-test mean scores for the fairness outcomes. Statistically significant increases were observed across all sub-dimensions following program implementation, further confirming the program's effectiveness in promoting fairness.

Table 11.

Pre-Test and Post-Test Results for the Sub-Dimensions of the Patriotism Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcomes	Pretest			Posttest			t
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	
Patriotism 1	19(17.3)	32(29.1)	59(53.6)	58(52.7)	35(31.8)	17(15.5)	
Patriotism 2	20(18.2)	41(37.3)	49(44.5)	65(59.1)	39(35.5)	6(5.5)	
Patriotism 3	31(28.2)	35(31.8)	44(40.0)	80(72.7)	21(19.1)	9(8.2)	

Patriotism 4	34(30.9)	50(45.5)	26(23.6)	70(63.6)	34(30.9)	6(5.5)
Patriotism 5	31(28.2)	51(46.4)	28(25.5)	80(72.7)	23(20.9)	7(6.4)
Patriotism 6	37(33.6)	58(52.7)	15(13.6)	80(72.7)	23(20.9)	7(6.4)
Patriotism 7	34(30.9)	60(54.5)	16(14.5)	69(62.7)	32(29.1)	9(8.2)

Table 11 displays the pre- and post-test distributions of behaviors associated with patriotism. For instance, Patriotism Outcome 1 (“States the definition of the homeland”) improved from 17.3% rated as “very good” pre-intervention to 52.7% post-intervention. Positive changes were observed in all patriotism-related outcomes.

Table 12.

Significance Levels of Pre- and Post-Training Scores for the Sub-Dimensions of the Patriotism Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcomes	Mean ± Standard Deviation (SD)	Min	Max	z	P
Patriotism 1-pretest	1.63±0.76	1	3	-6.829	0.001
Patriotism 1-posttest	2.37±0.74	1	3		
Patriotism 2-pretest	1.73±0.75	1	3	-8.203	0.001
Patriotism 2-posttest	2.53±0.60	1	3		
Patriotism 3-pretest	1.88±0.82	1	3	-7.278	0.001
Patriotism 3-posttest	2.64±0.62	1	3		
Patriotism 4-pretest	1.07±0.73	1	3	-5.587	0.001
Patriotism 4-posttest	2.58±0.59	1	3		
Patriotism 5-pretest	2.02±0.73	1	3	-7.015	0.001
Patriotism 5-posttest	2.66±0.59	1	3		
Patriotism 6-pretest	2.20±0.66	1	3	-5.660	0.001
Patriotism 6-posttest	2.66±0.59	1	3		
Patriotism 7-pretest	2.16±0.65	1	3	-4.755	0.001
Patriotism 7-posttest	2.54±0.64	1	3		

*Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test p=0.000

Table 12 presents the pre- and post-test mean scores for patriotism. For Patriotism Outcome 1, the mean increased from 1.63 ± 0.76 to 2.37 ± 0.74, with statistically significant gains across all outcomes. These findings highlight the effectiveness of the program in fostering patriotism among preschool students.

In following section of the study, second sub-question of the first research question, “Is there a significant difference between the pre-test, post-test, and delayed evaluation results in teachers’ assessments of the values outcomes specified in the program for the children?” is addressed. The findings related to the values outcomes are presented below in sequential order.

Table 13 (see appendix) presents the pre-test and post-test results for the sub-dimensions of the Respect outcome, based on teacher evaluations. Increases were observed across all sub-dimensions. For example, Respect Outcome 1 (“Provides examples related to respect”) showed an increase in the proportion of students rated as *Very Good* from 31.8% in

the pre-test to 74.5% in the post-test. Similarly, Respect Outcome 5 (“Shows respect for differences”) rose from 41 students rated as *Very Good* before the training to 95 students after the training. All other sub-dimensions also demonstrated numerical and percentage-based improvements. Retention test results indicated that nearly all outcomes requiring improvement were eliminated, suggesting that the program not only fostered behavioral change but also ensured its durability.

Table 14 (see appendix) presents the mean pre- and post-training scores for the sub-dimensions of the Respect outcome. For example, the mean score for Respect Outcome 1 was 2.10 ± 0.72 before training, increasing to 2.70 ± 0.55 after training. Respect Outcome 2 (“Displays respectful behaviors toward people around them”) and Respect Outcome 3 (“Matches behaviors related to respect in classroom activities”) had pre-test mean scores of 2.11 ± 0.67 and 2.76 ± 0.50 , respectively. Post-test findings indicated increases across all sub-dimensions, all of which were statistically significant. These results demonstrate that the intervention successfully enhanced respectful behaviors. Furthermore, no significant difference was found between post-test and two-month retention scores, indicating the sustainability of program effects over time.

Table 15 (see appendix) shows the distribution of pre- and post-training behaviors for the sub-dimensions of the Patriotism outcome, rated as *Very Good*, *Good*, or *Should Be Improved*. For instance, Patriotism Outcome 1 (“States the definition of the homeland”) increased from 17.3% rated as *Very Good* in the pre-test to 52.7% in the post-test. Improvements were recorded across all sub-dimensions. However, retention test results revealed a decline in *Very Good* ratings for Outcomes 1 (“States the definition of the homeland”), 2 (“Provides examples of concepts related to the homeland”), and 3 (“Defines patriotism”), compared to post-test levels. By contrast, the other sub-dimensions showed an increase in *Very Good* ratings at retention. These findings provide strong evidence of the program’s effectiveness and its lasting impact.

Table 16 (see appendix) reports the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test results for the pre-test, post-test, and retention test scores of the Patriotism outcome based on teacher evaluations. The post-test mean scores were significantly higher, confirming the positive effect of the program. The two-month retention test scores were also significantly higher than the pre-test scores. For instance, retention test scores for Patriotism Outcome 3 (“Defines patriotism”) and Outcome 7 (“Demonstrates behaviors related to patriotism”) were significantly higher than their post-test scores. Although not all changes were statistically significant, overall increases were observed in retention scores, suggesting sustained improvement.

Table 17 (see appendix) presents pre-test, post-test, and retention test results for the Love outcome, based on teacher evaluations. Prior to implementation, only 31.8% of students were rated as *Very Good* for Love Outcome 5 (“Expresses loving words to those around them”), a figure that rose to 82.7% after training. Across all outcomes, significant improvements were observed. However, retention test results revealed a decrease compared to the post-test,

although scores remained higher than the pre-test. This decline was accompanied by an increase in *Good* ratings. Importantly, no outcomes remained in the *Should Be Improved* category. For example, Love Outcome 1 (“Verbally expresses love to those around them”) rose from 29.1% *Very Good* before training to 68.2% afterward but declined to 21.8% at the retention test.

Table 18 (see appendix) presents pre- and post-test results for the Love outcome. Statistically significant increases were observed across all sub-dimensions. For instance, the mean score for Love Outcome 5 (“Expresses loving words to those around them”) rose from 2.11 ± 0.71 before the training to 2.74 ± 0.59 after the training ($p < 0.05$). The program effectively supported the acquisition of Love-related outcomes. However, retention test mean scores were significantly lower than post-test scores, indicating some decline over time.

Table 19 (see appendix) summarizes the findings for the Honesty outcome across the pre-test, post-test, and retention test. For example, Honesty Outcome 1 (“Defines the concept of honesty”) showed an increase in *Very Good* ratings from 17.3% before training to 68.2% afterward, before declining to 30.0% at retention. Similar patterns were found across other outcomes. While retention scores decreased compared to post-test results, the proportion of students rated as *Should Be Improved* declined, with more students classified as *Good*. This suggests that, although some regression occurred, overall performance remained above baseline.

Table 20 (see appendix) shows the mean pre-test, post-test, and retention test scores for Honesty outcomes. Post-test scores were significantly higher, confirming the positive effect of the program. At retention, scores declined compared to post-test levels but remained significantly higher than pre-test scores. For example, the mean score for Honesty Outcome 1 was 1.80 ± 0.71 at pre-test, 2.53 ± 0.73 post-test, and 2.20 ± 0.60 at retention. These findings indicate both short-term effectiveness and partial long-term retention of honesty-related behaviors.

Table 21 (see appendix) presents findings for Fairness outcomes. The proportion of students rated as *Very Good* for Fairness Outcome 1 (“Defines fairness”) increased from 22.7% before the training to 58.2% after training, but declined to 12.7% in the retention test, reflecting a shift toward the *Good* level. While decreases were noted in retention scores, no outcomes remained in the *Should Be Improved* category, with most classified as *Good*. This suggests that the program yielded lasting though moderated improvements.

Table 22 (see appendix) presents the mean scores for Fairness outcomes. Post-test scores were significantly higher than pre-test scores, indicating program effectiveness. However, retention scores declined significantly compared to post-test scores, except for Fairness Outcome 6 (“Compares people around them as fair and unfair”), where no significant difference was observed between post-test and retention. This suggests differential stability across sub-dimensions.

Table 23 (see appendix) presents the pre-test, post-test, and retention results for

Responsibility outcomes based on evaluations. For example, Responsibility Outcome 1 (“Defines the concept of responsibility”) increased from 22 students rated *Very Good* before training to 77 afterward, but declined to 19 in the retention test—below even pre-test levels. Generally, Responsibility outcomes shifted toward the *Good* category in the retention test, with no outcomes remaining in the *Should Be Improved* category.

Table 24 (see appendix) reports mean pre-test, post-test, and retention scores for Responsibility outcomes. Post-test scores were significantly higher than pre-test scores overall, indicating the program’s effectiveness. However, no significant difference was observed for Responsibility Outcome 2 (“Provides examples of rules”) in the post-test. Moreover, a significant decline was found in retention scores compared to post-test results, reflecting partial loss of gains over time.

This section of the study seeks to answer the second research question: “*What are the perceptions of preschool teachers regarding the effectiveness of the implemented values education program?*” The findings related to teachers’ perspectives are presented sequentially.

Among the teachers interviewed, Teacher A described the program as highly effective, stating:

“We had been trying to teach values independently, but since the topics were abstract, we struggled. Having a planned and systematic educational process was very beneficial. We did not face many difficulties, and the program’s effectiveness increased. Being involved in every stage of the program’s development pleased us and helped us address challenging topics. The students were not bored during implementation; they enjoyed the activities. In the future, the program could be enriched with more activities. Since values are abstract concepts, additional activities are needed to ensure permanence.”

Teacher B highlighted the program’s alignment with school needs: *“Since the values were selected by the preschool teachers, the program addressed exactly the values we needed. Observing lasting behavioral changes in students increased my motivation. I believe the program should be further developed and expanded. Adding values such as perseverance, kindness, friendship, sharing, and empathy could enhance the program, as preschool children find these concepts abstract and difficult to grasp. Including us in the committee for activity selection and other stages greatly contributed to its effectiveness. The students participated with enthusiasm and interest. The prepared activities were highly appropriate for their level. In particular, the structured group activities we designed collaboratively attracted great attention and proved effective. The duration of some art activities could be reconsidered, as some children’s attention spans are limited. Supporting the program with homework assignments in the future would strengthen it further.”*

Based on these comments, it can be concluded that the values education program was well-received by the teachers. Increasing both the number of values and the range of activities

included in the program is expected to enhance its impact. A structured curriculum and planned implementation appear effective in teaching abstract values. Teacher E further emphasized:

“I believe it is very effective. Because the selected values, planned activities, and implementation matched our needs, the program’s impact was high. We had never engaged in such a thorough planning process before; being consulted made us feel valued and helped us embrace the program. I observed positive developments in my students’ value acquisition, and I also received very positive feedback from families. I think the program was highly effective, but to increase its impact, it would be useful to repeat activities that children enjoy. This would enhance retention. Visual materials greatly attracted the children’s attention, and increasing their use would strengthen the program.”

These statements suggest that the use of visual materials increased the program’s effectiveness, and repeated engagement in enjoyable activities may further enhance sustainability.

Teacher F emphasized the success of the program in enabling active parental involvement, and also described the program as particularly effective:

“Until now, values education felt like something imposed on teachers. To be self-critical, because it was forced, teachers used to do things simply to meet requirements. The lack of resources made it harder for teachers in the past. However, being consulted during the preparation of this program greatly pleased the teachers and increased their willingness to work. I believe tailoring the program to the school’s needs increased its effectiveness. We also received very positive feedback from families; both families and students increased their awareness of values during this process. I believe the values included in the program should be expanded and continued.”

Considering the views of all participants, it can be inferred that the active involvement of teachers in program development contributed significantly to its effectiveness. The findings indicate that a values education program designed according to the needs of the school and teachers is effective. Furthermore, the program raised awareness of values among families and students.

DISCUSSION

The findings from the evaluation of the developed values education program show that the program was both beneficial and effective for all teachers. The delayed post-test conducted two months after implementation also indicated that the program’s positive effects on students were sustained. These results suggest that the activities implemented were effective for preschool children.

Data collected through value acquisition assessment forms completed by teachers for each student (Love, Respect, Fairness, Patriotism, Honesty, and Responsibility) revealed statistically significant improvements across all values.

A review of the literature supports these findings. Systematically designed values education programs implemented in a planned manner positively influence preschool children (Öztürk Samur, 2011; Skaggs & Bodenhorn, 2006). Aktepe (2015) and Aladağ (2009) reported that structured values education programs significantly improved students' acquisition of Patriotism and Responsibility. Similarly, Öztürk Samur and Deniz (2014) found that preschool programs targeting values such as self-confidence, cooperation, sharing, and responsibility improved interpersonal skills, self-control, and communication abilities. Uysal (2008) also documented positive impacts of values and character education programs.

Kesgin (2015) noted that in the United States, values education programs often referred to as moral education, values education, or character education are supported by both state and federal governments, and are mandatory in some states. These programs have been shown to produce positive outcomes. Berkowitz (2005), representing the Character Education Partnership, concluded that 33 values education programs demonstrated measurable effectiveness.

The findings of this study are consistent with the literature, suggesting that systematically developed values education programs can successfully impart targeted values to preschool students. Teachers' satisfaction with the program further confirms its effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to develop a Preschool Values Education Program by identifying values preschool teachers considered essential and to examine the program's effectiveness.

1. Significant improvements were observed in all targeted values (Love, Honesty, Responsibility, Fairness, Respect, Patriotism) across pre-test, post-test, and delayed post-test measures.
2. Teachers' evaluations confirmed that students achieved the program's intended learning outcomes.
3. Post-test ratings showed an increase in "Very Good" and "Good" evaluations, with a decline in "Should be improved" ratings, indicating program effectiveness.
4. Teachers emphasized that aligning program content with school needs, incorporating teacher input, and engaging families contributed to its success.
5. Repetition of enjoyable activities, use of visual materials, and expansion of values covered are expected to strengthen program sustainability.

Recommendations

1. The Preschool Values Education Program developed in this study could be implemented in other schools and regions to test its generalizability and effectiveness.
2. Teachers often feel underprepared in the area of values education. Regular in-service training could support their competencies.
3. Values education should be delivered through a structured curriculum rather than left entirely to individual teacher discretion.

REFERENCES

- Aktaş, O. (2008). Değer eğitimi akımlarına genel bir bakış. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 6(16), 9–27.
- Aktepe, V. (2015). Etkinlik temelli değer eğitiminin öğrencilerin yardımseverlik tutumlarına etkisi. *Researcher: Social Science Studies*, 2(3), 17–49.
- Aladağ, S. (2009). *İlköğretim sosyal bilgiler öğretiminde değer eğitimi yaklaşımlarının öğrencilerin sorumluluk değerini kazanma düzeyine etkisi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İlköğretim Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.
- Aral, N., & Kadan, G. (2018). 2013 Okul öncesi eğitim programının değerler eğitimi bağlamında incelenmesi. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 13(27), 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.24130/eccd-jecs.196720182159>
- Arslan, Z. Ş., & Yaşar, F. T. (2007). Yükselen değer kavramı üzerine eleştirel bir yaklaşım. *Değerler Eğitimi Merkezi Dergisi*, 1(1), 8–11.
- Avcı, N. (2007). Üniversite gençliğinin bireysel ve toplumsal değerlere ilgi ve bakışı: Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi örneği. In *Değerler ve Eğitimi Sempozyumu*. İstanbul: Değerler Eğitimi Merkezi Yayınları.
- Aydın, M. (2011). Değerler, işlevleri ve ahlak. *Eğitime Bakış*, 1(7), 39–45.
- Aydın, M. Z., & Akyol Gürler, Ş. (2013). *Okulda değerler eğitimi: Yöntemler, etkinlikler, kaynaklar*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Aytaçlı, B. (2012). Durum çalışmasına ayrıntılı bir bakış. *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 1–9.
- Bahar, H. İ. (2008). *Sosyoloji*. Ankara: Uluslararası Stratejik Araştırmalar Kurumu (USAK) Yayınları.
- Berkowitz, M. W., & Bier, M. C. (2005). *What works in character education: A research-driven guide for educators*. Retrieved May 14, 2018, from http://www.fresnostate.edu/kremen/bonnercenter/documents/What_Works.pdf
- Bradshaw, Y., Healey, J. F., & Smith, R. (2001). *Sociology for a new century*. Pine Forge Press.
- Bruno, L. F. C., & Lay, E. G. E. (2006). *Personal values and leadership effectiveness*. Retrieved November 19, 2017, from <http://acervo.ci.fdc.org.br/AcervoDigital/Artigos%20FDC/Artigos%20FDC%202006/Personal%20values%20and%20leadership%20effectiveness.pdf>
- Cevizci, A. (2016). *Eğitim felsefesi*. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Çiçekliyurt, Z. T., & Demir, M. K. (2015). Dördüncü sınıf sosyal bilgiler dersinde doğrudan verilecek değerlerin kazanılma durumunun değerlendirilmesi. *International Journal of Social Science*, 36, 75–94. DOI : [10.9761/JASSS2904](https://doi.org/10.9761/JASSS2904)
- Deveci, H., & Ay, T. (2009). İlköğretim öğrencilerinin günlüklerinde göre günlük yaşamda değerler. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(6), 167–181.

- Einarsdottir, J., Purola, A. M., Johansson, E. M., Broström, S., & Emilson, A. (2015). Democracy, caring and competence: Values perspectives in ECEC curricula in the Nordic countries. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 23(1), 97–114.
- Emilson, A., & Johansson, E. (2008). Communicated values in teacher and toddler interactions in preschool. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 40(1), 35–52
- Erdem, A. R. (2003). Üniversite kültüründe önemli bir unsur: değerler. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 4, 55–72.
- Evans, K., Russell, W., Furgione, B., & Sheridan, A. (2018). "Won't You be my Neighbor? A Study of Familial Perceptions of Character Education in PBS Media Programming in the United States. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 1(2), 1-22.
<https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.01.02.1>
- Fichter, J. (2006). *Sosyoloji nedir* (N. Çelebi, Çev.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Gökçek, B. S. (2007). *5–6 yaş çocukları için hazırlanan karakter eğitimi programının etkisinin incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Okul Öncesi Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İstanbul.
- Günay, M. (2006). Değerler bağlamında insan. Retrieved February 8, 2018, from http://www.felsefeekibi.com/dergi5/s5_y1.html
- Kagama, J. (2018). The School Curriculum and Its Influence on Teacher Motivation in Curriculum Implementation in Kenya. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 1(1), 9-25. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.01.01.2>
- Kennedy, A. (n.d.). *Defining values in early childhood education*. Retrieved December 18, 2017, from <http://www.cccvic.org.au/view/download.cfm>
- Kesgin, S. (2015). Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'ndeki karakter eğitimi programları üzerine bir değerlendirme (Georgia ve Florida örneği). *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 13(29), 117–148.
- Kızılcelik, S., & Erdem, Y. (1992). *Açıklamalı sosyoloji terimler sözlüğü*. Konya: Günay Ofset.
- Kuşdil, M. E., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerinin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz değer kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(45), 59-76.
- Lovat, T., Clement, N., Dally, K., & Toomey, R. (2011). The impact of values education on school ambiance and academic diligence. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 50(3), 166-170. DOI:10.1016/j.ijer.2011.07.008
- Memmedzade, F. (2011). Çağdaş Rus felsefesinde insan ve değerler problemi. *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(23), 245-252.
- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2018, Nisan 9). Okul öncesi eğitime ilişkin hedefler. <https://www.meb.gov.tr/okul-oncesi-egitime-iliskin-hedefler/haber/14508/tr>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2012). *Education at a glance*. OECD.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2014). *Eğitim programı: Temeller, ilkeler ve sorunlar* (A. Arı, Çev.). Konya: Eğitim Kitabevi.

- Öztürk Samur, A. (2011). *Ayrıntılı değerler eğitimi programının 6 yaş çocuklarının sosyal ve duygusal gelişimine etkisi*(Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Öztürk Samur, A., & Deniz, M. E. (2014). Değerler eğitimi programının 6 yaş çocuklarının sosyal ve duygusal gelişimlerine etkisi. *Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim Dergisi*, 7(4), 463-481. <https://doi.org/10.5578/keg.6986>
- Pratiwi V.U., Andayani, Winarni R., Anindyarini A. (2022). Digital Storybook to Transform Character Education of Local Wisdom Figures for Elementary School Students. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 13 (4), 250 – 264.
- Ravinder, R. (2006). Value-based education for human development – Eritrean perspective. *Essays in Education*, 18.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: The Free Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2005). Basic human values: Their content and structure across countries. In A. Tamayo & J. B. Porto (Eds.), *Values and behavior in organizations* (pp. 21-55). Petropolis, Brazil: Vozes. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.3.550>
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Towards a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(3), 550-562.
- Sigurdardottir, I., & Einarsdottir, J. (2016). An action research study in an Icelandic preschool: Developing consensus on values and values education. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 48(2), 161–177. <https://doi.org/10.4219/jaa-2006-345>
- Skaggs, G., & Bodenhorn, N. (2006). Relationships between implementing character education, student behavior and student achievement. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 18(1), 82-114.
- Sönmez, V. (2008). *Eğitim felsefesi*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Thompson, A. (2009). Interpreting Kahle's list of values: Being respected, security and self fulfilment in context. *UW-L Journal of Undergraduate Research*, 12.
- Tokdemir, M. A. (2007). *Tarih öğretmenlerinin değerler ve değer eğitimi hakkındaki görüşleri* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Trabzon.
- Tudball, L. (2007). Whole school approaches to values education: Models of practice in Australian schools. In D. N. Aspin & J. P. Chapman (Eds.), *Values education and lifelong learning: Principles, policies, programmes* (Vol. 1, pp. 395-410). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6184-4_21
- Tunca, N. (2012). *İlköğretim öğretmenleri için mesleki değerler ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi ve ilköğretim öğretmenlerinin mesleki değerlerinin belirlenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Türk Dil Kurumu. (2018, Ocak 15). Değerler eğitimi. http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_yanlis&view=yanlis&kelimez=101

- Ulusoy, K. (2007). *Lise tarih programında yer alan geleneksel demokratik değerlere yönelik öğrenci tutumlarının ve görüşlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2002). *Learning to be: A holistic and integrated approach to values education for human development* (APNIEVE Sourcebook 2). UNESCO.
- Uysal, E. (2008). Çağımızda değer kaymalarının doğurduğu sonuçlar ve etik kimliğin korunması. *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(1), 67-79.
- Ülavere, P., & Veisson, M. (2015). Values and values education in Estonian preschool child care institutions. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*, 17(2), 108–124. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jtes-2015-0016>
- Veugelers, W., & Kat, E. (2003). Moral task of the teacher according to students, parents and teachers. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 9(1), 75-91. DOI:[10.1076/edre.9.1.75.13543](https://doi.org/10.1076/edre.9.1.75.13543)
- Yalar, T. (2010). *İlköğretim sosyal bilgiler programında değerler eğitiminin mevcut durumunun belirlenmesi ve öğretmenlere yönelik bir program modülü geliştirme* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Mersin Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Mersin.
- Yazar, T., & Erkuş, B. (2013). Okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin değerler eğitimine ilişkin görüşleri. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 2(2), 1–19.
- Yeşilyurt, E., & Kurt, İ. (2012). Değerlerin kazandırılmasındaki etkililik açısından resmî ve örtük program ile okul dışı etmenlerin öğrenci görüşleri doğrultusunda değerlendirilmesi. *Turkish Studies – International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 7(4-II), 3253-3272.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yörükoğlu, A. (2003). *Çocuk ruh sağlığı: Çocuğun kişilik gelişimi, eğitimi ve ruhsal sorunları*. İstanbul: Özgür Yayınları.
- Zakiah L., Sarkadi, Marini A., Komarudin, Casmana A.R., Kusmawati A.P. (2023). Implementation of Teaching Multicultural Values Through Civic Education for Elementary School Students. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 14 (1), 110 – 142. <https://jsser.org/index.php/jsser/article/view/4547/608>

APPENDIX

Table 13.*Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Retention Test Results for the Sub-Dimensions of the Respect Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations*

Learning Outcomes	Pretest			Posttest			Retention test		
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)
Respect 1	35(31.8)	52(47.3)	23(20.9)	82(74.5)	23(20.9)	5(4.5)	79 (71.8)	30(27.3)	1(0.9)
Respect 2	32(29.1)	59(53.6)	19(17.3)	88(80.0)	18(16.4)	4(3.6)	85 (77.3)	24(21.8)	1(0.9)
Respect 3	40(36.4)	51(46.4)	19(17.3)	91(82.7)	15(13.6)	4(3.6)	86(78.2)	24(21.8)	0(0)
Respect 4	44(40.0)	47(42.7)	19(17.3)	90(81.8)	12(12.7)	6(5.5)	89(80.9)	20(18.2)	1(0.9)
Respect 5	41(37.3)	43(39.1)	26(23.6)	95(86.4)	10(9.1)	5(4.5)	92(83.6)	18(16.4)	0(0)
Respect 6	55(50.0)	38(34.5)	17(15.5)	92(83.6)	13(11.8)	5(4.5)	91(82.7)	18(16.4)	0(0)
Respect 7	38(34.5)	35(31.8)	37(33.6)	89(80.9)	17(15.5)	4(3.6)	85 (77.3)	25(22.7)	0 (0)

Table 14.*Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test Results for Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Two-Month Retention Test Scores on the Sub-Dimensions of the Respect Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations*

Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	P	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p
	Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)		
Respect pretest	1-2.10±0.72	-6.733	0.001	Respect 1-pretest	2.10±0.72	-7.154	0.001	Respect posttest	1-2.70±0.55	-1.000	0.137
Respect posttest	1-2.70±0.55			Respect 1-Retention test	2.70±0.47			Respect 1-Long r	2.70±0.47		
Respect	2-2.11±0.67	-7.440	0.001	Respect 2-pretest	2.11±0.67	-7.753	0.001	Respect	2-2.76±0.50	-1.342	0.180

pretest	2.76±0.50							posttest			
Respect 2- posttest				Respect 2-Retention test	2.76±0.44			Respect 2-Long r	2.76±0.44		
Respect 3- pretest	2.19±0.71	-6.867	0.001	Respect 3-pretest	2.19±0.71	-7.187	0.001	Respect 3- posttest	2.79±0.49	-1.633	0.102
Respect 3- posttest	2.79±0.49			Respect 3-Retention test	2.78±0.41			Respect 3-Long r	2.78±0.41		
Respect 4- pretest	2.22±0.72	-6.336	0.001	Respect 4-pretest	2.22±0.72	-6.852	0.001	Respect 4- posttest	2.76±0.54	-0.447	0.655
Respect 4- posttest	2.76±0.54			Respect 4-Retention test	2.80±0.42			Respect 4-Long r	2.80±0.42		
Respect 5- pretest	2.13±0.77	-6.828	0.001	Respect 5-pretest	2.13±0.77	-7.792	0.001	Respect 5- posttest	2.81±0.40	-1.342	0.180
Respect 5- posttest	2.81±0.40			Respect 5-Retention test	2.83±0.37			Respect 5-Long r	2.38±0.37		
Respect 6- pretest	2.34±0.73	-5.656	0.001	Respect 6-pretest	2.34±0.73	-6.232	0.001	Respect 6- posttest	2.79±0.50	-0.577	0.564
Respect 6- posttest	2.79±0.50			Respect 6-Retention test	2.82±0.37			Respect 6-Long r	2.82±0.37		
Respect 7- pretest	2.00±0.82	-6.959	0.001	Respect 7-pretest	2.00±0.82	-7.258	0.001	Respect 7- posttest	2.77±0.50	-1.890	0.059
Respect 7- posttest	2.77±0.50			Respect 7-Retention test	2.77±0.42			Respect 7-Long r	2.77±0.42		

Table 15.*Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Retention Test Results for the Sub-Dimensions of the Patriotism Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations*

Learning Outcomes	Pretest			Posttest			Retention test			
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should Be improved n(%)	
Patriotism 1	19(17.3)	32(29.1)	59(53.6)	58(52.7)	35(31.8)	17(15.5)	44(40.0)	59(53.6)	7(6.4)	9(8.2)
Patriotism 2	20(18.2)	41(37.3)	49(44.5)	65(59.1)	39(35.5)	6(5.5)	59(53.6)	48(43.6)	3(2.7)	8(7.3)
Patriotism 3	31(28.2)	35(31.8)	44(40.0)	80(72.7)	21(19.1)	9(8.2)	66(60.0)	39(34.5)	5(4.5)	1(0.9)
Patriotism 4	34(30.9)	50(45.5)	26(23.6)	70(63.6)	34(30.9)	6(5.5)	73(66.4)	35(31.8)	2(1.8)	1(0.9)
Patriotism 5	31(28.2)	51(46.4)	28(25.5)	80(72.7)	23(20.9)	7(6.4)	86(78.2)	22(20.0)	2(1.8)	2(1.8)
Patriotism 6	37(33.6)	58(52.7)	15(13.6)	80(72.7)	23(20.9)	7(6.4)	92(83.6)	16(14.5)	2(1.8)	8(7.3)
Patriotism 7	34(30.9)	60(54.5)	16(14.5)	69(62.7)	32(29.1)	9(8.2)	88(80.0)	20(18.2)	2(1.8)	

Table 16.

Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test Results for Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Two-Month Retention Test Scores on the Sub-Dimensions of the Patriotism Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p
	Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)		
Patriotism 1-pretest	1.63±0.76	-6.829	0.001	Patriotism 1-pretest	1.63±0.76	-8.663	0.001	Patriotism 1-posttest	2.37±0.74	-1.081	0.280
Patriotism 1-posttest	2.37±0.74			Patriotism 1-longr	2.33±0.59			Patriotism 1-longr	2.33±0.59		
Patriotism 2-pretest	1.73±0.75	-8.203	0.001	Patriotism 2-pretest	1.73±0.75	-8.801	0.001	Patriotism 2- posttest	2.53±0.60	-0.943	0.346
Patriotism 2-posttest	2.53±0.60			Patriotism 2- longr	2.50±0.55			Patriotism 2- longr	2.50±0.55		
Patriotism 3-pretest	1.88±0.82	-7.278	0.001	Patriotism 3-pretest	1.88±0.82	-8.048	0.001	Patriotism 3- posttest	2.64±0.62	-3.273	0.001
Patriotism 3-posttest	2.64±0.62			Patriotism 3- longr	2.55±0.58			Patriotism 3- longr	2.55±0.58		
Patriotism 4-pretest	1.07±0.73	-5.587	0.001	Patriotism 4-pretest	1.07±0.7	-7.371	0.001	Patriotism 4- posttest	2.58±0.59	-0.507	0.612
Patriotism 4-posttest	2.58±0.59			Patriotism 4- longr	2.64±0.51			Patriotism 4- longr	2.64±0.51		
Patriotism 5-pretest	2.02±0.73	-7.015	0.001	Patriotism 5-pretest	2.02±0.73	-8.165	0.001	Patriotism 5- posttest	2.66±0.59	-0.209	0.835
Patriotism 5-posttest	2.66±0.59			Patriotism 5- longr	2.76±0.46			Patriotism 5- longr	2.76±0.46		
Patriotism 6-pretest	2.20±0.66	-5.660	0.001	Patriotism 6-pretest	2.20±0.66	-8.011	0.001	Patriotism 6- posttest	2.66±0.59	-1.400	0.162
Patriotism 6-posttest	2.66±0.59			Patriotism 6- longr	2.81±0.43			Patriotism 6- longr	2.81±0.43		
Patriotism 7-pretest	2.16±0.65	-4.755	0.001	Patriotism 7-pretest	2.16±0.65	-7.792	0.001	Patriotism 7- posttest	2.54±0.64	-2.556	0.001
Patriotism 7-posttest	2.54±0.64			Patriotism 7- longr	2.78±0.45			Patriotism 7- longr	2.78±0.45		

Table 17.*Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Retention Test Results for the Sub-Dimensions of the Love Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations*

Learning Outcomes	Pretest			Posttest			Retention test			
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	
Love 1	32(29.1)	58(52.7)	20(18.2)	75(68.2)	21(19.1)	14(12.7)	24(21.8)	86(78.2)	0(0)	9(8.2)
Love 2	24(21.8)	55(50.0)	31(28.2)	72(65.5)	26(23.6)	12(10.9)	22(20.0)	88(80.0)	0(0)	8(7.3)
Love 3	26(23.6)	54(49.1)	30(27.3)	73(66.4)	23(20.9)	14(12.7)	25(22.7)	85(77.3)	0(0)	1(0.9)
Love 4	27(24.5)	50(45.5)	33(30.0)	80(72.7)	15(13.6)	15(13.6)	41(37.3)	69(62.7)	0(0)	1(0.9)
Love 5	35(31.8)	53(48.2)	22(20.0)	91(82.7)	10(9.1)	9(8.2)	63(40.0)	47(54.5)	0(0)	2(1.8)
Love 6	32(29.1)	54(49.1)	24(21.8)	85(77.3)	17(15.5)	8(7.3)	64(58.2)	46(41.8)	0(0)	8(7.3)
Love 7	45(40.9)	47(42.7)	18(16.4)	89(80.9)	12(10.9)	9(9.2)	64(58.2)	46(41.8)	0(0)	

Table 18.

Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test Results for Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Two-Month Retention Test Scores on the Sub-Dimensions of the Love Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p
	Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)		
Love 1-pretest	2.10±0.68	-6.128	0.001	Love 1-pretest	2.10±0.68	-1.373	0.170	Love 1-posttest	2.55±0.71	-6.932	0.001
Love 1-posttest	1-2.55±0.71			Love 1-Retest	2.21±0.41			Love 1-retentiontest	1-2.21±0.41		
Love 2-pretest	1.93±0.70	-5.717	0.001	Love 2-pretest	1.93±0.70	-3.557	0.001	Love 2- posttest	2.54±0.68	-6.929	0.001
Love 2-posttest	2-2.54±0.68			Love 2-retentiontest	2-2.20±0.40			Love 2-retentiontest	2-2.20±0.40		
Love 3-pretest	1.96±0.71	-4.605	0.001	Love 3-pretest	1.96±0.71	-3.404	0.001	Love 3- posttest	2.53±0.71	-6.500	0.001
Love 3-posttest	3-2.53±0.71			Love 3-retentiontest	3-2.22±0.42			Love 3-retentiontest	3-2.22±0.42		
Love 4-pretest	1.94±0.73	-6.369	0.001	Love 4-pretest	1.94±0.73	-4.637	0.001	Love 4- posttest	2.59±0.72	-5.084	0.001
Love 4-posttest	4-2.59±0.72			Love 4-retentiontest	4-2.37±0.48			Love 4-retentiontest	4-2.37±0.48		
Love 5-pretest	2.11±0.71	-6.859	0.001	Love 5-pretest	2.11±0.71	-4.890	0.001	Love 5- posttest	2.74±0.59	-3.971	0.001
Love 5-posttest	5-2.74±0.59			Love 5-retentiontest	5-2.57±0.49			Love 5-retentiontest	5-2.57±0.49		
Love 6-pretest	2.07±0.71	-5.664	0.001	Love 6-pretest	2.07±0.71	-5.399	0.001	Love 6- posttest	2.70±0.59	-3.273	0.001
Love 6-posttest	6-2.70±0.59			Love 6-retentiontest	6-2.58±0.49			Love 6-retentiontest	6-2.58±0.49		
Love 7-pretest	2.24±0.71	-5.956	0.001	Love 7-pretest	2.24±0.71	-3.957	0.001	Love 7- posttest	2.72±0.60	-3.728	0.001
Love 7-posttest	7-2.72±0.60			Love 7-retentiontest	7-2.58±0.49			Love 7-retentiontest	7-2.58±0.49		

Table 19.*Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Retention Test Results for the Sub-Dimensions of the Honesty Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations*

Learning Outcomes	Pretest			Posttest			Retention test			
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should improved n(%)	beVery Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should improved n(%)	beVery Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should improved n(%)	be
Honesty 1	19(17,3)	50(45.5)	41(37.3)	75(68.2)	19(17,3)	16(14.5)	33(30.0)	66(60.0)	11(10.0)	
Honesty 2	19(17,3)	54(49.1)	37(33.6)	73(66.4)	24(21.8)	13(11.8)	37(33.6)	60(54.5)	13(11.8)	
Honesty 3	20(18.2)	60(54.5)	30(27.3)	82(74.5)	15(13.6)	13(11.8)	38(34.5)	61(55.5)	11(10.0)	
Honesty 4	23(20.9)	54(49.1)	33(30.0)	74(67.3)	23(20.9)	13(11.8)	43(39.1)	55(50.0)	12(10.9)	
Honesty 5	25(22.7)	61(55.5)	24(21.8)	66(60.0)	40(36.4)	4(3.6)	37(33.6)	69(62.7)	4(3.6)	
Honesty 6	29(26.4)	61(55.5)	20(18.2)	76(69.1)	30(27.3)	4(3.6)	32(29.1)	72(65.5)	6(5.5)	
Honesty 7	38(34.5)	48(43.6)	24(21.8)	82(74.5)	22(20.0)	6(5.5)	55(50.0)	51(46.4)	4(3.6)	

Table 20.

Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test Results for Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Two-Month Retention Test Scores on the Sub-Dimensions of the Honesty Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p
	Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)		
Honesty 1-pretest	1.80±0.71	-7.089	0.001	Honesty1-pretest	1.80±0.71	-5.596	0.001	Honesty1-posttest	2.53±0.73	-5.259	0.001
Honesty 1-posttest	2.53±0.73			Honesty 1-retentiontest	2.20±0.60			Honesty 1-retentiontest	2.20±0.60		
Honesty 2-pretest	1.83±0.69	-7.443	0.001	Honesty2-pretest	1.83±0.69	4.997	0.001	Honesty 2- posttest	2.54±0.69	-4.895	0.001
Honesty 2-posttest	2.54±0.69			Honesty 2-retentiontest	2.21±0.64			Honesty 2-retentiontest	2.21±0.64		
Honesty 3-pretest	1.90±0.67	-8.145	0.001	Honesty 3-pretest	1.90±0.67	-5.181	0.0001	Honesty 3- posttest	2.62±0.68	-5.980	0.001
Honesty 3-posttest	3-2.62±0.68			Honesty3-retentiontest	2.24±0.62			Honesty 3-retentiontest	3-2.24±0.62		
Honesty 4-pretest	1.90±0.71	-7.542	0.001	Honesty 4-pretest	1.90±0.71	-5.014	0.001	Honesty 4- posttest	2.55±0.69	-4.330	0.001
Honesty 4-posttest	4-2.55±0.69			Honesty 4-retentiontest	2.28±0.61			Honesty 4-retentiontest	4-2.28±0.61		
Honesty 5-pretest	2.00±0.67	-7.091	0.001	Honesty 5-pretest	2.00±0.67	-4.063	0.001	Honesty 5- posttest	2.56±0.56	-4.230	0.001
Honesty 5-posttest	5-2.56±0.56			Honesty 5-retentiontest	5-2.30±0.53			Honesty 5-retentiontest	5-2.30±0.53		
Honesty 6-pretest	2.08±0.66	-6.777	0.001	Honesty 6-pretest	2.08±0.66	-2.380	0.017	Honesty 6- posttest	2.65±0.54	-5.907	0.001
Honesty 6-posttest	6-2.65±0.54			Honesty 6-retentiontest	6-2.23±0.54			Honesty 6-retentiontest	6-2.23±0.54		
Honesty 7-pretest	2.12±0.74	-6.860	0.001	Honesty 1-pretest	2.12±0.74	-4.319	0.001	Honesty 1-posttest	2.69±0.57	-5.371	0.001
Honesty 7-posttest	7-2.69±0.57			Honesty 1-retentiontest	2.46±0.56			Honesty 1-retentiontest	1-2.46±0.56		

retentiontest

Table 21.*Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Retention Test Results for the Sub-Dimensions of the Fairness Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations*

Learning Outcomes	Pretest				Posttest			Retention test		
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should improved n(%)	beVery Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should improved n(%)	beVery Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should improved n(%)	be
Fairness 1	25(22.7)	35(31.8)	50(45.5)	64(58.2)	25(22.7)	21(19.1)	14(12.7)	96(87.3)	0(0)	
Fairness 2	28(25.5)	36(32.7)	46(41.8)	63(57.3)	24(21.8)	23(20.9)	14(12.7)	96(87.3)	0(0)	
Fairness 3	30(27.3)	33(30.0)	47(42.7)	68(61.8)	21(19.1)	21(19.1)	22(20.0)	88(80.0)	0(0)	
Fairness 4	31(28.2)	36(32.7)	43(39.1)	70(63.6)	19(17.3)	21(19.1)	40(36.4)	70(63.6)	0(0)	
Fairness 5	32(29.1)	53(48.2)	25(22.7)	71(64.5)	31(28.2)	8(7.3)	44(40.0)	66(60.0)	0(0)	
Fairness 6	30(27.3)	58(52.7)	22(20.0)	67(60.9)	36(32.7)	7(6.4)	56(50.9)	54(49.1)	0(0)	
Fairness 7	44(40.0)	34(30.9)	32(29.1)	83(75.5)	19(17.3)	8(7.3)	37(33.6)	73(66.4)	0(0)	

Table 22.

Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test Results for Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Two-Month Retention Test Scores on the Sub-Dimensions of the Fairness Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p
	Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)		
Fairness 1-pretest	1.77±0.79	-7.346	0.001	Fairness 1-pretest	1.77±0.79	-3.804	0.001	Fairness 1-posttest	2.39±0.79	-8.076	0.001
Fairness 1-posttest	2.39±0.79			Fairness 1- retentiontest	2.12±0.33			Fairness 1- retentiontest	2.12±0.33		
Fairness 2-pretest	1.83±0.80	-6.682	0.001	Fairness 2-pretest	1.83±0.80	-3.386	0.001	Fairness 2- posttest	2.36±0.80	-8.137	0.001
Fairness 2-posttest	2.36±0.80			Fairness 2- retentiontest	2.12±0.33			Fairness 2- retentiontest	2.12±0.33		
Fairness 3-pretest	1.84±0.82	-6.607	0.001	Fairness 3-pretest	1.84±0.82	-3.897	0.001	Fairness 3- posttest	2.42±0.79	-7.506	0.001
Fairness 3-posttest	2.42±0.79			Fairness 3- retentiontest	2.20±0.40			Fairness 3- retentiontest	2.20±0.40		
Fairness 4-pretest	1.89±0.81	-6.868	0.001	Fairness 4-pretest	1.89±0.81	-5.138	0.001	Fairness 4- posttest	2.44±0.79	-6.173	0.001
Fairness 4-posttest	2.44±0.79			Fairness 4- retentiontest	2.36±0.48			Fairness 4- retentiontest	2.36±0.48		
Fairness 5-pretest	2.06±0.72	-6.621	0.001	Fairness 5-pretest	2.06±0.72	-3.826	0.001	Fairness 5- posttest	2.57±0.62	-4.737	0.001
Fairness 5-posttest	2.57±0.62			Fairness 5- retentiontest	2.40±0.49			Fairness 5- retentiontest	2.40±0.49		
Fairness 6-pretest	2.07±0.68	-6.480	0.001	Fairness 6-pretest	2.07±0.68	-4.117	0.001	Fairness 6- posttest	2.54±0.61	-2.101	0.036
Fairness 6-posttest	2.54±0.61			Fairness 6- retentiontest	2.50±0.52			Fairness 6- retentiontest	2.50±0.52		
Fairness 7-pretest	2.10±0.82	-6.694	0.001	Fairness 1-pretest	2.10±0.82	-2.464	0.014	Fairness 1-posttest	2.68±0.60	-6.713	0.014
Fairness 7-posttest	2.68±0.60			Fairness 1- <u>retentiontest</u>	2.33±0.47			Fairness 1- retentiontest	2.33±0.47		

Table 23.*Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Retention Test Results for the Sub-Dimensions of the Responsibility Outcome Based on Evaluations*

Learning Outcomes	Pretest			Posttest			Retention test		
	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)	Very Good n(%)	Good n(%)	Should be improved n(%)
Responsibility Outcome 1	22(20.0)	60(54.5)	28(25.5)	77(70.0)	30(27.3)	3(2.7)	19(17.3)	91(82.7)	0(0)
Responsibility Outcome 2	27(24.5)	57(51.8)	26(23.6)	82(74.5)	25(22.7)	3(2.7)	18(16.4)	92(83.6)	0(0)
Responsibility Outcome 3	15(13.6)	73(66.4)	22(20.0)	90(81.8)	17(15.5)	3(2.7)	20(18.2)	90(81.8)	0(0)
Responsibility Outcome 4	20(18.2)	67(60.9)	23(20.9)	82(74.5)	22(20.0)	6(5.5)	40(36.4)	70(63.6)	0(0)
Responsibility Outcome 5	19(17.3)	63(57.3)	28(25.5)	86(78.2)	18(16.4)	6(5.5)	30(27.3)	80(72.7)	0(0)
Responsibility Outcome 6	18(16.4)	67(60.9)	25(22.7)	94(85.5)	11(10.0)	5(4.5)	61(61.8)	48(33.6)	0(0)
Responsibility Outcome 7	12(10.9)	77(70.0)	21(19.1)	87(79.1)	18(16.4)	5(4.5)	61(61.8)	49(44.5)	0(0)

Table 24.

Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test Results for Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Two-Month Retention Test Scores on the Sub-Dimensions of the Responsibility Outcome Based on Teacher Evaluations

Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p	Learning Outcome	Mean	±z	p
	Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)				Standard Deviation (SD)		
Responsibility pretest	1-1.94±0.67	-7.459	0.001	Responsibility pretest	1-1.94±0.67	-3.204	0.001	Responsibility posttest	1-2.67±0.52	-7.103	0.001
Responsibility posttest	2-2.67±0.52			Responsibility 1retentiontest	2-2.17±0.37			Responsibility 1-retentiontest	2-2.17±0.37		
Responsibility pretest	2-2.00±0.69	-7.662	0.001	Responsibility pretest	2-2.00±0.69	-2.213	0.027	Responsibility posttest	2-2.71±0.50	-7.714	0.001
Responsibility posttest	3-2.71±0.50			Responsibility retentiontest	3-2.17±0.37			Responsibility retentiontest	3-2.17±0.37		
Responsibility pretest	3-1.93±0.57	-8.236	0.001	Responsibility pretest	3-1.93±0.57	-4.025	0.001	Responsibility posttest	3-2.79±0.47	8.310	0.001
Responsibility posttest	4-2.79±0.47			Responsibility retentiontest	4-2.18±0.38			Responsibility retentiontest	4-2.18±0.38		
Responsibility pretest	4-1.97±0.62	-7.640	0.001	Responsibility pretest	4-1.97±0.62	-4.768	0.001	Responsibility posttest	4-2.69±0.57	-5.662	0.001
Responsibility posttest	5-2.69±0.57			Responsibility retentiontest	5-2.36±0.48			Responsibility retentiontest	5-2.36±0.48		
Responsibility pretest	5-1.91±0.65	-7.901	0.001	Responsibility pretest	5-1.91±0.65	-4.501	0.001	Responsibility posttest	5-2.72±0.55	-7.103	0.001
Responsibility posttest	6-2.72±0.55			Responsibility retentiontest	6-2.27±0.44			Responsibility retentiontest	6-2.27±0.44		
Responsibility pretest	6-1.93±0.62	-6.941	0.001	Responsibility pretest	6-1.93±0.62	-7.326	0.001	Responsibility posttest	6-2.80±0.49	-3.592	0.001
Responsibility posttest	7-2.80±0.49			Responsibility retentiontest	7-2.67±0.47			Responsibility retentiontest	7-2.67±0.47		

Responsibility 6- posttest				retentiontest				Responsibility 6- retentiontest			
Responsibility 7-2.91±0.54 pretest	-6.659	0.001		Responsibility 7-2.91±0.54 pretest	-5.557	0.001		Responsibility 7-2.74±0.53 posttest	-6.640	0.001	
Responsibility 7- posttest				Responsibility 7-2.36±0.48 retentiontest				Responsibility 7- retentiontest			
