

TURKISH PRESCHOOL TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT CHILDREN'S
CONCEPTION OF SOCIAL CONVENTIONAL AND MORAL EVENTS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MUHAMMET ALI KARADUMAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

AUGUST 2018

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tlin Gen z
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Assist. Prof. Dr. H.  zlen Demircan
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully
adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Feyza Erden
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Metehan Buldu	(Kırıkkale Uni., ECE)	<hr/>
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Feyza Erden	(METU, ECE)	<hr/>
Assoc. Prof. Dr. �ı�dem Haser	(METU, MSE)	<hr/>
Assist. Prof. Dr. H. �zlen Demircan	(METU, ECE)	<hr/>
Assist. Prof. Dr. �a�la �neren-�endil	(TED Uni., ECE)	<hr/>

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Muhammet Ali Karaduman

Signature :

ABSTRACT

TURKISH PRESCHOOL TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT CHILDREN'S CONCEPTION ABOUT SOCIAL CONVENTIONAL AND MORAL EVENTS

Karaduman, Muhammet Ali

Ph.D., Department of Early Childhood Education

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Feyza Erden

August 2018, 175 pages

This phenomenological study investigates the beliefs of Turkish preschool teachers regarding young children's conception of moral and social conventional events. To serve for this purpose, participants' definitions and categorizations of young children's in-class behaviors have been identified first and then participant teachers own conceptions have been examined before analyzing their beliefs. The data has been conducted from 26 Turkish preschool teachers working in 5 different provinces in Turkey. Primary method for data collection is three-interview-series which is a type of in-depth interview. Findings suggests that participants categorize in-class behaviors into two groups: desired and undesired behaviors. Findings also reveals that participants categorize events or transgressions into three categories: Moral, Social conventional and Mixed, which are also mentioned in previous social domain research. Teachers' beliefs about children's conceptions provide similar results for social conventional and

mixed domain events. However, in terms of moral events, findings are totally different from both the teachers' own conceptions and previous social domain research. Participants emphasized social conventional influences, especially obedience to authority, when they mention children's conceptions for moral events. A conclusion to be drawn based on the findings is that participant teachers of the current study can differentiate social conventions from morality but they lack sufficient understanding of the moral capabilities of children. Given that the findings of the current study indicate that both pre-service and in-service trainings are required to help teachers understand moral development of children and its application to the classroom settings, recommendations are offered for the CHE and MoNE.

Keywords: Early Childhood Education, Social Domain Theory, Moral Reasoning, Social Understanding, Teachers' Beliefs

ÖZ

TÜRK OKUL ÖNCESİ ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN ÇOCUKLARIN TOPLUMSAL-GELENEKSEL VE AHLAKİ OLAYLARI KAVRAYIŞ BİÇİMLERİNE İLİŞKİN İNANISLARI

Karaduman, Muhammet Ali
Doktora, Okul Öncesi Eğitim Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Feyza Erden

Ağustos 2018, 175 sayfa

Bu fenomenolojik çalışma, okul öncesi öğretmen inanışlarını küçük çocukların ahlaki ve toplumsal/geleneksel olayları kavrayışlarına bağlamında araştırmaktadır. Bu amaca hizmet etmek için öğretmen inanışlarından önce katılımcıların küçük çocukların sınıf içi davranışları tanımlamaları ve sınıflandırmaları istenmiş ve katılımcı öğretmenlerin kavrayışları incelenmiştir. Veriler, Ankara'da ve Karadeniz kıyısındaki 4 farklı ilde çalışan 26 Türk okul öncesi öğretmeni ile yürütülmüştür. Veri toplama yöntemi olarak, bir tür derinlemesine görüşme yöntemi olan üçlü görüşme dizisi kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, katılımcı öğretmenlerin sınıf içi davranışları iki gruba ayırdığını göstermektedir: İstendik ve istenmedik davranışlar. Bulgular ayrıca katılımcı öğretmenlerin olayları veya ihlal durumlarını üç kategori çerçevesinde değerlendirdiklerini ortaya koymaktadır: (1) Ahlaki, (2) Toplumsal/geleneksel ve (3)

Karma. Öğretmenlerin çocukların kavrayışları hakkındaki inanışları, toplumsal/geleneksel ve karma alan için benzer sonuçlar vermiştir. Ancak ahlaki olaylar açısından bulgular hem öğretmenlerin kendi kavrayışlarından hem de önceki sosyal alan araştırmalarından tamamen farklıdır. Öğretmenlerin toplumsal-geleneksel davranışlar ve karma davranışlar ile ilgili inanışları kendi kavrayışlarıyla paralellik göstermektedir fakat ahlaki davranışlara yönelik inanışlarında farklı sonuçlara ulaşılmıştır. Öğretmenler çocukların ahlaki davranışlara dair kavrayışlarının otorite etkisiyle değişebileceğini belirtmişlerdir. Bu sosyal alan kuramının bulgularıyla çelişmektedir. Bulgulardan yola çıkarak katılımcı öğretmenlerin ahlaki olan ile toplumsal/geleneksel olan davranışları birbirinden ayırabildiğini söyleyebiliriz. Ancak katılımcı öğretmenlerin çocukların ahlaki yargı yeteneklerini yeterince anlamadıklarından söz etmek yerinde olacaktır. Mevcut çalışmanın bulguları okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin çocukların ahlaki gelişimini anlamaları ve okul öncesi sınıflarına uygun ahlak eğitim yöntemleri geliştirmelerine yardımcı olmak için hem hizmet öncesi hem de hizmet içi eğitimlerin gerekli olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu bağlamda Yükseköğretim Kurumu ve Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı için öneriler sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okul Öncesi Eğitimi, Sosyal Alan Kuramı, Ahlaki Yargı, Toplumsal Kavrayış, Öğretmen İnanışları

To
Nil & Tuğçe

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am lucky enough to have been given the supportive gift of amazing people in my life, without all of whom, this work would not have been completed.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Feyza Erden, for her ongoing support and invaluable suggestions throughout my journey to doctorhood. I have been extremely lucky to have her as my supervisor. Throughout this writing period, she provided encouragement, sound advice, good teaching, good company, and lots of good ideas. I would have been lost without her. I have greatly benefited from her expertise and supervision. I am also grateful to all of those with whom I have had the pleasure to work with during this and other projects. Each of the members of my Dissertation Committee has provided me extensive personal and professional guidance and taught me a great deal about both scientific research and life in general. I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çiğdem Haser, Assist. Prof. Dr. Özlen Demircan, Assist. Prof. Dr. Metehan Buldu and Assist. Prof. Dr. Çağla Öneren-Şendil. I am also grateful to Prof. Dr. İsmihan Çetin, Head of the Department of Child Development at Hacettepe University and Prof. Dr. Elliot Turiel, Jerome A. Hutto Professor of Graduate School of Education at UC Berkeley, who have been supportive of my career goals and who worked actively to provide me with the academic motivation to pursue those goals. As my teacher and mentor, they have taught me more than I could ever give them credit for here. They have shown me, by example, what a good researcher, teacher and person should be.

I must express my gratitude to Tuğçe, my wife, who kept me going when I wanted to give up. She was always there when I thought that it is impossible to keep standing. I cannot thank her enough for her unending contribution and inspiration. I appreciate my daughter, my little angel Nil for her patience: I apologize for every second I cannot be there with you.

I would like to thank the Turkish State Planning Organization, not only for providing the funding which allowed me to undertake this research, but also for giving me the opportunity to meet so many interesting people.

Most of this study was written during my weekly travel from Artvin to Ankara, Turkey. So, I would like to thank Turkish Airlines and Artvin Ses Turizm, which is a regional transportation company, for turning a tedious and uninspiring exercise into a more interesting one.

Finally, thanks to others who offered help and anyone who would read this.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Purpose of the Study.....	6
1.2. Research Questions.....	7
1.3. Significance of the Study	7
1.4. Personal Motivation.....	9
1.5. Delimitations of the Study	12
1.6. Definition of Important Terms	12
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	14
2.1. Piaget’s Theory of Moral Development	14
2.1.1. Shift from heteronomy to autonomy.....	14
2.1.2. The shift towards autonomy	15

2.1.3. Application in classrooms by teachers	16
2.2. Stage Based Moral Development.....	17
2.2.1. Pre-conventional level	18
2.2.2. Conventional level.....	19
2.2.3. Conventional level of moral development.....	20
2.3. Social Cognitive Domain Theory.....	23
2.3.1. Morality among individuals.....	23
2.3.2. Domain differences through social experiences.....	25
2.3.3. Social conventions.....	27
2.4. Moral Development and Education.....	30
2.4.1. Approaches to social and moral education	31
2.4.2. Application of social domain theory on moral education.....	32
2.4.3. Moral education and associated implications	33
2.4.4. Moral development in contemporary education.....	35
2.5. Behaviors in the Paradigm of Moral Reasoning	36
2.6. Moral Reasoning in Turkey	38
2.7. Teachers Beliefs on Social Domain and Morality	42
2.7.1. Definition and nature of teachers' beliefs and characteristics ...	43
2.7.2. Importance of teachers' beliefs and its impact on their teaching	44
2.7.3. Orientation and organization of moral classrooms.....	45
2.8. Obedience to authority.....	47
2.8.1. Overview of obedience	47
2.8.2. Milgram's behavioral study of obedience.....	47
2.8.3. Zimbardo's prison experiment	48
2.8.4. Raz's theory of authority	48
2.8.5. Montessori's the absorbent mind	49
2.9. Summary.....	50

3. METHODOLOGY.....	52
3.1 Research Design.....	52
3.1.1. Phenomenological approach	53
3.1.2. Researcher's role	55
3.1.3. Participants	56
3.2. Data Collection Procedures.....	59
3.2.1. Pilot interviews.....	59
3.2.2. Interviews.....	60
3.3. Data Analysis Procedure.....	63
3.4. Trustworthiness	65
3.4.1. Credibility	65
3.4.2. Transferability	66
3.4.3. Dependability	67
3.4.4. Confirmability	67
3.5 Ethical Issues.....	67
4. FINDINGS.....	69
4.1. Categories of Classroom Behaviors based on Preschool Teachers' Definitions.....	70
4.2. Teacher's Conceptions of Social Conventional and Moral Events	76
4.2.1. Moral domain	77
4.2.2. Social conventional domain	84
4.2.3. Mixed domain events.....	89
4.3. Teachers' Beliefs about Children's Social and Moral Judgment...	93
4.3.1. Moral events	95
4.3.2. Social conventional.....	101
4.3.3. Mixed domain events.....	105
4.4. Findings Overview	108
4.4.1. Teacher's conception of moral and social conventional.....	108

4.4.2. Teachers' beliefs about children's conception of moral and social conventional events	109
5. DISCUSSION.....	111
5.1. Teacher's Conceptions of Moral and Social Conventional Events 114	
5.2. Teachers' Beliefs about Children's Conception of Moral and Social Conventional Events.....	116
5.3. Implications of the Study.....	121
5.4. Limitations of the Study	123
REFERENCES	125
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Consent Form.....	142
Appendix B: Interview Protocols: Interview 1.....	144
Appendix C: Interview Protocols: Interview 2.....	146
Appendix D: Interview Protocols: Interview 3.....	147
Appendix E: Approval of Human Subjects Ethics Committee	149
Appendix F: Curriculum Vitae	150
Appendix G: Turkish Summary / Türkçe Özet	153
Appendix H: Tez Fotokopi İzin Formu.....	175

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Kohlberg's distinction between Type A and Type B moral orientations	22
Table 3.1 Participant preschool teachers' demographics	58
Table 3.2 Characteristics of the behaviors provide a basis for conceptions ..	64
Table 4.1 List of desired behaviors.....	71
Table 4.2 List of undesired behaviors	72
Table 4.3 List of all behaviors	74
Table 4.4 Characteristics of the behaviors provide a basis for conceptions	76
Table 4.5 The 10 most unaccepted in-class behaviors	77
Table 4.6 Participant teachers' conceptions of moral events	78
Table 4.7 Participant teachers' conceptions of social conventional events	85
Table 4.8 Participant teachers' conceptions of mixed domain events	90
Table 4.9 Participant teachers' beliefs about children's conception of social conventional and moral events	94
Table 4.10 Participant teachers' beliefs about children's conception of moral events	95
Table 4.11 Participant teachers' beliefs about children's conception of	

social conventional events	102
Table 4.12 Participant teachers' beliefs about children's conception of	
mixed domain events	105

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CHE: Council of Higher Education
ECE: Early Childhood Education
MoNE: Ministry of National Education
SDT: Social Domain Theory

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Educational institutions all over the world play a vital role in not only educating the youth, but also in imparting social, moral, and cultural values to them, which may sometimes contribute to processes of social change (Velea & Farca, 2013). Since the known history of human development, learning and the accompanying moral values have two distinct perspectives, i.e., external and internal perspectives (Wren, 2014). The external view of moral values is contextualized as a method or standard to interact with others, while moral values are also regarded as methods of interactions for one's own self, if perceived internally. It can also be considered that moral education is significant for controlling the social interaction process among individuals and the necessary tool for self-communication and acknowledgment (Wren, 2014).

Berkowitz (2012) emphasized that the initial stage of schooling is a significant source of influencing the youth and thus requires the assessment of its actual role in imparting moral values to children. Although the school is the primary means by which children are educated and taught knowledge, its contribution to the efficiency of children's moral development is considered more important. Nucci and Turiel (2009) described the application of morality-oriented knowledge on the development of youth in the respective education and learning system at school or elsewhere.

In the paradigm of school education, there are diverse viewpoints on imparting moral values to children during their education. Similar disparities prevail in the scholar's perspective of expected educational results in terms of social and personal moralities along with the role of educational institutions imparting such moralities (Berkowitz, 2011; Berkowitz & Bier, 2007; Catalano et al., 2002; Davin, 2007; Flay,

Berkowitz, & Bier, 2009; Hester et al., 2004; Martin & Martin, 2007; Klem & Connell, 2004; Snell, Berlin, Voorhees, Stanton-Chapman, & Hadden, 2012; Stone & Dyal, 1997; Veugelers, 2010). It is pertinent to mention, as debated by Harecker (2012), that the active and supporting actors in the education sector, like teachers, do not really model the expected social and moral values through their behaviors to children. Instead, all teachers expect children to equip themselves with the prevailing social norms and apply these norms by means of interactive social and political participation.

Harecker (2012) urged that imparting moral values and social norms in education must be done in an interactive fashion while encouraging students to apply the moral values themselves instead of imposing them on them. Additionally, schools are considered another highly influential factor in educating pupils in terms of moral values. For children, schools initially play the role of being an interactive place where they face the larger society while possessing a membership within. Parents and teachers are thus expected to facilitate children in their process of learning moral values within the schooling system (Berkowitz, 2012; Harecker, 2012; Nucci & Powers, 2014). Moral education at school or at a higher level of institution generally adopts such a mode of education which not only delivers the lessons of morality but also includes the socially desired and undesired behaviors. In other words, moral education stands on the primary foundation of differentiating the rights and wrongs in a society and for individuals themselves (Fenstermacher, Osguthorpe, & Sanger, 2009).

However, perspectives and understandings of morality vary among scholars. There is no single paradigm utilized to psychologically determine the meaning and context of morality (Smetana, 2006; Richardson, Mulvey, & Killen, 2012; Turiel, 2015). For instance, according to Smetana (2006), morality may be considered as the behaviors and actions of individuals while interacting and socializing with others, despite the existing varieties in the meanings of the word morality. This term is used among people in everyday life, portraying the actions of individuals as moral or immoral in general. The current study is structured on the basis of the above-mentioned theoretical framework pertaining to the Social Domain Theory (Nucci, 1981; Nucci & Turiel, 1976; Smetana, 1981; 2006; Turiel, 1983a; 1983b; 2015). The

theory was basically founded on the psychological and developmental theories of Piaget (1932/1966) and Kohlberg (1969; 1971) and philosophical perspectives of judgments and reasoning (Gewirth, 1978), social conventions (Durkheim, 1925/1961; Freud, 1923; 1930/1961; Skinner, 1971; Watson, 1924) and justice and fairness (Rawls, 1971). The main psychological components of the theory addressed the reasoning and judgment within different domains (Turiel, 2015). The domains in the social domain theory are twofold: moral domain and social conventional domain.

Social domain researchers, like Turiel (2015), Smetana (2006) and Nucci and Powers (2014) have provided a general framework to understand the domains. The moral domain is generally focused on the actions and the contextualization of harm, justice, rights, and fairness in the actions of human beings and the society in which they live. The underlying aspects of morality are given universal significance and are adapted by not only societies and legislations but also by individuals themselves, irrespective of influences from the prevailing authority (Nucci & Turiel, 1976; Turiel, 2015). Consequently, moral issues derive their internal influence from the motivation of “avoiding harm, promoting people’s welfare ensuring fairness, and protecting rights” (Turiel, 2008, p.137). They are universal and could be applied across various cultural contexts regardless of the existence of authority and/or social rules because they are independent of personal preferences, cultural influences or power of authority. Hitting, stealing and cheating are some of many transgressions of moral domain.

The social conventional domain is related to understanding appropriate behaviors within a cultural context (Nucci & Turiel, 1976; Turiel, 2015). Conventional issues derive their influence from external sources, like authority and rules. Social conventions involve customs and traditions and rules that define the behavioral frameworks and common agreements of a social organization. In this regard, it is quite evident that conventions can only be practical for people within a particular social organization in which a common agreement exists regarding authority and rules: Any rule to maintain social order in a particular social organization, like not calling teachers by their first names, and standing up when teacher gets in the classroom.

In order to distinguish conceptions of morality and social conventions, social domain researchers observed children in playground and school settings (Crane &

Tisak, 1995; Nucci & Nucci, 1982a; 1982b; Nucci & Turiel, 1978; Smetana, 1981; Smetana & Bregaes, 1990) while playing in their normal routines and then administered interviews with those whose behaviors researchers witnessed a transgression in. Additionally, conducting interviews about hypothetical transgressions were used to determine people's categorization of events (for reviews see Nucci & Powers, 2014; Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015). To draw a theoretical framework, two dimensions of judgments have been used to describe participants' domain distinctions: (Turiel, 2015) (1) criterion judgments and (2) justifications. To assess criterion judgments, participants are asked to respond to some hypothetical questions that encourage them to reconsider whether a behavior would be right or wrong under different circumstances. Smetana (2006) and Jambon (2016) argue that there are four most common dimensions although there a few more. These are: (a) generalizability, (b) rule independence, (c) authority independence and (d) rule alterability. The justifications are defined by Turiel (2015, p.508) as "the ways individuals reason about courses of action."

Another crucial phenomenon for the current research is teachers' beliefs. Although beliefs have been studied for a long time, there is as yet no common agreement on its definition (Galvis, 2012). Modern psychology delimits them as probably the most influential mental processes underlying our observable actions (Galanter, 1989). Nevertheless, Pajares (1992) states that beliefs are one of the most confusing constructs of human understanding because of the difficulty in making a distinction among beliefs, knowledge and cognition (p.308). Consequently, in order to set the limits, in the current study, beliefs are defined as consciously or unconsciously held personal understandings and conceptions accepted as true (Galvin, 2012). They are also founded on individuals' subjective understandings and experiences (McLeod & McLeod, 2002).

Likewise, there are a number of different definitions of educational beliefs; however, most educational researchers agree on the importance of teachers' beliefs since understanding teachers' beliefs enable researcher to understand teachers' way of teaching (Clark, 1998; Galvin, 2012; Richards & Lockhard, 1994; Tondeur, Hermans, Braak, & Valcke's, 2008). Haser (2006) defines teachers' beliefs as invisible mental

processes that lead to observable teacher actions and behaviors occurring within a classroom. Pajares (1992) maintains that teachers' beliefs are universal and broad. Thus, they are not dependent on any context because teachers' subjective understanding of their experiences has an impact on their beliefs about the act of teaching and student characteristics. Hence, there is a generally recognized notion among educational researchers that beliefs are major elements influential in shaping teachers' instructional practices (Clark, 1998; Davis & Wilson, 1999; Richards & Lockhard, 1994).

In educational research, it is maintained that teachers have specific beliefs about each subject matter they teach (Borg, 2001; Richardson, 1968). Since their beliefs are shaped by not only their teaching experiences but also their previous experiences. Those experiences create particular mindsets about a subject matter within teachers' repertoire of beliefs. In classroom, teachers' instructional practices are influenced by their beliefs because they filter both new knowledge and understanding (Galvin, 2012). Additionally, decision making processes and lesson planning are also influenced by beliefs.

Research suggest that teachers' beliefs influence their instructional practices (Galvis, 2012). As discussed by Haser (2006; 2016), teachers' beliefs have an intrinsic impact on their pedagogical decisions. Teachers' decisions within a classroom regarding social and moral development of children are not different from other pedagogical content areas. As a result, there is a need to examine teachers' beliefs in order to determine how they teach social conventions and morality in a classroom context. In the current research, teachers' beliefs about children's conceptions of moral and social conventional behaviors were assessed to understand how they infer children's development from the perspective of social domain theory. Ertmer (2005) advocates that beliefs should be studied to find out misconceptions, if there are any. Defining teachers' beliefs would not lead to change (Rokeach, 1968) but being aware of them helps researchers and policy makers develop action plans (Galvis, 2012).

1.1. Purpose of the Study

As mentioned above, this research is based on the social domain theory. Despite having a multifaceted approach and various cognitive components, debate still persists on the prioritization of these components in different situations and environments. It is also yet to be clarified whether the differences in the perspectives of morality are based on variations of the environment, context and/or social system, or whether these are spread over the social as well as physical borders across the countries while having an impact of universality (Mithra, 2001). In this regard, the social domain theory helps clarify the morality and social convention concepts and broadens the study of moral development, especially in children by positioning that their thinking process for the outer world depends on the approach of heterogeneity along with other orientations of social nature (Kohlberg, 1987).

Based on the evidence that has been provided by social domain research over the last 40 years, it can be said that people can differentiate morality from social conventions starting from as early as early childhood. It provides fruitful source for developmental research; however, its role in educational research necessitates further research. As Nucci and Turiel (2009) state, one of the major problems of educational researchers is applying findings of developmental research to educational settings. Besides, it is identified during the literature review that there is lack of literature in relation to beliefs of preschool teachers regarding children's conceptions about social conventional and moral events. What teachers believe is significant because beliefs are the mental processes that maintain a connection between not only professional experiences of teachers but also personal ones and their current pedagogical decisions (Galvis, 2012; Haser, 2016). Teachers, just like other professionals, cannot control what they believe because all their life experiences shape their beliefs. Beliefs are different from knowledge since they include subjectivity and emotion (Pajares, 1992). Thus, teachers' beliefs describe how they spend their time and energy with children in a classroom.

In the light of the research, the purpose of the current study is to identify the current beliefs of preschool teachers regarding children's way of thinking about

morality and social conventions. To this end, the current study aimed to investigate and describe early childhood teachers' conceptions of morality and social conventions and their beliefs about children's conceptions of moral and social conventional events occurring within their classrooms. The experiences of teachers were associated with not only the way they reason about social conventional and moral events, but their beliefs regarding children's social and moral judgments. The researcher of the present study chose early childhood education teachers' beliefs as a paradigm and early childhood education as a context because the literature shows that children can distinguish social conventions and morality (Nucci & Powers, 2014; Turiel, 2015). Moreover, the review of the research suggests that children and adults have some differences in their judgments of social conventional and moral events (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015). Additionally, research suggests that teachers' beliefs are one of the major determiners of their in-class behaviors and attitudes. Hence, in the current study the beliefs of preschool teachers are examined from the perspective of the social domain theory.

1.2. Research Questions

In the current study, one research question accompanied with two sub-questions has been formulated.

1. What do Turkish preschool teachers believe about young children's conceptions of moral and social conventional events?
 - 1.1. How do Turkish preschool teachers define and categorize young children's in-class behaviors?
 - 1.2. How do Turkish preschool teachers distinguish between social conventional and moral events?

1.3. Significance of the Study

The traditional schools usually play a predefined role in establishing the education environment which may contribute to the moral training of the students. These schools can even play a more significant role while formulating and

implementing an action plan for fostering the reward based moral education influencing the societal foundations (White & Warfa, 2011). Different studies suggest that interventions made in the school for moral and social development have yielded significant results (DeRosier & Lloyd, 2010; DeRosier & Mercer, 2007; Flay, Berkowitz, & Bier, 2009; Marshall, Caldwell, & Foster, 2011; Royal & Baker, 2005; Skaggs & Bodenhorn, 2006; White & Warfa, 2011). Because teachers spend significant amount of time with children and they are professionals of early childhood pedagogy, understanding teachers' beliefs is important to contribute to the moral development and education of students in the schools. Contextualizing the beliefs and moral judgments of teachers will contribute to highlighting the significance of this research, especially in moral and social development. It may also help scholars and researchers in the analysis of mental processes including cognition of social events underlying the attitudes of children (Jambon, 2016).

Moreover, social domain literature provides strong evidence for domain distinction. It is clear that children as young as 3-year-olds (Smetana & Braeges, 1990; Davidson, Turiel & Black, 1983) and even children with autistic spectrum disorder (Blair, 1996) can differentiate morality from social conventions. However, there is not enough research on what teachers believe about children's moral judgments. As explained earlier, teachers' beliefs have an intrinsic impact on their in-class decisions and behaviors. From this perspective, this study might be the first of its kind to investigate teachers' beliefs about children's moral judgments from the perspective of the social domain theory. There is a gap in the research field, which needs to be filled with relevant research, like the present study, in order to address and explore teachers' beliefs on the moral reasoning of children in the context of the social domain theory.

Additionally, this study may provide evidence for the social domain research literature to extend its cultural variability. A number of research studies have been conducted in different countries with different cultural groups (Ardila-Rey & Killen, 2001; Bersoff & Miller, 1993; Carey & Ford, 1983; Hollos, Leis, & Turiel, 1986; Madden, 1992; Miller & Bersoff, 1992; Nucci, Camino, & Milnitsky-Sapiro, 1996; Song, Smetana, & Kim, 1987; Yau & Smetana, 2003; Zimba, 1987) although most of the research regarding the social domain theory have been conducted in the United

States. All of these studies show that people differentiate morality, i.e. welfare, justice and harm, from social conventions. Thus, the current study is one of the first studies conducted in Turkey.

Lastly, most of the social domain research studies have used hypothetical stories or witnessed events (for reviews see Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015) to assess people's moral judgments and reasoning. However, in the current study, we initially identified desired and undesired classroom behaviors with our participant teachers. After identifying classroom behaviors, we asked teachers to make judgments and justifications for these behaviors. Subsequently, we asked them what they believed about children's moral judgments. Thus, it can be said that teachers were interviewed about what they experienced in their own classrooms. Asking about their own experiences made the interviewing process more realistic for the participants. It may help participants to access their memories more easily.

1.4. Personal Motivation

In Turkey, there seems to be a misconception regarding the real aim of education. A common fact about education in Turkey is that the measurement and assessment system, rather than the education itself, have been determining the behavior of students (Berberoğlu & Tansel, 2014). Schools define their goals as being successful in national examinations because success indicators are based on academic achievement (Berkowitz & Bier, 2005). People consider education as a tool to equip children with proper academic skills that help them to surpass other people. Therefore, all the stakeholders of education, undeniably, focus on the core content areas to be tested in the examinations. Even so, preschools keep up with the latest fashion of education and most of them advertise their services based on the academic content, like the mathematics and science they offer. Bassok, Latham and Rorem (2016) suggest that due to accountability concerns kindergartens have emphasized academic skills and reduced play opportunities.

Nothing may be wrong with having a utilitarian perspective towards education; however, this perspective provides an incomplete picture. The sole aim of education

is not to instruct academic content, nor to promote intelligence. It also has a social function; as Martin Luther King Jr. (1948) mentioned, “we must remember that intelligence is not enough”. Therefore, another function of education should be to help children become more competent social and moral agents. One of his famous sayings, reflects the motive underlying the current study:

Intelligence plus character--that is the goal of true education. The complete education gives one not only power of concentration, but worthy objectives upon which to concentrate. The broad education will, therefore, transmit to one not only the accumulated knowledge of the race but also the accumulated experience of social living.

As the researcher of the current study, my interest in the topic of the study derives from more than one simple motive. First, my interest in social and moral development is based on my father’s influence on me. Like any other child, when I was asked what job I wanted to do in the future, my answers would always undergo changes throughout the years; however, my father’s response would always be the same: be a good person first! I do not think I really understood what he meant at the time, but now as a researcher I realize how important it is to understand the context of social interactions and act accordingly. Secondly, my maternal grandmother placed great emphasis on friendship and kindness. She always prayed for me as “May god bless you to have good people around you all the time!” She never asked me if I had successful people around me; rather, she always asked if I had good friends. I have good people around me who make me feel comfortable regardless of the context and setting. I understood the importance of having good people around particularly when I went to the U.S.A. for academic purposes and left my family members behind. Thirdly, I am a former-boarder who is familiar with the feeling of ‘infinite loneliness. I left home when I was 12 and for seven years I spent most of my time with people who were not a part of my family. Actually, my parents believed it was a gift because I was a successful student. My father told me that I was clever enough to survive. What he did not tell me was that I would be alone with tens of people around me. I managed to survive but it was not about being clever; instead, it was about being socially skillful. I was just an easy-going boy who could get along with anyone. Life was easier for me

because I obeyed almost all the rules, like a soldier in Turkey would do, without asking questions. It is clear to me now that I could get along with the masters of the school dormitory, the authority figures. Not every child was lucky like me. The life in the dormitory was not easy because the masters made it clear that they were not our parents who tolerated our childish behaviors. Therefore, we were not allowed to be children anymore. There was a number of rules we should follow. They believed our academic success was a result of the authoritarian regime they applied. Now when I look back to those days I see that it was not a matter of commitment to follow the orders, but a matter of making the masters believe we did. It was both fun and stressful to hide some things from the masters or do some things behind their back. I always wondered how we could act in a particular way while we thought it was totally wrong. Besides the authoritarian regime in boarding schools, I met a number of people and realized that people prefer to be around respectful and responsible people without considering their academic success. Additionally, although academic topics are important, the level of its importance varies among people. For example, it does not really matter to me whether or not I have successful physicists or mathematicians around. I prefer being with people who understand me and respect my decisions and life style. In other words, academic content loses its importance at some point; however, social and moral skills have lifelong importance. Hence, my personal kinship to the topic is connected to not only my family's perspective to life, but also my personality and my experiences as a former boarder.

Additionally, I owe everything I have now to the Republic of Turkey and the fathers of the republic. Atatürk, the first president of the republic, was highly interested in education. He once said he had wanted to be the secretary of education if he could. He saw education as the only tool to help our nation to survive and rise. He believed that unless a nation had an army of wisdom, the brilliant victories in battlefields would not lead to lasting results. Therefore, he asked teachers to be public figures in order to show the public that they were not there just to teach the alphabet to their children. Rather, they were there to educate positive, honest, considerate, and strong children capable of accomplishing the tasks they started and could overcome the obstacles they encountered. He believed school had the responsibility to train honorable and

knowledgeable professionals. I share his perspective on education. Also, I know how important early childhood education is to foster fundamental life skills. Consequently, I am interested in studying social and moral development of young children.

As a teacher trainer, I have chosen to study teachers' beliefs because beliefs are the most important mental constructs that influence their attitudes, values and behaviors. I am interested in gaining insight into what teachers believe so that I can understand the way they think and act. If I can understand what the way they think and act, I can explain the foundations of their intentions, behaviors and attitudes towards children's social and moral development.

1.5. Delimitations of the Study

Turiel's (2015) conceptualization of social conventions and morality based on judgments and justifications was used for the study. In fact, four dimensions of moral judgment have drawn the frame of the study. Those dimensions are generalizability, rule independence, authority independence and rule alterability. Interview questions addressing teachers' both judgments and beliefs regarding children's judgments were prepared in line with the social domain conceptualization. Additionally, Seidman's (2006) three interview series method was adapted for the current study. All the participants are preschool teachers, consequently scope is limited to their beliefs.

1.6. Definition of Important Terms

Belief: Consciously or unconsciously held personal understandings and conceptions accepted as true (Galvin, 2012).

Conception: "The way in which something is perceived or regarded" (OxfordDictionaries.com, 2017).

Domain: a conceptual sphere of understanding.

Preschool Teacher: In Turkey, they are teachers who work with young children from 18 to 66 months.

Justification: the act of providing reasonable explanations about what has been told.

Moral development: the process of developing ability to differentiate moral, social and personal concepts (Turiel, 2015).

Moral Judgment: the ability to make decisions about social and moral events (Kohlberg, 1969).

Social Conventions: Boundaries set up by most members of a society for behaviors to cope with daily life issues.

Transgression: an act that violate a rule or code of conduct (Turiel, 1977; 2015).

Young Children: Children aged between 24 to 66-months-old.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following chapter involves a summary of the related research that has maintained a theoretical background for the current study. There are three different parts of this chapter. The first part is a review of the literature about moral reasoning and judgment. Piaget's theory of moral development, Kohlberg's stage-based moral development theory and Social domain theory will be mentioned. In the second part, there will be a review about teachers' beliefs and at the end there will be a summary of related literature about obedience to authority.

2.1. Piaget's Theory of Moral Development

2.1.1. Shift from heteronomy to autonomy

In his initial theoretical work, Jean Piaget (1932/1965) emphasised on the moral and ethical lives of pupils through analysing the way they use to play games which also helped him to know in depth the belief system of the students regarding what is wrong and what is right. He claimed that any sort of development and change occurs on the basis of actions; the concept which can lead to suggest that the production and reconstruction of knowledge among individuals rely on their interactions with and within the environment. The visual observation of Piaget for the game playing children stimulated him to think that the rules applied by the children on their games can prove that the morality can also be included as a process developed through actions and learning in that case (DeVries, 1997; 1998; Piaget, 1932/1966).

In addition, Piaget (1932/1966), during his examination of children, asked them about lying and stealing things. Most of the respondents who were children and

adults responded that these two words show negativity and badness and should not be done with others because these are not supposed to be good. These sorts of responses compelled Piaget to conclude that children started their initial years of life in the condition of heteronomy, which means that they use to construct the meanings and understanding of a particular concept based on moral and social influential reasoning while being obedient to learned rules.

Thus Piaget (1932/1966) concluded that the children and adults are mostly oriented by the heteronomous thinking style within morality domain, in which they are bound to perceive things and concepts based on the set rules, and moral imagination which they learn from parents and society which in their age considered as flawless. The moral obligation and obedience are considered to be the only choice which the young children have to adapt. By doing so, they do not and even wish not to disagree or oppose those who were considered through heteronomy as flawless (Lerner, Liben & Mueller, 2015).

2.1.2. The shift towards autonomy

Piaget (1932/1966) later in his approach experimented the children in a game where there were no prior or known rules and children were to play as per their own convenience and setting the modality of the game. In this scenario, children were unexpectedly seemed to have difficulties with their adhered approach towards heteronomy and were not feeling comfortable in playing the game in which everything was allowed to them. Piaget reiterated that these challenging and new situations can serve as a changing element for the children to divert and shift their approach from heteronomy to autonomy. In this approach, they are blessed with the freedom to not just adapting the rules, as they were, but to assess these rules through the paradigm of requirements and objectives of the prevailing situation, without damaging any other's respect.

According to Piaget (1995), this shift of approach can impact the cognitive thinking practices and transform it into a paradigm of perspective oriented consideration. These characteristics of behaviors led Piaget develop his views that the development of morality in individuals is formed on the basis of interpersonal

interactions of a person with others to develop the consensus on the resolutions of matters and the particular thoughts. Turiel (2006) added that the comparative analysis of the two approaches may come up as the fair view of morality through autonomy may lead to ensure the persistence in the behaviors of the individuals than the orientation approach explored in the children based on heteronomy.

2.1.3. Application in classrooms by teachers

Jean Piaget made some recommendations based on his conclusion from his social experiments on school children regarding the shift of cognitive behavior from heteronomy to the autonomy of thinking and perceiving. He suggested that the educational institutes for children must encourage and impact the capabilities in children for collaboratively making the decisions after exploring fairness based new rules through consensus. This perspective of Piaget apparently got contradictory with the one of a sociologist Emile Durkheim (Turiel, 2002).

The view of Durkheim was same regarding moral development as a product of social interaction but the primary difference between Durkheim's view and Piaget's view was that Durkheim believed that the moral development of children is based on the characteristics of a group to which an individual is attached (Durkheim, 1925/1961), while on contrary, Piaget (1997) believed that moral development can be a two process and individual are free to contribute to the group with their particular thoughts and viewpoints and hence can even affect the characteristics of the group in reciprocal. Turiel (2006) explained that why Piaget (1997) suggested that in order to let the children become more confident and freer in expressing their thoughts, the classroom teacher should encourage and implement such an atmosphere in the classroom in which every child should be given equal freedom to participate in the learning process instead of being the only listener.

Based on the above recommendation to encourage free social interactions in the classrooms among students and between student and teachers, DeVries and Zan (1994) stressed that it is easy to predict or expect possible conflicts in the classrooms. Most of the schools especially the primary schools do not like the conflicts to take place within their premises as they perceive it as a negative act of social interaction

which may lead to serious consequences. Their viewpoint is certainly acceptable and rather appreciable, however the concept of Piaget to promote the conflict resolution mechanism among children needs certain conflicts to raise in their settings and the students must be trained and given the opportunities to work on the resolution of these particular conflict, no matter real or hypothetical (DeVries and Zan, 1994).

2.2. Stage Based Moral Development

Piaget's theory of moral development was agreed by another scholar Lawrence Kohlberg in his doctoral dissertation in 1958. He presented a revolutionary idea for the moral education and formulation through stages. Morality was focused on him as the primary force in psychology. He used to perceive all the children up to the age of adulthood as the agent or developers of moral philosophy who are also competent enough to form and revise their self-paradigms. Snarey and Samuelson (2014) discussed in their work that Kohlberg presented three models of moral development including types of moral development, stages of moral development and atmosphere for the development of morality. He also developed his methods to be imparted in the moral education including dilemma discussions on moral development, exemplars of moral development and the community schools as the agent of moral development.

Kohlberg like many other researchers got inspired and derived his theoretical work from those who earlier presented their arguments in favour or in a critique of the moral development approaches. He drew his research work on the basis of Jean Piaget and Emile Durkheim's approaches toward moral development through education. In his persistent approach with the work of Piaget, Kohlberg suggested that the thinking opportunities are designed for children through the experience they face in multiple environments and at multiple locations. According to Turiel (2006), these thinking experiences also contribute to developing the social concepts in the brains of children including human rights, equality, justice, and other welfare oriented causes and concepts. He also added that the process of moral development among individuals is spread over longer stages of life in contrast to the maximum stage of adulthood suggested by Piaget in his theory of moral development.

Mithra (2001) debated that Kohlberg was of the view that the moral development is a process spread over six different but connected stages which contribute in the structuring the judgment capabilities among individuals for moral development and reasoning. He argued that the rightness or wrongness of moral thinking leads the formation of moral development. Individuals only perceive the environment as per their existing mechanism and structures of developed thoughts. These structures are refined only when the process of visualising or perceiving the environment fails or comes up with undesirable results (Mithra, 2001).

The six stages of moral development as suggested by Kohlberg are grouped by him in three consecutive levels while having two stages in each level. These three levels are categorised as pre-conventional level; conventional level; and post-conventional level of moral development. These six stages of moral development were not supposed to be skipped before going to the next stage. Following are the brief description of each level of moral development along with the possessing stages within.

2.2.1. Pre-conventional level

This is the level at which the child is able enough to respond to the societal and cultural norms and perceive the labels of what is negative and what is positive. Most of these perceptions are based on the basis of comfort or discomfort to the child or the serious outcomes as articulated by those who are considered flawless (Kohlberg, 1958; 1969; Snarey & Samuelson, 2014).

The pre-conventional level of moral development constitutes two sub stages as follows:

Stage-1: Orientation of obedience and punishment

At this stage (from 3 to 7 years of age) children are taught at school or at home about the basics of morality encompassing the following and complying with the rules for the sake of obedience and to evade damaging or hurting the people and their belongings (Kohlberg, 1958; 1969; Snarey & Samuelson, 2014). At this stage, children learn through the self-evident role of morality associated with certain things or concepts which do not require explanation or justification. However, at this stage, the

differences of interests among individuals are not understood by children. This stage also explains the understanding of justice as a morality to obey the infallibles (Turiel, 2006).

Stage-2: Exchange and instrumental purpose

Through this stage (from 8 to 11 years), the individuals go through the moral development phase while learning to perform the obedience of rule in matters in which their interest of immediate nature compels them to obey the rule. This is a kind of exchange of good or bad deeds to fulfil the interests (Turiel, 2006). At this stage, individuals come up with the understanding that the interest of every other person may be different. Through the exchange of good or bad deeds, but the individuals use to protect their self-interests. Justice at this stage is perceived to the individuals as the protection of everyone's interests (Kohlberg, 1958; 1969; Snarey & Samuelson, 2014).

2.2.2. Conventional level

The moral development framework is widened at this stage. To meet the expectations and moral desires of peers, family, social group or the country are imparted as the indicators of moral development to the individuals. Students also learn that moral development is not just to meet the expectation level of the societal players, but also to become loyal to these expectations and acts of morality (Kohlberg, 1958; 1969; Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977; Snarey & Samuelson, 2014). The conventional level again has further two stages in its scope which is as follows:

Stage-3: Good relations and mutual interpersonal expectations

Most of the scholars use to perceive this stage (from 12 to 17 years) of moral development as the most important one in learning the cycle of an individual. At this stage, the youth demonstrates the ability to consider and understand the perspectives, thinking style and intentions of the other individuals (Turiel, 2006). The boundaries of understanding justice are wider in this stage while considering not to harm or to damage the rights of others by protecting the rights of self. The morality at this stage tends to be developed through peer circle which can be effective for even the socially deviant people. This stage of morality also defines the good or bad behaviors to the youth by portraying that the behavior can be good or bad only if the other person

perceives it as good or bad (Kohlberg, 1958; 1969; Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977; Snarey & Samuelson, 2014; Turiel, 2006).

Stage-4: Maintenance of conscience and social system

This stage (from 18 to 25 years) of moral development demonstrates the virtues of being a citizen of good faith and practices as per the prevailing law and social order in order to maintain the social system in the society. The morality is referred at this stage as the effective performance of the set obligations and duties on oneself. The legislative order in the given region is to be obeyed in any case until it contradicts with the performance of duties which are already prevailed and popular in a societal context. In general, the individuals are supposed to enlarge their duties from interpersonal to societal level (Kohlberg, 1958; 1969; Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977; Snarey & Samuelson, 2014).

2.2.3. Conventional level of moral development

This is the level at which the moral development emerges by putting an emphasis towards defining the principles and social values and norms in a particular form. This form includes the one which is validated and can be applied in addition to those rules and instructions that the individuals get from their peers and the authoritarian infallible (Mithra, 2001; Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977).

The last two stages of moral development fall under the third level of Kohlberg's moralities are discussed below.

Stage-5: Social contract and individual rights

This stage suggests that after 25 years of age, individuals learn for the larger interests of the society, i.e., every entity and individual has equal human rights, which need to be protected and respected by every single individual. It does not matter that how much extended are the provisions in the prevailing law regarding these rights and interests on human grounds (Kohlberg, 1958; 1969; Kohlberg & Hersh, 1977; Snarey & Samuelson, 2014).

Stage-6: Principles based on universal ethics

Snarey and Samuelson (2014) discussed that as per Lawrence Kohlberg, this stage of moral development is not limited, started or ended into a certain age group;

rather it always serves very specific or few individuals in a society. According to him, during the stage of moral development, certain individuals used to follow the norms and values and principles that were set by universal organisation pertaining to human rights.

Turiel (2006) highlighted this aspect by stating that good citizens always abide the prevailing law of the country, but at this stage of moral development, these citizens learn to follow the universal ethical rules which are somehow violated by the country at where they live. In these cases, the prevailing human rights regulations and orientation are adapted by these individuals who depict that every human has equal rights, which is to be protected not only by the government but also by the society and the individuals (Turiel, 2006).

According to Kohlberg (1976), there were some in-stage variations in participants' responses that stages did not explain alone. To describe these variations Kohlberg and colleagues (Schrader, Tappan, Kohlberg & Armon, 1987; Tappan et al. 1978) combined Piaget's two forms of morality and Weber's ideal types (Snarey & Samuelson, 2014). They defined two sub types as Type A and Type B as a reflection of heteronomy and autonomy, respectively. These moral types emphasize the content of the interviewees' moral reasoning rather than cognitive structure of moral development. They developed nine coding criteria based on Piaget's and Kant's theoretical explanations (Snarey & Samuelson, 2014) which are summarized below in Table 2.1.

According to Snarey and Samuelson (2014), moral types are useful tools to understand how moral reasoning are related with moral action. For example, it has been found that Type B people tended to act more likely based on their moral judgments even when they are not in accordance with the current rule or the authority. Additionally, there is a positive relationship between Type B (i.e. autonomous) reasoning and moral stage development, like Piaget suggests. They also found that there is shift from Type A to Type B reasoning (for reviews see Kohlberg, 1984; Logan, Snarey & Schrader, 1990; Snarey & Samuelson, 2014).

Table 2.1 Kohlberg's Distinction between Type A and Type B Moral Orientations

Criteria	Type A (Heteronomous)	Type B (Autonomous)
Hierarchy	No clear moral hierarchy, reliance on pragmatic and other concerns	Clear hierarchy of moral values; prescriptive duties are primary
Intrinsicity	Instrumental view of persons	Persons as ends in themselves; respect for autonomy, dignity
Prescriptivity	Moral duty as instrumental or hypothetical	Moral duty as moral obligation
Universality	Judgments uncritically assumed to be held by everyone or based on self-interest	Generalized view; applies to everyone in same situation
Freedom	External bases validate judgments	No reliance on external authority or tradition
Mutual Respect	Unilateral obedience	Cooperation among equals
Reversibility	Views the dilemma from only one point of view	Understanding of the other's perspective; reciprocity
Constructivism	Rigid view of rules and laws as fixed	Flexible view of rules and laws as adaptable
Choice	Does not choose or justify choice in terms of fairness or justice	Chooses solution generally seen as just or fair

Source: Logan, Snarey & Schrader (1990), p.75 (As cited in Snarey & Samuelson, 2014, p.70)

The third model Kohlberg (1980) developed to understand moral development is moral atmosphere. Snarey and Samuelson (2014, p.71) define moral atmosphere as “a community’s shared expectations and normative values.” Kohlberg focused on moral education as well as moral development. While studying on moral development, he found out that social organization in which an individual took part has a major impact on moral development. As mentioned before, Kohlberg had influenced by Durkheim’s ideas on moral education (Durkheim used the term ‘*character education*’) that drawn a framework about society’s influence on individuals’ moral development. However, Kohlberg’s ideas differentiated from Durkheim’s, as he mentioned justice,

fairness and wellbeing of other members of the society. He believed that democratically governed societies promote moral reasoning.

2.3. Social Cognitive Domain Theory

2.3.1. Morality among individuals

This theory of social cognitive domain or the social domain theory is based on the principle and basic ingredient of morality, which is defined in multiple dimensions by multiple authors and researchers (Nucci, 2001; Smetana, 2006; 2013; Turiel, 1978; 1983; 2006; 2015). According to Smetana (2006), morality may be considered as the behavior and actions of individuals while interacting and socialising with others, despite the versatility in the meanings of the word morality. This term is used in everyday life among people portraying the actions of individuals as moral or immoral in general. The perspective of understanding the morality, however, differs among scholars and psychological experts. Single paradigm is never used psychologically to determine the meaning and context of morality (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2006; 2015).

Despite the having multifaceted approach and various cognitive components debate still persists on the prioritisation of these components in different situations and environments. It is also yet to be clarified that whether the differences in the perspectives of morality are based on the variations of environment, contexts and/or social system, or these are spread over the social as well as physical borders across the countries while having an impact of universality (Turiel, 2006: 2015). In this regard, social domain theory helps in clarifying the morality concept and broadens the research regarding moral development, especially in children by positioning that their thinking process for the outer world depends on the approach of heterogeneity along with other orientation of social nature (Smetana, 2006).

Social domain theory basically serves as a framework used to assess the behaviors of individuals in how they interpret, evaluate, prioritise and understand the world in its social context. This theory proposed three different psychological dimensions to construct or to perceive the knowledge of social norms and moral development. Scholars like Turiel (1977; 1978; 2006; 2015), Smetana (2006) and

Nucci (1982a; 1982b; 2001; Nucci & Powers, 2014) have rationalised in their works the empirical evidence of the last many decades to summarise that the learning of individual children up to adulthood is perceived through moral practices of other individuals; prevailing social norms; and the psychological cognitions.

Based on the basic principles of Jean Piaget's on moral development, among children, the social domain theory argues that production of knowledge among individuals is based on their learning from different and continuous experiences in life right from the early stage. Nucci (2001) had stressed that the moral development and the judgment of moral values can be considered as the primary or natural capabilities among childhood.

The moral concerns in social domain theory including rights of individuals prevail with the subjects of traditions, societal values, authority, personal privacy, body control and integrity, and the preferences patterns of individuals (Turiel, 2015). Furthermore, the social conventions, personalised issues, and moral domain contribute in building the organisation and structure of knowledge based on a social domain which is developed through a process of experiencing multiple and prevailing social regularities in different environments (Turiel, 2015).

The development of social and moral domain among children is considered crucial because it expects that the children be clear in their approach regarding different rules of the social system, interactive relationships among individuals, and the settings required to build these relationships. Children are found to learn the moral and social concepts from their experiences of judging whether a particular thing or situation is fair enough or it may harm in anticipation. Smetana (2006) focused on the understanding that the social interaction with other individuals certainly helps the children in developing their understanding of not only the outer psychological moral learning but also in knowing their own self-traits.

Different studies explained that there could be differences even among the moral domains and contexts. The differences are either highlighted or managed by the individuals while being concerned with the social indicators including moral values, cautiousness or other issues of personal nature (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2006). The

differences within moral values may be understood by the fact that privileges of freedom and autonomy are exercised more among males than in females.

This issue is generally perceived differently among individuals of different mental paradigms. Some individuals are of the view that the grant of more freedom to males is based on the necessities or practicalities required to perform certain actions. On the contrary, many people perceive it as the issue of inequality. Still, there are some people with different approach who consider this issue as the outcome of moral and social values based on the principles of equal fairness or harm within the concept (Turiel, 2015).

2.3.2. Domain differences through social experiences

Discussing the social experiences, Turiel (2015) highlighted that there are some theoretical perspectives on reasons for differences in the construction of different kinds of social domain knowledge. These reasons could be understood initially through the sense of feeling which serves as the primary mode of learning for new born babies as they tend to be sensitive towards the pains and grief of others starting from the relationship of parents.

Evidence from contemporary researches shows that those toddlers under the age of one year showed significant responses in the psychological examinations which prove that they are potential enough to respond with the feeling of care for others in the prevailing environment (Hamlin, 2013). These finding also served in the development of social knowledge pertaining to justice, harm and fairness.

Contradictions and differences prevail in the association of moral development with children's behaviors. Researchers like Turiel (2015) and Killen (2005) argued that the early development of the judgment of wrong and right and the feeling of care for others, among toddlers, are not due to any biological or physical instincts. Instead of it, these developments are due to the interactions of the child with the other individuals. The more children interact with others, the more and quick they learn the prevailing social domains of the given society (Turiel, 2006).

Research studies conducted to highlight the social experiences of kids proposed that the influence of social interaction is significant on the developing social

morality in a child. Moreover, it is also important to know that the child's interaction as per the learning of justice, fairness, badness, rightness or wrongness up to the middle childhood period is happened to be only one way in which either positive or negative responses are rare from the peer circle on the transgressions of the child during school timings (Nucci & Powers, 2014).

The different school of thought Schmidt, Rakoczy, and Tomasello (2012) argues that the children even before the school have shown positive results during research in responding to disorders in the prevailing social domain environment and the factors pertaining to badness. Schmidt et al (2012) stressed on the findings that irrespective of differences in the perception and learning of children regarding the moral development of social domains, the response of relatives and peer circle on the violation of social system has a direct effect on the learning and even actions of the young children, which they adopt in a particular environment.

There is another perspective of differences in social experiences, which highlights the significance of emotions in the context of child's learning experiences. According to Arsenio, Adams and Gold (2009), young children at their earlier ages expressed their clear and noticeable emotions on the moral construction of events happening around them. For example, children showed their deep concern and sympathy through their negative emotions towards the subject which was hit by transgression during the research. Similarly, they showed their likeness and happiness through their greetings oriented emotions towards experimental events containing good deeds including help or appreciation for others (Arsenio et al., 2009).

Enormous research studies are also conducted on the topic of individual differences in the moral development of social domain. Many of these studies discuss that child's behavior is derived through a cognitive process which is derived by the influencing social interactions and emotions in general. Few similar research studies highlight that the apart from the differences in the social domain, the individual's perspective and learning modalities have itself a lot of differences towards social experiences (Olson & Dweck, 2008).

2.3.3. Social conventions

Social norms and rules are also called the social conventions and have been emerged in society while helping and facilitating in the resolutions in complex situations arose due to certain conflicts. Olson and Dweck (2008) highlighted in the study that the social conventions are considered to be the dedicated social norm for restricting the behavior of individuals regarding particular action, a set of action or a strategy.

Moreover, a social convention is, in fact, the regulation and control of the individuals' behaviors which also serves as a resolving mechanism to a coordination oriented problem which is or may arise during the social interaction of the individuals. This is how the benefits of adopting the social conventions by individuals are that they can save themselves from indulging into conflicting situations by practicing those actions which are commonly and unanimously considered as acts of fairness and justice (Turiel, 2006).

There is a difference between the morality and the social conventions, later of which can be understood as the norms which define the mode and control of interactions among the members of a certain social organisation or group. Turiel (2006) argued that the tools and concepts of social conventions are defined through the understanding of the significance of the prevailing social and cultural norms in order to form a predefined social organisation. In addition, the social domain theory also suggests that conceptual social systems are in fact formed the basis of our understanding of the social conventions and the moral development (Smetana, 2006).

Although the social domain theory is based on the moral development grounds which were earlier discussed by Jean Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg, there is a contradiction on the understanding of moral development through social convention between the domain theory and the work of Piaget and Kohlberg (Snarey & Samuelson, 2014).

The earlier work on the understanding of moral development illustrated that the social learning of moral development is a process which takes place in various stages spread over the whole life span of individuals. It also suggested that children

use to learn the moralities of the prevailing social system at later ages near adulthood. On the contrary, the domain theory persists, that the learning of social norms in the context of social conventions is a process which is started even at the age of fewer than three years of age, as suggested by various research studies in the last four decades (Davidson, Turiel & Black, 1983; Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2006).

Turiel (2015) explained in his work that the morality and social conventions are different i.e., they are the parallel frameworks in psychology instead of being a single approach that was perceived by Kohlberg in 1969. However, it is pertinent that due to the existence of social and moral events in society, the position of an individual in choosing a particular mode of action in a given environment may probably force the individual to opt a certain perspective for only one of these two frameworks. Even one can choose certain actions while being in both of these two frameworks of morality and social convention. For instance, like letting the women first in the queue or in other matters of preferences, make this action as moral and also following the social convention.

Studies presented by Smetana (2006) and Nucci and Powers (2014) shows that the social domain theory iterates the fact that the children are not only capable enough to develop the morality in their knowledge and behaviors but also they use to adapt the prevailing social conventions in their environment. This can be depicted by looking at a funeral ceremony in which all people including children use to wear black clothes. The development of social conventions among children happens in their social settings like their homes, parents, peer group, teachers at school and other such environments in which the child started to learn the patterns and trends in norms and behaviors of the other individuals while interacting with them.

In the same context, Smetana (2006) argues that numerous different social experiences are interlinked with the violations of social conventions and the moral development. The case can be relevant to any age and even the very young children who may still be at the stage of learning and stacking the differences of social domains and morality inside their cognitive thinking and brain. He emphasised more on the subject that the social domain theory clearly signifies the extraction of rules among children of even three years old, from the surrounding of their flawless during the stage

of heteronomy based learning as suggested by Piaget in his earlier works (Turiel, 2015).

There is a need to understand that social conventions have significance in the society and the development of morality among individuals. The relevant matters and actions under social conventions are not considered and known as having or provoking serious consequences of interpersonal nature, if not adopted by the individuals (Smetana, 2006). This can be understood by the example of calling the teacher in an institute with a prefix of the professor. In this way, students pay due respect to the teacher, which is already prevailed in the society; however, the students are still free to call the teacher with the prefixes of Mr. or Ms. and even they can call the teacher without any prefix. These ways of calling the teacher do not make differences in the practice of education, but certainly, affect the social respect which is privileged by the teachers in almost all over the world.

A research study was conducted in order to highlight whether the practice of morality is dependent on the prevailing social conventions (Nucci & Turiel, 1993). The study used religious tradition as the tool for judging the respondents' orientation of morality and social convention. Children from two different religions were asked questions regarding some violated acts in society in the religious perspective. All the children in the survey showed that they would not have any objections on acts which are against the religious social conventions like marrying of the Catholic priests. However, the all the students responded their due concerns against all sort of bad acts which are against the prevailing moral values of not only the society but the humanity. These acts were supposed to be like stealing, hurting or hitting someone or damaging any other's personal interest. Children argued that these acts would consistently be considered as violent acts no matter whether the religion is quite against addressing them in the divine books. Thus, the dominance and significance of morality have been vitally depicted from that research study that moral values are perceived by the individuals as the dominating force irrespective of any social convention (Nucci & Turiel, 1993).

There is another example highlighting the distinction between the morality and the social convention. People can be judged while they use to be in a queue for either

paying a bill, buying a ticket or to enter into certain premises. The lining up of the individuals for a certain cause can depict their adaptation of a particular social convention that making the queue is a sign of not only obeying the rules but a sign of being civilised and moral (Nucci, 1984). Although at least in civilized countries, where this practice is established as a social convention, but this sort of actions may not be spread over cultures in broader term and may differ in other parts of the world. On the contrary, in any civilized country, the line breaking practice or the violation of queue in any given environment is considered seriously as a violence of social system and social norm which is prevailed by the people to be just and practice the fairness in the society.

2.4. Moral Development and Education

There has been a continuous debate and issue of how to capitalise the knowledge of developmental stages of children on their educational and learning oriented system (Kamii & Joseph, 2004). This issue gets more highlighted when it comes applying the knowledge of morality and moral development in the education system. The theoretical work of Kohlberg regarding the stage based moral development somehow contributed in formulating the goals and prioritisation in the education of morality among students (Nucci, 2001).

According to the theory of stages, the morality is developed among children based on the principles of universal morality and goodness. This approach started to be adapted after the emergence of Kohlberg's theory and teachers applied it through imparting the morality within the coursework discussions and assignments in the classrooms according to the level of students' class and grade. Despite its significance alone, this approach was perceived as very difficult to change the normal and traditional practices in the classroom environments; even it is successful in its delivery, the desired moral conduct in children's behaviors (Nucci, 2001).

According to Durlak and his colleagues (2011), it has become a common practice that the low performance and grades of the school children are blamed to the three parties including parents, teachers and certainly the students. Dissatisfactory

educational performance at school level has also been researched critically by the scholar and expert stakeholders. Durlak et al. (2011) argued that normally the causing point for low-grade educational performance is either the lack of devotion and motivation in studies by the student, lack of competency in teachers to let the students give desired results, or the insufficient support and supervision by the parents.

It is also observed in many cases that school authorities use to criticise the state, government level policies and the legitimate educational standards because most of the time these regulations become a hindrance in developing and implementing an innovative educational curriculum for a consistent period. Some gaps are highlighted on part of decreasing taxpaying community due to which the necessary funding serves as an obstacle for bringing some innovation especially regarding moral development in education. One of such innovations can be to promote and support the moral development in students in their knowledge learning and behaviors during their education (Durlak et al., 2011).

The discussion of education based moral development generally dominates with the changes in the age. These changes and issues may be logic, language, mathematics, number, morality, relationship, understandings of psychological concepts, or the attitudinal emotions. It is worked out by Nucci and Turiel, (2009) that the education of moral development is spread over all the stages of moral development as proposed by Lawrence Kohlberg. Moreover, younger children even under the age of five years are found differentiating between the social conventions and morality based on the moral education they learn through social interactions right from the beginning (Nucci, 2001).

2.4.1. Approaches to social and moral education

One of the primary objectives of moral development among schools, children is their character building. The traditional mode of building character among students is through the education itself at large. The term of character education is widely used as one of the significant methods of moral development. However, the studies are limited illustrating the educational approaches of character to the school going children. Arthur (2014) discussed that the character of an individual is constituted with

the blend of nurtured factors that form differentiation among the individuals from one another. The main player identified by him in constructing or shaping the character of school children is no one else than their teacher. Teachers are thus considered as the changing agents who can impart the fairness in the characters of the students with or without depending on certain curriculum to teach in the classroom (Arthur, 2014).

2.4.2. Application of social domain theory on moral education

There is a need to understand that the application of social domain theory regarding the education of morality in students still persists and has rather been broadened on the basis of constructive and developmental paradigms in education (Nucci & Powers, 2014). That application of theory addresses three basic points which must be covered during the character building process of children including the dedicated structure of the classroom with the focus on the objective of character building; responding to the behavior and attitude of the pupils in an organized and purposeful manner; and the integration of morality and character development into the prevailing or intervened course curriculum.

Nucci and Powers (2014) further extended the explaining of the application of domain theory on character education as suggesting best practices for developing the environment of classrooms more social based on mutual trust and care for each other. These characteristics of a classroom may certainly lead to the emergence of the moral domain among students and especially from teachers' side in the response of the possible misconducts of the children.

Spread over numerous research studies, it is widely recognised by the educators of morality and character that the development of morality is basically hidden in the curriculum but not the course curriculum. This sort of curriculum as discussed by Watson (2006) is rather hidden virtually in the discipline of teachers and the management system of the classroom. Such curriculum often relies on the reward and punishment methods in order to control and mold the behaviors of the students leading them to own a high moral character.

Watson (2006; 2014) discussed in his work about the developmental discipline of character development among students which is aimed at devising the alternative

source of imparting the morality among children through reflection, explanation, and teaching of emotional, moral and social competencies instead of rewards and punishment approach in the classrooms and schools. The power and authority granted under the developmental discipline are rooted not from a single domain like the teacher or the students but from the mutual relationship of these two domains based on caring (Watson, 2006).

2.4.3. Moral education and associated implications

Studies on the topic of developing morality among individuals contributed significantly the debate of moral education, through separately clarifying the context and understanding of the morality domain and discussing the perspective of students towards social convention (Turiel, 2006). Those research based approaches helped in suggesting the guidelines for implementing an innovative strategy in classrooms for better educating the morality to students.

Moreover, the research on moral development opened the opportunity for the personal or traditional issues in the existing curriculum and education system to be highlighted. It is recommended by the researchers like Nucci (2014) that any policy level or educational modifications regarding the inclusion of moral education must be implemented within the prevailing curriculum and be delivered by teachers during the routine classroom education instead of designing a separate schedule for a dedicated moral education class. Recommendations by Nucci (2014) were based on two principles as follows:

- The educational reform of imparting the moral development should be based on the cognitive domains prevailed in the society and certain events on specific issues.
- The moral education must not be for the sake of education only, rather it must ensure the developmental outcomes among the students gradually.

Another implication suggested by Berkowitz (2012) that must be considered in the education of moral development is that the education and training of moral character must also possess the basic of how to build the character first. This is because

it is evident that the character building approach on the basis of incentives, punishment, and rewards, idealisation of popular people and the power oriented authority in the prevailing society has been failed and did not come up with flourishing results. The imaginations of ideals among children are based on the reflections of the cultural and societal norms prevail in their institutes (Berkowitz, 2012; Berkowitz & Bier, 2007; Durlak et al., 2011; Lickona, 1991).

Regretfully, it is observed in studies that the children learn even during their school education that overall pattern of social players is to consider the value of success and victory instead of recognising and empowering the adaptation of virtue practices in any given environment. Berkowitz (2012) emphasised on the fact that children observe that the high grades in examinations win the moral rewards of teachers instead of being honest. Similarly, the social circle or group of friends always demand the loyalty and stickiness to that particular group instead of being neutral and kind to those who either left the group or are not yet become part of the group.

There are some more implications in the education of moral development in many parts of the world. It is observed through many surveys that people, or particularly the parents use to express their support and liking when asked of bringing interventions in the prevailing education system at the school level, but most of them oppose the proposal of moral education designed on a community level. Such parents form the basis of their opposition on the basis of following concerns (Berkowitz & Bier, 2007).

- The fear of parents could be on the basis that they equalise the moral education as sex education and want to avoid that for their children.
- Some parents consider the moral education in schools as the religious education and thus do not feel comfortable with it.
- On contrary, other parents fear the moral education will not be based on any religious thought.
- The rest of the parents appeared in the survey opposed the moral education as they fear that it will be imparted for brain storming and the mind controlling of their children.

2.4.4. Moral development in contemporary education

The contemporary understanding and orientation of moral education have been modified and transformed in many parts of the world. It is rather overcome by the development of citizenship. The citizenship concept has not been perceived any long as of political in nature rather it is considered more as social and interpersonal and, in many cases, even at intrapersonal. They generally focus on the modes individuals adopts to live their lives. Durlak et al. (2011) argue that there is a relationship between the development of citizenship and identity. they urge that the building of the nation and the identification of a citizen in the context of civil society are basically the rationale supporting the education of citizenship on a level that is more political.

Cohesion within society and the behavior of citizens are usually considered to be societal. The education of citizenship at both political as well as social level depends directly on the self-regulations which an individual implement on his own self at intrapersonal and interpersonal levels. These four levels of the education of citizenship are interconnected with the narratives, values, practices and the competencies of individuals. Education on a particular level such as political level can be self-contradictory because leaving the other three levels from the process on the grounds of being personal for the students, proves wrong the interconnectedness of these four levels (Berkowitz & Bier, 2007).

The development of citizenship may focus on the various social and political actions while discussing the social obedience in behaviors; discussing individualism oriented autonomous approach for individual citizens; or a discussing a democratic blend of both autonomous and individualistic approach for a citizen (Durlak et al., 2011). There are therefore a lot of research work already undertook on the topic of democracy and its significance. It is pertinent that the strengthening of a democratic society can only be possible by gaining enough knowledge pertaining to democracy and having the expertise of required to act in a democratic way. The more important part of being a democratic citizen is to impart in faith the values of democracy. The contemporary education of development of citizenship in the democracy prevailing

societies considers the democratic lifestyle of people as one of the necessary academic objectives (Durlak et al., 2011).

2.5. Behaviors in the Paradigm of Moral Reasoning

According to Hamlin (2013), the recent results of some contemporary researches showed acceptance of the claim that the morality in individuals owns at least few inborn characteristics including the judgment of behaviors and actions. The statistics of those researches depict that expression of morality and the moral motivations were recorded among young children and even in infants and toddlers. Hamlin (2013) further explains that the moral learning among infants was also observed as flexible, urbane and unexpectedly in line with the moral motivations and practices of their peer adults. This is how the infants use to incorporate the fairness and the morality of evaluation and response, therefore; he suggested that the morality is one of the primary components of human nature.

Harman (2012) debates that our inside moral judgment for an individual depends on the fact that he/she is able enough to be motivated by the particular considerations on morality. Similarly, the process of our inner moral judgments continues even for those whom we consider incapable enough for those motivations. The judgment can be understood as the process of developing a thought for someone regarding his/her goodness/badness or the mode of how he/she undertakes a task as good or bad.

As per Harman (2012), there is a need to understand that the inner judgments are different with the spoken or outer judgment of an individual or a group of individuals. Because calling someone as brutal, betrayer, evil or the enemy is not included in the inner judgment process for someone. This means that the spoken judgment may not necessarily mean what we really think of a particular person because our inner thought provoking process compels us to consider the reality of emotions and deeds of the next person to whom we are passing comments verbally.

It was proposed by Gibbs and his colleagues (2007) that there is a need for a variable, which can intervene between the stages of moral judgment and social

behavior. Individuals should rely on that variable in one of these stages and conceptualizes the specific and relative given action. The situation based influences value and require due attention and importance as the effects of regression on social behaviors on occasional situations like the conditions of prison has been observed since long.

Numerous scholars and researchers tried to link the emotions of individuals with their moral judgment practices, as rationalized by Prinz (2006) that without utilizing the sentiments factors in one's feelings, he/she cannot actually construct a moral thought for anybody else. The author questioned about what really happens inside our thoughts when we verbally say the terminologies of good, bad, wrong or right. Some majority of empirical evidence of the surveys aimed to find the answer to those questions reveals that in general, the moral judgments are based on emotions by default. There is also a possibility that the negativity of emotions hardly derives our focus towards the positive aspects of a situation or a person. Precisely, it can be considered that bad or negative emotions serve as the derive force even alone for establishing negative judgments on morality in a specific situation despite lacking any other concrete reasons for associating negativity with someone or something (Prinz, 2006).

Pizarro (2000) argued with the example of a jury whose members are given straight instructions by the judges to avoid the sympathetic feelings or emotions which may influence the judgments in their cases. These instructions also serve as the fundamental basis of the legal system in most of the countries all over the world. This is because the role of emotional feels can certainly put the impact on the unbiased, fair and accurate judgment based on the principles of morality. It is also evident historically that a significant number of theorists agreed on the debate that emotions are the influencing factor for developing moral judgment and reasoning (Pizarro, 2000).

Conclusively, it can be understood that the process of moral judgment is certainly influenced by the emotional intuitional practices. Despite the fact it is also observed in many cases that emotions can easily host the strategies and regulations through which individuals use to restrain adequate reactions based on again certain

emotions when they are depicted with a concerning element. It can be understood by letting two individuals are put in a situation for providing moral judgments in the end, while one of those individuals is not able to experience the feelings of emotions. The end results of moral judgments from both of these individuals are most likely to be the same as suggested by Pizarro (2000); however, the normal emotions oriented a person is likely to be advantageous in his/her daily events of moral judgments with or without depending on the emotional feelings aspect.

2.6. Moral Reasoning in Turkey

In Turkey, moral development and education had been one of the major topics just after multi-party period began in 1945. There was some weak efforts before about moral development and education, however they were mostly leaded by policy makers such as introducing a class named *moral conversations* (Turkish: Musabakat-ı Ahlakiye) for primary grade students in 1924, however, there were a few individual academic efforts. Kanad (1930; 1934; 1942; 1947) Evrenol (1926; as cited in Aladag, 2016) wrote a number of books about child development and education that mentioned about moral development and education. However, these books did not explain moral development and moral education in detail. Another individual effort made by Ziya Gokalp. Gokalp, who was a follower of Durkheim (Nefes, 2013), defined Turkish morality in his book, Principles of Turkism (1923; Turkish: Türkçülüğün esasları).

According to Gokalp (1923) there are 5 types of morality: (1) homeland ethics, (2) professional ethics, (3) family ethics, (4) civil ethics and (5) international ethics. He defines homeland ethics as the morality of Turkish culture which involves family ethics and professional ethics. He describes family ethics as the tissues and professional ethics as the organs of homeland ethics (p.139). He defines professional ethics as the guiding principles of a profession like medical doctors and lawyers. He suggests there should be a guild as a control mechanism (p.141). Gokalp uses Durkheim's methodology to define the family. Durkheim define five types family from the evolutionary perspective (Lamanna, 2002), however, Gokalp mentions just two of them in his book. Gokalp makes a comparison between two family types.

Although they are not clear, they probably are the Germanic paternal family and the Roman patriarchal family, defined by Durkheim (Lamanna, 2002). His definition of family is based on roles and responsibilities rather than rights. Additionally, he underlines that ancient Turkish communities had a democratic and feminist perspective. He defines civil ethics from the perspective of Durkheim, too. The society means more than the sum of its individual members. For the sake of the society, the members should compromise their individual rights. There is freedom but its borders are set by the community. He defines international ethics as the code of conduct that regulates international relations. According to Gokalp, moral action is a result of a conscience moral decision making. He was one of the first researchers that emphasize moral development. Additionally, like Durkheim, Gokalp shows signs of moral reasoning in his book because he accepts people as moral decision makers who evaluate the moral context and social setting before acting.

After the individual efforts made by the researchers mentioned above, there was a vacuum for almost 20 years in moral development field until the second national education council. Just before multi-party period began, second national education council was held. One of the key themes took part on the agenda of the council (1943) was developing moral education in schools. The most remarkable goal for moral education was mentioned as a subtitle: ‘to define social and personal principles of Turkish morality’ (Yinilmez-Akagündüz, 2017). The council encouraged individuals to take part and contribute to foster moral education. As a result, Taskiran published his book defining the principles of Turkish morality (Turkish: Türk ahlakının ilkeleri) in 1943.

Multi-party system resulted a democratic evolution. Terms like change of power, political participation, political opposition, democracy and citizenship had been emphasized more than before (Sahin, 2012). To maintain stability of multi-party system, government had to ensure the freedom of choice and a diplomatic change of political power (Kamer & Alabaş, 2017). Consequently, the primary education program developed in 1948 has emphasized the terms of democracy, justice, fairness, tolerance, respect, freedom and citizenship (MoNE, 1949). Furthermore, in 1951, the Congress of Moral Education (Turkish: Ahlak terbiyesi kongresi) was held in Ankara

University Campus in Ankara. The main aims of this congress were written as to define morality and moral education (TODMB, 1951). The purpose of the congress was defined as to analyze and evaluate moral and social events in order to provide a basis for an effective moral education (TODMB, 1951).

Media coverage suggested that the congress could not reach its goals (Kamer & Alabaş, 2017). In fact, the congress caused an intense debate about moral education, especially about dress code and co-education. This ongoing debate encouraged researchers to study on morality, moral development, moral education and moral reasoning. As a result, in 1952, the first post-Piagetian study conducted by a Turkish researcher: Refia Uğurel-Şemin. Uğurel-Semin (1952) conducted a laboratory study with 291 children aged 4-16, in İstanbul. The children were asked to distribute an uneven number of nuts between themselves and another child from the same classroom, and then they were interviewed about their behavior. She categorized children's sharing behaviors into 7 codes: (1) Egocentrism, (2) sociocentrism, (3) awareness of social reaction, (4) superficial reciprocity, (5) deeper and enlarged reciprocity and cooperation, (6) altruism and (7) justice. She suggested that younger children were egocentric that is, they reasoned based on their selfish needs. Around 9 years of age, they tended to reason based on obedience to the society and shame. By the increase in age, they emphasized on interpersonal relationships, empathy, altruism and justice and fairness. For the following 25 years, there had been around 30 studies regarding moral reasoning conducted by Şemin's undergraduate students. However, the researcher could not have access to them because they are not available online.

In 1978, three well-known researchers in the field of moral reasoning, Turiel, Edwards and Kohlberg (1978) studied development of moral judgements in Turkish children, adolescents and young adults. They interviewed a total of 113 male subjects from Turkey in 1964, 1966 and 1970. Interviews took place in a village of Manisa, and province capitals (city centers) of İzmir and Ankara. Participants were asked to respond given moral dilemmas. The results were similar to the previous studies conducted by Kohlberg and colleagues in other countries. However, they found some differences about stage sequences between groups. They found Turkish men reached

4th stage around the age of 20, which totally different from other studies but sequence was still the same.

After Turiel et al. (1978) mostly unpublished dissertational studies and thesis have been conducted until 2009. For instance, Çileli (1981) found that there was not any significant difference, in moral reasoning, between school, sex and age. However, in 1987, Koca studied whether sex, education level of mothers, number of sibling(s) and nursery school attendance influence moral judgments for her dissertation. Findings suggested that all the factors had influenced children's moral judgments. Likewise, Özkaynak (1982) found that there was a relationship between age and development of moral reasoning. Like Çileli, Özkaynak also found that sex and development of moral reasoning was not related. Moreover, Koyuncu (1983) studied the relationship between moral development and gender role and moral development and sex. She found that moral development is related with neither sex nor gender role. Ilgar (1996) and Kurt (1996) studied the relationship between locus of control and moral development. Ilgar (1996) suggested that there was a difference between people who had internal locus and people who had external locus. However, there were not any relationship between sex and moral reasoning. Likewise, Kurt (1996) found no relation between sex and moral reasoning. Ersoy (1997), also, reached similar results for sex and moral reasoning. Oktay (2001) compared MBA students' and managers' moral judgments. He suggested that there were some significant gender differences that caused by different value structures of the participants.

Akkoyun (1987) studied the relationship between moral reasoning and empathy. According to the findings there were not a significant difference between empathy and moral reasoning. However, the researcher suggested that the results are not reliable and valid due to the limitations of the scale. Ciftci-Aridag and Yuksel (2010) conducted a study with 129 undergraduate students in Bursa. They studied the relationship between the same variables and they either found a relationship between empathy and moral reasoning. Yet, they found a negative correlation between personal discomfort and moral reasoning. Özsöz (1990) studied the relationship between conviction and moral development stages in adolescents aged 14-18. Findings suggested that age, similar to Özkaynak (1982) sex and conviction status did not

influence moral reasoning. Additionally, convicts and other adolescents did not vary in terms of moral development stage sequence.

In another study, Özeri (1994) studied the relationship between moral development and maternal attitudes in early childhood period. She found that protective maternal attitude, sex and birth order had impact on moral development of young children. Eyyam, Menevis and Dogruer (2012) found that education level of mother was very important for development of moral reasoning. Another study done by Karakavak-Cinar (2006) suggested that there was a significant relationship between parents' education level and moral reasoning. However, Tola (2003) conducted a study with 5th grade students to investigate the relationship between students' moral judgment and their attitudes towards their parents' parenting types. Findings suggested that there was not any difference in sex, children's attitudes towards parents' parenting type, SES, and parents' education level.

Çiftçi (2001) conducted a study comparing Turkish high school students live in Turkey and Germany in terms of moral development levels. She found that there was a negative correlation between moral development level and families' tendency to force their children to obey religious rules. Students in Germany had higher moral reasoning scores than those in Turkey. In addition, boys had better moral reasoning scores than girls. Kuyel and Glover (2010) found similar results. They studied 396 undergraduate students from the USA and Turkey in terms of moral reasoning and justice and care orientation. According to the results, female students had significantly higher scores on justice and care orientations than male students. Yet, Ozgulec (2001) studied moral judgments of children aged 7-11 and she found that birth order and sex is not related with moral reasoning however, there were a significant relationship between age and moral reasoning.

2.7. Teachers Beliefs on Social Domain and Morality

It is identified in a research study of Haser (2006) that the teachers at all levels in a school have some specific beliefs about their subject matter and its teaching methods in the classroom. Teachers hold these beliefs, which were developed and

influenced on the basis of their teaching experiences in the classrooms and other training programs (Haser, 2006). There is usually formed a relationship which influences teachers' instructions methods through their beliefs and students' learning methods through teachers' instructions.

2.7.1. Definition and nature of teachers' beliefs and characteristics

In a study by Haser (2006), attention was brought to the research gap that still needs to be filled that a certain definition of belief is yet to be on consensus and different researchers define beliefs in different dimensions as per the requirement of their studies. Haser (2006) argued in her study that the behavior of a teacher is influenced by many personal mental constructs including their beliefs. However, teachers' beliefs are not supposed to be easy to be observed and measured. Teachers of same subjects and teaching style can still hold different beliefs regarding their teaching and learning of students. It is also pertinent that beliefs are not possible to be defined in a way acceptable for certain people (Furinghetti & Pehkonen, 2002). As the nature of beliefs is found complex and having differing perceptions among different teachers, therefore, the relationship of teachers' beliefs with their instructions methods for students is still a complicated research problem to be solved (Galvis, 2012).

Unlike other psychological concepts, teachers' beliefs are very much complicated to reveal the personality or perceptions of the teachers. According to a viewpoint of Rokeach as referred in the studies of Galvin (2012) and Haser (2006), the beliefs of a person, say a teacher, regarding something or someone may not necessarily represent his/her real thoughts and beliefs for the same subject. This is because of several societal and moral reasons which compel the teachers to express the actual inner thoughts. The environment of classrooms and the presence of peers in the schools may and certainly hinder the teachers to truly express and claim their beliefs.

Haser (2006) argued in his study that due to being subjective in nature the beliefs systems differentiate with the knowledge system at large. The belief systems may vary in certainty, irrespective of relevant knowledge can be evaluated on the basis of evidential norms and rational investigations. This is how beliefs are different from

knowledge because of lacking any evidence based judgment and evaluation criteria which may lead certain mutual agreement among scholars.

2.7.2. Importance of teachers' beliefs and its impact on their teaching

Teachers are generally found holding various but interlinked beliefs related to what they teach as subject matter. They also have beliefs regarding the mode of instructing the subject, students learning level from these instructions, responsibilities of students as well as teachers in the classrooms and other general objectives of education in the school etc. It is believed that the modes of teaching the concepts to the students are influenced by the belief system of teachers regarding the knowledge of the matter, required skill sets, and the rationale of the content to be delivered. Pertinently, the belief system of teachers also plays a role in developing or influencing the belief system of the students in the classroom (Flores & Day, 2006; Galvin, 2012; Haser, 2006).

It is believed all over the world with the mutual consensus of all acting agents within the society that the role of the teacher is always significant in developing not only the children but the agents of change and pillars of society in the future. This value and dignified position of teacher is based on moral principles including his/her honesty, fairness, compassion, integrity, respect, patience, care, impartiality and dedication etc. Campbell (2008) highlighted that the fact that these moral virtues of teachers are likely to be more strengthen when they try to impart these values to the students and encourage them to learn, adapt and practice these virtues in their life within and outside classrooms. Successful teachers as per Campbell (2008) are those who are aware of the fact that their moral virtues in classrooms are only successful if these virtues are also reflected in their actions, emotions, intuitions, practice, philosophy, and experiments in front of classroom students.

Buzzelli and Johnston (2002) stated in their work that the profession of teach is based on moralities and virtues which inherit several aspects of ethics hidden in its exercise and scope. In the profession of teaching the knowledge base of the profession is itself the knowledge base of morality and ethics, in contrast to other professions like a medical profession or the practice of legal affairs, in which morality is applied to

popular knowledge of these particular professions. Pertinently, educating the youth is itself completely an ethical profession based on moral grounds. It is also suggested by Campbell (2008) that despite the moral grounds associated with the profession of teaching, the lack of ethical and moral language is still there with the help of which teachers may correspond mutually about their moral education practices in the classroom with other teachers.

2.7.3. Orientation and organization of moral classrooms

The development of a moral or ethical classroom is based on not only the respect for the teacher but primarily on the respect of children by the teacher in valuing their interests, ideas and especially their emotional feelings which are normally at an earlier stage. The respect factor should not be prevailing in the brain process of teachers but it must also be reflected in the group activities and exercises to be facilitated by the teacher in the classroom. Frei (2013) insisted that teachers must ensure the organisation of the classroom the way in which the needs and necessities of the students are addressed also encompassing their mental, physical and emotional needs.

There is a need to understand that the moral development as per the research supports the teachers to develop their understanding regarding the moral reasoning of children. Teachers are also supposed to avoid giving innocent remarks or moral expressions to younger students on their childish talks or behavior; instead, they should encourage the children on this move by expressing the emotions as if these behaviors were real. In other words, teachers are supposed to impart moral development among students by realizing that the level of their learned level on the basis of which children use to response with innocent replies to normal questions (Frei, 2013).

DeVries and Zan (1994) argued in their work that the teachers should design and implement strategies for the effective management of classrooms to ensure the avoidance of cooperation breakdowns but also to preach the moral education as a primary objective. Researchers believe that the teachers with the constructivist

approach are always found active in strengthening their efforts for promoting and encouraging the self-regulation paradigm among students.

It is explored by Bullough (2011) in his work that as per the consensus of the majority of researchers and scholars, the profession of teaching is more than just a profession but a moral and ethical enterprise. Many of the authors believe that the relationship between the teachers and the students may elaborate the efficiency of the teachers through their organization of the classroom and the modes and medium of delivering the lessons. The caring aspect is always highlighted on teacher's part when it comes to treat the students in the class, especially the younger students.

Fenstermacher et al. (2009) contributed to their research illustrating that teachers can develop the moral character of school children by either presenting various examples and let the children extract the positivity from these examples or by delivering direct/indirect lectures to the students while teaching them the lessons of morality and ethics. They (2009) believed that teachers can adapt teaching the morality to students through the content of delivery. They argue that the content for teaching morality to students should comprise matters of ethical importance for the students to focus and consider them as the primary object of learning at school.

In a study by Lumkin (2008), it has been emphasized that teachers with their own moral character may be served as a role model in front of their students in the classroom while demonstrating the characteristics of respect, truth, responsibility, fairness, trust and above all the morality. Teachers impart moral education to their students while emphasizing them that the moral and ethical decisions by the individuals are based on the process of moral reasoning. Teachers are generally the most effective agents of bringing or developing the change and moral education into the behaviors and attitude of the students especially during the activities of the classroom (Lumkin, 2008).

Moreover, it was concluded in the study of Lumkin (2008) that all the lessons should be based on the moral ground and virtues whether they are learned within the classroom or outside the classroom, through lectures or through written content. Therefore, teachers should be careful in their approach to teaching which must possess the characteristics and attributes of respect, fairness, honesty, responsibility, and

integrity along with any other trait representing the moral values supporting the moral development of the students.

2.8. Obedience to authority

2.8.1. Overview of obedience

Obedience to authority is an explicit phenomenon intervening different aspects of cultural and social practices throughout the globe. Obedience to authority has been identified as a basic concept characterizing the functioning of the communities and is associated with a positive and negative chain of events modifying human relations (Southard, 2014). Obedience emerges during the early childhood developmental stages. Socialization helps the children to learn and adapt to comply with obedience by respecting the orders from the elders either to gain a reward or avoid punishment. Different scientists underpinned obedience to authority by carrying out experimental studies. Of these, Milgram, Raz and Zimbardo studies and Montessori's writings have gained much significance in the field of social psychology and early childhood education.

2.8.2. Milgram's behavioral study of obedience

Milgram, in 1962, conducted the most controversial yet unethical experiment to analyse the positivity of obedience among the individuals (Milgram, 1963). Milgram was of the opinion that humans exhibited operational behavior on two distinctive levels; as an autonomous entity, aware of the consequences of their attitude and conscientious and as agentic individuals who are no longer in control of their actions (Robinson, 2014). Participants were requested to bring along a friend where one would act as a learner and the other as the teacher. The aim of the study was to assess the willingness of the learners to obey the authority while reacting to impending electric shocks (Russell, 2014; Stanley, 1974). The electric shocks were administered beginning from 15-V to 450-V with a 15-V increment every time the learner failed to recall the phrase learned previously (Haslam & Reicher 2012).

Key findings of the study were to determine the extreme readiness of the teachers in commanding authority by inflicting potentially lethal electric shocks on

innocent individuals. A partial replication of the Milgram experiment was recently conducted by Burger in 2009 by ensuring the participant's welfare while sustaining the original aspects of the experiment. Burger, Girgis, and Manning (2011) discussed that Burger halted the experiment at 150-V when the participants started to complain of pain and discomfort. However, the response rate of the Burger experiment was no different than the Milgram's rate recorded four decades ago.

2.8.3. Zimbardo's prison experiment

In contrast to Milgram experiment, Zimbardo's Prison Experiment took forth the idea of destructive behavior by randomly selecting students as prison guards in a mock prison at Stanford. On contrary to the Milgram's analysis, the aim of Zimbardo was to examine the interactive behavior between the prisoners and guards in the absence of malevolent authority (McLeod, 2008). Shockingly, the results demonstrated massive prisoner's meted abuse by the guards that resulted in the termination of the experiment within a week's time. Haslam and Reicher (2012) signified that brutality was identified as a natural consequence exhibiting power and autonomy to the individuals.

Gray (2013) critiqued the findings of Zimbardo on the fact that the study was conceived in a poor manner with inadequate interpretations (Griggs, 2014). Gray conducted an open-ended survey of the students designated the role of prison guards. Out of 150 respondents, 80% of the students pictured prison guards as hostile, aggressive, and oppressive towards the needs of the prisoners. The plausible results indicated that the students behaved in the similar manner as they conceived the behavior of the guards with the assumption that Zimbardo's experiment demanded role similarity.

2.8.4. Raz's theory of authority

The perception of authority is bifurcated into theoretical authority and practical authority. Ehrenberg (2011a) described theoretical authority as the power held by individuals with greater knowledge. As opposed, practical authority is accounted for inducing behavioral changes in others by leading the way (Raz, 2003). Raz paired the

notion of practical authority with a legitimate authority to analyze the behavior and autonomous actions of the individuals. The aim of Raz's cumulative assessment was to determine a relation between behavioral reasoning while respecting the individual values and perception (Wallace et al., 2004).

Raz defended the theory of law by aligning it with the practical authority to explain the nature of the law (Raz, 2009). Raz offered a robust analysis of the right to authority. Ehrenberg (2011b) criticized Raz's theory in terms of limited right to control the attitude and behavior of the individuals on the basis of theoretical knowledge. Practical authority is usually exhibited by parents, employers, political and religious leaders, and commanders who may lack additional knowledge or subject expertise.

2.8.5. Montessori's the absorbent mind

Maria Montessori, in 1949, proposed a new pedagogy in relation to contemporary modes of scientific learning, teaching, and education. Montessori signified child as an absorbent mind endowed with the immense power to offer guidance for a luminous future (Montessori, 1949). Montessori criticized that education, by no means should be considered as the provision of information, yet, education should be linked to the personality development of a young child. The aim of the Montessori analysis was to envisage the role of education in the rise of humanity from early developmental stages of the cognitive system.

Montessori principles on educational theory are still in practice that has offered a new approach to cultural diversity, active engagement of the children, and self-directed methods to help the students learn in a welcoming environment (Thayer-Bacon, 2012). As opposed, conservative Darwinism concepts proposed by Spencer and Sumner argued that cognitive development and behavioral characteristics were predetermined by hereditary (Montessori, 2009). Moreover, education had a limited role in modifying the attitude and behaviors of the young children. Kayili and Ari (2011) assessed the impact of the readiness to education in the preschool students and concluded that Montessori Method was more efficient than contemporary educational methods in enhancing the learning and cognitive development of preschool children.

2.9. Summary

So far in this chapter, an overview of existing research regarding ‘moral reasoning from the perspective of Domain theory’, ‘teachers’ beliefs’ and ‘obedience to authority’ have been given in order to ascertain relevant literature. The objective was to purposefully document, evaluate, and summarize related literature on which the research questions have been formulated.

Domain theory basically studies children’s conception of autonomy from social conventional perspective. Its basic statement is that morality and social conventions are two different but interrelated aspects of human development. Individuals’ reasoning about an event is founded on their understandings of social situations. The moral domain is generally focused on the actions and the contextualization of harm, justice, rights, and fairness in the actions of human beings and the society in which they live. The underlying aspects of morality are given universal significance and are adapted by not only societies and legislations but also by individuals themselves, irrespective of influences from the prevailing authority. They are universal and could be applied across various cultural contexts regardless of the existence of authority and/or social rules because they are independent of personal preferences, cultural influences or power of authority. The social conventional domain is related to understanding appropriate behaviors within a cultural context. Conventional issues derive their influence from external sources, like authority and rules. Social conventions involve customs and traditions and rules that define the behavioral frameworks and common agreements of a social organization.

Another important term for the research problem of the current study was teachers’ beliefs. Beliefs are one of the most significant mental processes behind a person’s behaviors and actions. They are originated from the goals, values and conceptions of teachers. Teachers’ previous daily life and teaching experiences, personality, and professional training shape their beliefs which influence their in-class behaviors, lesson plans, attitudes towards learners and teaching, and values. According to Pajares (1992) teachers’ beliefs are universal and broad.

In view of the opposing theories and experimental studies, it has been analyzed that obedience to authority is controlled by the situational analysis in addition to the natural conformity to the authority delegated to the individuals. Milgram and Zimbardo's experiments offered a provocative analysis indicating that emotional reactions were less likely correlated with destructive obedience. As opposed, Raz theory complied with the practical authority and change in behavior as a direct result of observation and analysis. Lastly, Montessori offered an advanced pedagogy system to improve the cognitive growth, learning, and behavioral development of children at early stages of life.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

So far, this study has given attention to the literature addressing the social domain theory, social and moral development and teachers' beliefs. The previous chapters have focused particularly on ECE teachers' beliefs regarding children's way of thinking about morality and social conventions. The present chapter describes the procedures and methodological considerations used to conduct the current study. It includes the following sections: the research design, data collection procedures, data analysis, trustworthiness, and ethical issues. The first section identifies the overall design of the study. The research approach and the strengths of using this approach are described. Next, the selection of participants and the role of the researcher are defined. In the third section, data collection procedures and their appropriateness are discussed. Then, data analysis, trustworthiness and ethical issues are examined in detail.

3.1 Research Design

The present study is descriptive in nature. The purpose of the current study is to identify the current beliefs of ECE teachers regarding children's conception of morality and social conventions.

In the study, the interpretivist paradigm is employed. This paradigm suggests that knowledge is socially constructed through interaction and that it is subject to change; knowledge is based on interpretation and reinterpretation rather than measurement; moreover, knowledge is context specific (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Willis, 2007). It tends to change based on individuals'

characteristics, attitudes, perceptions and beliefs. In this respect, the aim of a research project from an interpretivist's perspective is to gain a greater understanding of a topic and/or a context. Meanwhile, the researcher does his best to grasp a greater and deeper understanding of a phenomenon through social interaction (Bryman, 2012). The methodology of this paradigm "contains the investigator's assumptions ... about the manner in which an investigation should be performed" (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; as cited in Plack, 2005, p. 224). In this study, I try to understand the morality and social conventions highlighted from the beliefs of teachers within the ECE context. Hence, considering the nature of the findings expected from the current study, a research project based on the interpretivist paradigm was considered to be the most suitable.

3.1.1. Phenomenological approach

There is a variety of different approaches in the interpretivist paradigm and the purpose and the design of the study led the researcher to employ one of them. Four approaches might be suitable for the current research: Ethnography, case study, grounded theory and phenomenology. In this study, the phenomenological approach was employed because as previously mentioned the current study is descriptive in nature, aiming to describe the current beliefs of preschool teachers about children's judgments of social and moral development. Although data are gained from a particular group, the snowball sampling method was used since it allowed the recruitment of new participants with the help of the existing ones. Cultural identities were not defined and the only criterion that was established was for the teacher to be an PRESCHOOL teacher within the Turkish education system. Furthermore, the phenomenon is not examined in a predefined setting or case; thus, this study is neither ethnographic nor a case study (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Bryman, 2012; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Likewise, the grounded theory approach is not preferred as the research design because the intention is not to develop a theory or introduce a model (Charmaz, 2006) about PRESCHOOL teachers' beliefs, nor about the social and moral development of children. Consequently, the phenomenological approach was considered to be the best fit for the current study.

Phenomenology is described by Oxford English Dictionary (n.d.) as “[a]n approach that concentrates on the study of consciousness and the objects of direct experience.” In spite of the philosophical moorings of the discipline, which is often limited to the characterization of sensory qualities, from the beginning of the 20th century, Husserl and his successors have advocated phenomenology as the proper foundation of all philosophy and have expanded its range (Mohanty, 2008; Smith, 2016) by suggesting that all the experiences, surrounding things and occurrences are richer in content than mere senses and have a significant meaning for the individual (Smith, 2016). As a result, the discipline may be characterized as the study of phenomena, that is, interpretations of experience from individuals’ very own perspective (Moran, 2000). It studies experience that is consciously reconstructed rather than remembered or recalled as experienced by an individual.

A phenomenological study tries to portray participated people’s lived experiences regarding a phenomenon. According to Moustakas (1994), description is one of the key terms; he defines phenomenology as a *description* of what and how individuals experience a phenomenon. Another important term may be *interpretation*. Interpretation is the analysis of a lived experience by relating it to a relevant context (Smith, 2016). Because each and every individual experiences the things, events, etc. naturally, researchers can only reach social reality by means of description and interpretation (Moerman, Qualitative Research lecture, 2016). Husserl defines this as combining natural knowledge and personal understanding of an individual regarding a phenomenon to grasp the essence (Silverman, 2015).

The phenomenon in the current study is moral reasoning of children. The aim is to study PRESCHOOL teachers’ beliefs regarding the phenomenon which has been shaped based on their personal experiences. The point of interest lies in the descriptions of participants’ experiences (Seidman, 2006), which is indicated in the research question:

1. What do Turkish preschool teachers believe about young children’s conceptions of social and moral judgments about given in-class behaviors?
 - 1.1. How do Turkish preschool teachers categorize young children’s in-class behaviors?

- 1.2. How do Turkish preschool teachers distinguish between social conventional and moral events?

3.1.2. Researcher's role

The purpose of a phenomenological study is to understand a phenomenon better through the experiences of individuals (Moustakas, 1994). Phenomenological research is founded on the researcher's motive to comprehend a subject, problem and/or topic (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Bryman, 2012; Flick, 2009; Heidegger, 2005; Smith, 2016). Like any other person, my motive is to understand and gain insight into the world around me. I have been in the field of early childhood education for more than a decade and I am a father. Therefore, as a researcher, an educator and a father, I have a curiosity in how children develop. In fact, I am interested in social and moral development more than any other topic related to child development and education. I spend a substantial amount of time with both pre-service and in-service PRESCHOOL teachers and I believe teachers play a significant role in child development. I am curious about what PRESCHOOL teachers believe regarding social and moral development because I think what they believe is related to how they behave within the classroom.

As Moustakas (1994) states, phenomenological studies are subject to researchers' preconceptions and related experiences. The first step in a phenomenological study is to become aware of pre-conceptions regarding the topic and then set them apart. Phenomenological research requires researchers to be aware of their role as well as their biases (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). As phenomenological researchers, we should use epoche to "...set aside our prejudgments, biases and preconceived ideas about things" (Moustakas, 1994, p.85). It is hard, generally impossible, to achieve epoche; however, the efforts of researchers -to reflect their positions and to take a step back to see the whole picture- limit the influence of preconceived thoughts and biases significantly (Moustakas, 1994).

The role of the researcher may change throughout the course of the research study. I have mostly assumed the role of an actor while defining the research topic, and developing and conducting interviews. I have been a facilitator, a listener and an

observer during the interviews (Flick, 2009). Since I have been involved in every step of the study, I was required to be careful about my biases and experiences, i.e. my personal connection, in the topic. I realized that my perceptions of the importance of social and moral development and the importance of teachers in the social and moral development of children are the ones that I need to set aside. Being aware of these, I tried not to let my personal judgments and experiences have an influential impact before and during the development of the interview questions, while conducting the interviews and while analyzing the data.

As mentioned above, I was an interviewer and a facilitator in the current study. I was not a member of the schools where I met with the interviewee teachers and I did not know any of the teachers before the study. I reached them via snowball sampling. Considering that my role as a teacher educator might have a negative influence on my instant perception during the interviews, I ensured that I strictly kept to the script to prevent these negative influences. Additionally, completing the pilot study with 8 PRESCHOOL teachers helped me to construct the framework of my study. It also helped me to direct my focus onto the beliefs of PRESCHOOL teachers about social and moral development of children. Working on this topic made me feel I was making a favorable contribution to myself and the field of child development and education.

3.1.3. Participants

As above-mentioned, a phenomenological study is a description of the experiences of the participants of a study. By means of these descriptions, researchers seek answers for their research questions. Thus, the researcher gathers data from individuals who are familiar with a phenomenon, and make a broad description based on those individuals' experiences (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). In a phenomenological research study, gathering data from individuals who are appropriate for the purposes of the study and who can provide wealthy and useful information is crucial (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Bryman, 2012; Silverman, 2000).

The selection of participants is related to generalizability; however, in qualitative research, proper selection of participants who can provide fruitful information about the topic and the central phenomenon is more crucial than

generalizability (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Bryman, 2012; Flick, 2009; Irving, 2006; Silverman, 2000; Smith, 2016; Willis, 2007). Hence, to gather sufficient data, purposeful sampling was mainly employed in the current study. The data were gathered from a particular group of people via snowballing. No cultural identities had been defined before the study but willingness and being an PRESCHOOL teacher in Turkey were the initial criteria. However, after conducting the pilot study, one more criterion was added: working as a PRESCHOOL teacher for more than 5 years. The rationale behind this criterion was based on the statements of 5 participants from the pilot study. They said it took two years for them to feel like teachers and only then could they start to pay attention to the grounds of in-class behaviors.

After establishing guidelines for participant selection, I visited a local public preschool and expressed my intention to them. Starting from that school, I reached 81 teachers. 38 of them accepted to become involved; unfortunately, four of them withdrew from the study because of personal issues. As a result, the study was conducted with 34 participant teachers. There were 20 teachers from private schools (6 of them were included in the pilot study) and 14 teachers from public schools (2 of them were included in the pilot study). The teachers were from 5 different provinces, namely Samsun (14), Ankara (12), Trabzon (4), Artvin (2) and Rize (2). 27 teachers held a degree in ECE and 7 teachers had graduated from child development and education department (CDE). Six teachers held an MS degree in ECE and one of them was a PhD student in the same field (See Table 3.1 for teachers' demographics). Data gathered from eight of the participants were used as pilot data. Based on the data, the interview procedures and research questions were finalized. For the main study, the data of the other 26 PRESCHOOL teachers were used.

Table 3.1 Participant preschool teachers' demographics

Department	ECE	27
	CDE	7
Degree	BA/BS	27
	MS	6
	PhD	1
Hometown	Kırıkkale	7
	Artvin	6
	Erzurum	6
	Izmir	5
	Diyarbakır	2
	Trabzon	2
	Giresun	2
	Konya	2
	Denizli	1
	Sivas	1
Graduation	Burdur MAE University	5
	Erzurum Ataturk University	5
	Gazi University	4
	Hacettepe University	4
	Trakya University	4
	Dokuz Eylul University	3
	Karadeniz Technical University	3
	METU	3
	Cukurova University	2
	Samsun 19 Mayıs University	1
Number of children	No child	12
	1 child	8
	2+ children	14
Working school type	Public School	20
	Private School	14
Where they work	Samsun	14
	Ankara	12
	Trabzon	4
	Artvin	2
	Rize	2
Teaching experience	Max.	21years
	Min.	5 years
	Average	~8.5 years

3.2 Data Collection Procedures

By nature, the interpretivist paradigm is linked with the qualitative data collection procedures. There are a number of data collection procedures in qualitative research, such as individual interviews, focus group interviews, observations or visual or textual document analysis; however, the individual interview is the most frequently used data collection procedure (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Legard, Keegan, Ward, 2003; Silverman, 2000). Interviews could be preferred to examine perspectives, beliefs and attitudes of interviewees as well as to dig into related experiences of those people. In the current study, individual interviews were used as the primary instrument to gather data. Moreover, written documents about social and moral development, the social domain theory and teachers' beliefs were employed.

3.2.1 Pilot interviews

Interviews in qualitative research methods provide fruitful data to capture individuals' personal experiences from their own perspective. However, it is not easy to measure individuals' subjective experiences with in-person interviews as defining the process. Consequently, qualitative research methods require serious preparation before beginning to collect data. For the current study, a pilot study was conducted to ensure the interview questions are understandable and to define appropriate participant characteristics. Once the interview protocols and data collection procedures had been defined based on both the related literature and experts' opinion, pilot study were conducted with eight preschool teachers. All the participants were located in Ankara. They have teaching experience between 6 to 14 years with an average of 10 years. The interviews were conducted at administrators' rooms and were recorded by digital recorders. They ranged in time between 71-108 minutes. Verbatim was transcribed after each individual interview was completed.

Before the main study, data collection process was divided into three separate interviews and they were modified based on Seidman's (2006) instructions because they used to take a lot of time. Based on the findings of pilot study, research questions finalized and purpose of the study was clarified. Additionally, pilot interviews

facilitated clarity by modifying wording of the questions and enhancing probes. Because the participants found them irrelevant or unnecessary, some of the questions were removed before the main study, such as

- *What is morality?*
- *How do you define a person of character?*

Moreover, participants had changed some phrases like “*what do you think*” (Turkish: ne düşünüyorsunuz?) into “*according to you*” (Turkish: sizce) because they thought it was clearer in that way.

After working on wording, I worked on developing three interview series. Three separate interviews were organized based on Seidman’s (2006) instructions. The three-interview-series procedure will be discussed in detail below. Two experts reviewed the questions and the interviews were finalized.

3.2.2 Interviews

Interviewing is an effective technique to recognize individuals’ beliefs (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Bryman, 2012). Because it is interactive, it is a beneficial data gathering instrument. There are a number of interviewing techniques developed based on the nature of the research and/or the intentions of the researcher. As a primary instrument to gather data, *the three-interview series* introduced by Seidman (2006) was used for the current study to understand “the process by which people construct meaning and to describe what those meanings are” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p.43). Interviews were developed based on Seidman’s instructions. A series of three separate interviews have helped break the contextual ice between the researcher and the participant teachers while exploring the topic within the scope of teaching experience. In this way, we had the chance to be within the same research frame and understand each other’s perspectives.

Each of the interviews was semi-structured which provides enough space for having the participants reveal their beliefs freely. Before each interview I briefly present the topic and introduce myself to let them think about the topic one more time. Interviews took 20-60 minutes. Sessions started with an ice-breaker session. After each interview session, I asked them if they had any further comments or questions

regarding the topic. It was "...an informal, interactive process" and utilized "open-ended comments and questions" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 114).

A flexible approach was employed to let the participant teachers schedule the sessions. I informed them before and let them schedule each of the three sessions. There were 2-to-10-day intervals between the interviews although Seidman (2006) suggests 2-to-5-day intervals. In fact, there were 2-4 days between the first and the second interview. However, there were 8-10 day-intervals between the second and the third interview because the third interview was related to the findings of the second interview. Hence, I had to transcribe the findings of the second interview and to define the patterns of findings. I let the participants prepare their own timetable. The interviews were mostly conducted at the school the teacher worked at. Based on the participants' decision, the interviews were conducted just after school hours in the preschool each teacher working at. All the sessions were audio-recorded by a cell phone and a portable audio recorder.

As stated above, each participant was interviewed three times. All three are discussed below in detail (See Appendix B: Interview Protocols).

First interview

The first part of the three-interview practice was about the participants' life histories in terms of social and moral development. The questions used in this part were prepared in a descriptive manner. In fact, they were broad and starter questions that triggered reconstructing their life experiences up to the moment of the interview. Thus, background demographics were sought during the first interview. It was also used as a conversation starter or small talk to break the conceptual ice between the researcher and the participant. Snowballing was employed as the sampling method. Therefore, before the first interview, data were gathered about the participant and the questions were organized accordingly. For instance, one of the participants was interested in knitting. I did my own research on knitting, and then talked to her about her knitting products. Another interviewee was a motorcycle rider; thus, I told her about my motorcycles and asked her about her riding experiences as a starter. After 5-10 minutes of small talk I started to ask my questions. I tried to be conversational but

I was aware of my role as a researcher; therefore, I did not let the small talk last long in the interviews except for one of them.

Consequently, the aim of the first set of questions was twofold: (1) to help the participants to reconstruct their childhood memories about morality and the rules and the norms of the community they belong to; (2) to break the ice between the researcher and the interviewee.

Second interview

The second interview concentrated on the participant teachers' in-class experiences regarding the phenomenon. The details of their experiences were the main target. The aim of this part was to encourage participant teachers to reconstruct –not remember- (Seidman, 2006) the concrete details of their experiences in the context of social and moral development.

Additionally, this interview was used to describe how participant teachers define and classify children's behaviors and in-class transgressions in light of both their studentship and teaching experiences. I asked the participants to name the behaviors they defined as desired or undesired, or to use whatever name they wanted to name them. Then, I asked them to describe how they had made those classifications.

Third interview

In the third interview, I tried to encourage participant teachers to draw a reflection of their own experiences. During the first two interviews, I tried to support them on their reconstruction of their memories and experiences in the context of social and moral development. Thus, I can say that the third interview was like drawing conclusions while focusing on the participant teachers' understandings of the phenomenon. Indeed, it was used to maintain connection between the past and the present. It functioned as a tool for meaning making and drawing reflections of what they had experienced.

Therefore, the third interview was used to find out how they conceptualized moral and social conventional events and what they believed about children's conceptions regarding the behaviors they named during the second interview. Briefly, the questions were centered around PRESCHOOL teachers' understandings of children's moral and social conventional behaviors.

Generally, I used probes to encourage the participants to talk more. In order to make the questions more encouraging, I had taken suggestions from two experts who were experienced in qualitative research and the social domain theory. Moreover, eight pilot interviews helped me adjust the questions. Sometimes I used different phrases to change the participants' focus and asked them to elaborate on their answers. Further, I tried to observe the participants' body language and facial expressions as well as take notes when they paused or nodded their heads.

3.3 Data Analysis Procedure

Analyzing the data may be the most challenging part of a qualitative research project, especially for an extensive one including three-interview series, because a three-interview series provides extensive amount of data. The data analysis procedure started with the transcription of all the interviews. After the transcription was completed, the written text was read several times to become familiarized with the data. Based on the interview data and the relevant literature, the findings were divided into two different sections: definitions and classification of in-class behaviors and PRESCHOOL teachers' conceptions and their beliefs about children's conceptions. The data analysis procedure followed the suggestions of Moustakas (1994).

1. First of all, all the relevant quotations regarding the defined phenomenon were marked and every relevant expression was listed (horizontalization).
2. Each and every expression was tested to see if it was necessary and sufficient, and if it was possible to be labeled. Expressions that did not meet the criteria were eliminated (reduction).
3. After assignment of the expressions, clusters and themes were built based on the similarity among them and the relevant literature (clustering and thematizing).
4. A final identification of the themes was made by ensuring if they were explicitly expressed within the transcripts and if they were compatible. In other words, a validation check was made in order to ensure if the themes were clean, correct and useful.

5. Individual textural descriptions for each participant was written to construct individual structures.
6. A composite textural description, which is a synthesis of all individual textural and structural descriptions, was written.

The first two interviews were transcribed immediately. Based on the findings of these two procedures, the in-class behaviors of the children as expressed by teachers were categorized. The third interview was created based on these behaviors. During the pilot study, it was realized that using all the behaviors teachers mentioned in the second interview might be overloading; still, there were 25 behaviors mentioned. In the third interview, there were 10 questions for each behavior. Hence, after discussing the issue with the participant teachers in the pilot study and co-coders, I decided to add a question to the second interview asking about the most unaccepted behaviors emerging within participant teachers' classrooms. The ten most unaccepted behaviors listed by the teachers were used in the third interview procedure. It took a week to analyze the data from the first two interviews. Then, based on their findings, the third interview was constructed. The very same procedure defined above (Moustakas, 1994) was also applied for the third interview.

Table 3.2 Characteristics of the behaviors provide a basis for conceptions

Categories	Codes	<i>f</i>	N
Harm	Physical Harm	35	129
	Psychological Harm	94	
Abuse	Fairness	79	151
	Welfare	72	
Social Conventions	Context dependency	124	419
	Authority obedience	162	
	Rule obedience	133	

As a result of the data analysis procedure seven codes were created within three categories which provided a basis for conceptions of social conventional and moral events. The categories were *Harm*, *Abuse* and *Social Conventions*. Harm category

involved the codes of *Physical Harm* and *Psychological Harm*; Abuse involved *Fairness* and *Welfare*; and Social Conventions involved *Context Dependency*, *Authority Obedience* and *Rule Obedience* (See Table 3.2).

3.4 Trustworthiness

In quantitative research, it can be said that ensuring validity and reliability is referred to as trustworthiness. Because the instruments do not provide metrics for defining validity and reliability and, generally, the concept is more obscure, the term ‘trustworthiness’ is used for the process of ensuring that the data in a qualitative study are valid and reliable (Creswell, 2007). In other words, it is a process to support that the research findings “worth paying attention to” (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p.290). Therefore, it is a different process from that in the quantitative (positivist) research. Guba and Lincoln (1981; Lincoln, 1995, p. 277) defines four criteria about ensuring trustworthiness for a qualitative researcher: credibility, transferability, dependability and conformability.

3.3.1 Credibility

Credibility, which is related to internal validity concerns (Guba & Lincoln, 1981), is one of the most essential criteria defined for qualitative research. It is used to make certain if the research methods and researcher’s intentions regarding the phenomenon correspond. The following practices were used to contribute to the credibility of the current study.

First of all, to ensure honesty in participants, the participants were told that they had every right to refuse to answer any question without hesitation and they could withdraw from the study any time without explanation. Additionally, they were asked repetitive questions to ensure greater transparency over data; however, no discrepancies were found within the transcripts. Furthermore, during the process of thematizing, findings from both previous research and the current study were compared to consider if there was consistency between them.

Frequent debriefing sessions were held with an expert on the topic of the study to test my interpretations. Then, the data and my interpretations were tested with the

participant teachers (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). After each transcription was ready, it was sent to the participant teacher to review and check the accuracy of the text. They were asked if their thoughts were revealed accurately and if they had anything else to add. Moreover, they were provided with explanations about how the findings were interpreted based on the theories and the transcriptions. They were given two weeks to review the transcripts. All of the participants were willing to review their transcripts but none of them requested a change.

Finally, triangulation was done through investigator triangulation (Archibald, 2016; Denzin, 1970), which means using multiple researchers during data gathering and interpretation of the data, to increase the credibility of the findings (Archibald, 2016). There were two other researchers who were involved in the transcription of the participants' interviews and in the establishment of clusters (coding). One of the co-coders had a PhD degree in Elementary Education and his research focus was values education. The other co-coder had a PhD degree in Psychological Counselling and Guidance and his research focus was classroom management and undesired behaviors of elementary grade children. In fact, the second coder was a researcher familiar with moral education and the social domain theory and the third coder was familiar with guidance and classroom management in ECE settings.

3.3.2 Transferability

Transferability indicates that the findings of a study can be replicated at other settings or contexts (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Creswell (2007) implies qualitative research findings can be generalizable within a framework of a theory. Likewise, Yin (2009) suggests findings can be generalizable based on theories, not populations. In contrast, van Manen (1997) suggests that findings of a qualitative study, especially those of phenomenology, are context specific that completely rely on individuals; as a result, they are not applicable to other settings and contexts unless their characteristics completely fit. Additionally, according to van Manen (1997), a qualitative study could be considered to be significant without being concerned about generalizability or transferability, if the researcher could get into the 'world' of the participants and their experiences through their stories, understand the meanings beyond the text as

expressed by the participants, and examine deeply in order to undermine the real intentions of the participants. Consequently, the findings of the current study cannot represent all teachers or even PRESCHOOL teachers but readers could find similarities between their experiences and the expressions of the participants of the current study. This could be attributed to the orientation, strength, richness and depth of the findings of the current study (van Manen, 1997) or the framework developed based on previous research on social domain theory (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015).

3.3.3 Dependability

“Dependability corresponds to the reliability criterion of positivism and addresses how the findings and interpretations could be determined to be an outcome of a consistent and dependable process” (Lincoln & Guba, 2013, p.105). Qualitative researchers use dependability to indicate stability of the findings over time and within various contexts and settings (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). To ensure dependability, the inter-rater reliability technique was used. A second and a third coder independently coded the data before each theme and the codes were compared and agreed upon after discussing them.

3.3.4 Confirmability

Confirmability refers to the objectivity of the instruments and the researcher. As mentioned previously in the ‘Researcher’s Role’ section, phenomenological studies are subject to researchers' preconceptions and related experiences (Moustakas, 1994). I was aware of my biases about teachers’ beliefs and social and moral development and I tried hard to “...set aside [my] prejudgments, biases and preconceived ideas” (Moustakas, 1994, p.85). Additionally, I detailed every step of the current study in this chapter to allow readers to be aware of the research procedures.

3.5 Ethical Issues

Before collecting data, the current study was submitted for an independent review by Human Subjects Ethics Committee (HSEC) of Middle East Technical

University and was approved by HSEC (See Appendix C: Human Subjects Ethics Committee Approval). Additionally, ethical standards defined by Creswell (2007) were used, such as using aliases instead of the real names of the participants because of privacy issues, making clear descriptions of the purpose of the study, the researcher's role, participants' role and the methods and the procedures before informed consent. I sought for willingness; hence, I reached 81 PRESCHOOL teachers and 34 of them were involved. Additionally, I sent the transcripts to the participants after each interview session so that they could review them.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The findings of the current study are presented in the following section. As mentioned above, the research questions were as follows:

1. What do Turkish preschool teachers believe about young children's conception of moral and social conventional events?
 - 1.1. How do Turkish preschool teachers define and categorize young children's in-class behaviors?
 - 1.2. How do Turkish preschool teachers distinguish between social conventional and moral events?

Thus, the main focus of this chapter is threefold: (1) to describe Turkish preschool teachers' categorization and definitions of young children's in-class behaviors; (2) to describe Turkish preschool teachers' conception of social conventional and moral events; and (3) to describe what PRESCHOOL teachers believe about children's conception of social conventional and moral events. In the first section, some examples are given of the participant teachers' responses about their categorizations of classroom behaviors. Two categories of classroom behaviors, namely desired (See Table 4.1) and undesired behaviors (See Table 4.2) emerged based on the teachers' definitions. The second section describes teachers' conceptions of classroom behaviors based on the codes and the categories which were generated from the participant teachers' responses. The categories that emerged were similar but not the same as the dimensions used in previous social domain research. The final section defines what teachers believe about children's conceptions of classroom behaviors using the same codes and the categories. We, as three co-coders, have categorized

participant teachers' responses into three categories: harm, abuse, social conventions (See Table 4.4). *Harm* includes two codes, which are physical harm and psychological harm. *Abuse* involves two codes: fairness and welfare. In this category, we decided to include the responses about fairness and justice into the fairness code. The final category is social conventions. This category involves three codes: context dependency, authority obedience and rule obedience. Previous social domain research has been using rule dependency and rule alterability as two distinct dimensions (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015); however, in the current study, we have coded related responses under the code of rule obedience. The following sections will present the findings of the current study.

4.1. Categories of Classroom Behaviors based on Preschool Teachers'

Definitions

The participants of the current study have categorized classroom behaviors of ECE children into two groups: 'Desired Behaviors' and 'Undesired Behaviors or Misbehaviors'. Some of them also defined a third category named 'Acceptable behaviors'; however, this definition is not included in the current study because only two participants mentioned this term and both of them used different terms like normal behavior and acceptable behavior. There was unanimous agreement among the co-coders that this term should not be included into the study. In brief, acceptable behavior is like an intersection set of desired and undesired behaviors. They are "any kind of behavior that neither interrupt the learning process nor promote it (P-17)". In other words, "They are negative behaviors which are the ones that not prevent teacher to teach or positive behaviors that do not promote the learning process anyhow (P-07)."

The current study mainly focused on the misbehaviors, i.e. transgressions, yet both definitions of desired and undesired behaviors were included. As can be seen in Table 4.1, desired behaviors are what is regarded as the most appropriate to the context and the setting. In other words, they are "...desired and approved actions of the

children within the classroom (P-09),” and “...they are to help ensure the continuity of the learning process (P-05).”

Table 4.1: List of desired in-class behaviors

Behavior	Number of responses	The most common behavior	The most unacceptable behavior
Maintaining eye contact	26	0	0
Raising hands before talking	26	0	1
Using manners like, please, thank you, excuse me, sorry	26	0	0
Following directions	24	0	1
Working co-operatively	22	2	1
Participating in activities willingly	18	0	0
Getting in line	18	0	2
Washing hands	14	0	0
Sub-total	174	2	5

Therefore, they are the “DOs of the classroom (P-17)” because “...every child should exhibit his own learning and social environment and behaviors that will not affect the environment of others (P-08).” These behaviors “...neither retard the efficiency of learning and teaching process nor threaten the physical and psychological well-being of the children and teacher (P-21).” Some of the behaviors in this category were defined by the participants as high level prosocial behaviors, which are “shaped by the expectations and the value judgements of the society (P-04).” These are “...the behaviors that will help ensure a regular, peaceful and safe environment for learning (P-01).” Thus, “...they are non-problematic behaviors (P-08)” which “...are approved by the society (P-05).” Correspondingly, the desired behaviors under the opinion of the historical experiences of the teachers could be defined as “...helpful behaviors for teachers to maintain order within the classroom (P-09)” (See Table 4.1).

Table 4.2: List of undesired in-class behaviors

Behavior	Number of responses	The most common behavior	The most unacceptable behavior
Hitting	26	26	26
Inappropriate language	26	6	4
Disrespectful behaviors to others	26	0	1
Damaging a toy or classroom material	24	14	8
Name-calling	24	5	13
Taking others' belongings w/out asking	23	3	8
Eating with fingers	21	5	2
Spitting	21	1	4
Leaving seat w/out permission	20	7	2
Inappropriate dress	18	0	2
Off task	16	0	1
Interrupting others	16	9	1
Not paying attention	14	0	1
Incomplete class work	11	0	0
Chattering	9	0	0
Temper tantrums	4	0	0
Passing gas	3	0	0
Sub-total	302	76	73

On the other hand, undesired behaviors (or misbehaviors) were summarized by teachers as any annoying and disturbing action which threaten the learning process and mental and physical well-being of others within the learning environment. One of the participants defined undesired behavior as “any action that threatens the physical,

psychological and emotional well-being of children themselves and/or other children around them. And, of course, any behavior that would affect learning, teaching and development processes adversely (P-03),” “such as, hitting, swearing, and breaking the toys (P-05).” Similarly, another teacher defined undesired behavior as “...any behavior that threatens safety or affects the learning environment of other children (P-02)” and “...creates an offensive atmosphere involving humiliating, intimidating and hostile actions (P-26).”

As can be seen in Table 4.2, “...an undesired behavior could be anything which is accepted as annoying by the recipient (P-13).” Therefore, participant teachers have considered undesired behaviors as “...a safety-threatening behavior, behavior that prevents self-learning, and behaviors that prevent friends from learning (P-21)”, such as “...actions, speech and/or gestures that could cause other individuals’ suffering or discomfort (P-17).” Hence, they are “...behaviors which are the ones that prevent me (teacher) from teaching (P-07)”.

Consequently, they are “...the DON’Ts of the classroom (P-17).” Sometimes, they are “...children’s actions which are unrelated to the learning process (P-17)” or “...crucial disciplinary problems and adversely affects the learning process (P-03).”

To sum up, the undesired behaviors with respect to the opinion of the interview participants could be categorized as stealing, hitting, spitting, damaging the objects and/or toys in the classroom, leaving the seat without the permission of the teacher, using inappropriate language, calling out to others using offensive names, unsuitable clothing (See Table 4.3 for the full list of classroom behaviors mentioned by the participant teachers).

During the interview, it was observed that most of the teachers believed children learned not only social norms and rules but also moral conduct while interacting with their peers in the classroom environments. The participants signified that the teachers played a significant role in developing the ethical and desired behaviors in the children during their early childhood years. One of the participants defined the role her teachers in terms of her social and moral development. The following quotation is an example depicting her perspective.

I belonged to a strict family in which my parents used to punish me when I didn't listen to them. Consequently, I used to behave opposite at school and used to snatch the toys from other children and did not share any of my books/toys/lunch with any other student. But, I am thankful to my teacher who helped me out with adopting the desirable behavior at school and also informed my parents regarding my undesirable behavior. This helped in cultivating my behaviors (P-17).

The teachers are of the opinion that during interaction with their peers, children learn how to behave in social environments: not touching other students' lunch boxes/toys without their permission, sharing their belongings with their peers during class activities, not sitting on other students' chairs and listening to the teacher's instructions. This promotes children's social and moral development. To illustrate, one of the participants said as follows:

I consider my father as the most caring person in my life, who never got angry at me. But, I got spoilt and used to show my aggressive behavior at school but my teacher helped me to see how wrong my attitude was. I used to open the lunch boxes of my friends and used to push other children and sit on their chair. But, my teacher used to handle such acts carefully and made me realize the consequences of my behaviors (P-09).

Table 4.3: List of all in-class behaviors

Category	Behavior	Number of responses	The most common behavior	The most unacceptable behavior
Desired Behavior	Maintaining eye contact	26	0	0
	Raising hands before talking	26	0	1
	Using polite manners	26	0	0
	Following directions	24	0	1
	Working co-operatively	22	2	1
	Participating willingly	18	0	0
	Getting in line	18	0	2
	Washing hands	14	0	0
Sub-total		174	2	5

Table 4.3. (cont.) List of all in-class behaviors

Category	Behavior	Number of responses	The most common behavior	The most unacceptable behavior
Undesired Behavior	Hitting	26	26	26
	Inappropriate language	26	6	4
	Disrespectful behaviors to others	26	0	1
	Damaging a toy or classroom material	24	14	8
	Name-calling	24	5	13
	Taking others' belongings w/out asking	23	3	8
	Eating with fingers	21	5	2
	Spitting	21	1	4
	Leaving seat w/out permission	20	7	2
	Inappropriate dress	18	0	2
	Off task	16	0	1
	Interrupting others	16	9	1
	Not paying attention	14	0	1
	Incomplete class work	11	0	0
	Chattering	9	0	0
	Temper tantrums	4	0	0
	Passing gas	3	0	0
	Sub-total	302	76	73
Total responses		476	78	78

4.2. Teacher's Conceptions of Social Conventional and Moral Events

In order to describe the participant teachers' conceptions of social conventional and moral behaviors, similar question used in prior research on social domains were asked. The questions were used to define participant teachers' judgements of classroom behaviors based on four dimensions, i.e. generalizability, rule independence, authority independence and rule alterability. Questions about judgments were simple yes/no questions; however, just after these questions I tried to gain more profound insight to understand their justifications by asking why questions and probing into their answers. Using the responses as justifications, seven codes within three categories were created. Table 4.4 illustrates the codes and the categories that were drawn from the framework of the current study, with their frequencies.

Table 4.4 Characteristics of the behaviors provide a basis for conceptions

Categories	Codes	<i>f</i>	N
Harm	Physical Harm	35	129
	Psychological Harm	94	
Abuse	Fairness	79	151
	Welfare	72	
Conventions	Context dependency	124	419
	Authority obedience	162	
	Rule obedience	133	

There were twenty-five behaviors defined by the teachers. In the pilot study, 3 of the participants said it was time-consuming and boring to answer the same questions 25 times. As a result, I decided to ask the teachers to name the three most unacceptable behaviors, and 10 unacceptable behaviors were selected based on the frequencies. The behaviors are listed in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5 The 10 most unaccepted in-class behaviors

Domains	Behaviors	<i>f</i>	N
Moral		55	26
	Hitting	26	
	Name-calling	13	
	Damaging property	8	
	Taking others' belongings without asking	8	
Social Conventional		10	26
	Spitting	4	
	Leaving seat without permission	2	
	Eating with fingers	2	
	Inappropriate clothing	2	
Mixed		4	26
	Not getting in line	2	
	Inappropriate language	2	

Teachers' responses have been evaluated based on the categories. Both judgments and justifications of participant teachers were considered while analyzing the findings. The definitions about moral and social conventional events have previously been provided. However, people are not always able to make a clear distinction between morality and social convention because some events "...are multifaceted and entail overlapping concerns with morality, social conventions, prudence, pragmatics, or personal issues, sometimes in conflict with one another and sometimes in synchrony" (Smetana, 2006, p.123). As a result, this section was organized considering the categorization of social domain research; as seen in Table 4.5, data yielded three types of conceptions about events which were parallel to the social domain approach: (1) moral, (2) social conventional and (3) mixed-domain.

There are three categories created based on teachers' responses. The categories of harm and abuse are related to morality; the third category is related to social conventions and it was named as such. The following section has been organized accordingly.

4.2.1. Moral domain

Social domain researchers have clearly defined what moral domain consists of. The focus of moral domain is considered as contextualization of harm, justice, rights

and fairness in actions. Morality is accepted as a global phenomenon irrespective of cultural influences. Similarly, the participants of the current study have focused on harm (N=78) and abuse (N=90) for some events while ignoring the influence of social conventions (N=47). Based on the responses of the participant teachers, four behaviors were defined as moral: Hitting, damaging property, taking others' belongings and name-calling. Table 4.6 illustrates the frequency of codes mentioned during the interview sessions.

Table 4.6 Participant teachers' conceptions of moral events

Categories	Behaviors	Codes			<i>f</i>	<i>N</i>
Harm		Physical Harm	Psychological Harm			78
	Hitting	26	11		37	
	Damaging property	0	0		0	
	Taking others' belongings	0	18		18	
	Name-calling	0	23		23	
Abuse		Fairness	Welfare			90
	Hitting	1	11		12	
	Damaging property	14	14		28	
	Taking others' belongings	14	0		14	
	Name-calling	18	18		36	
Social conventions		Context	Authority	Rule		47
	Hitting	2	1	2	5	
	Damaging property	5	7	8	20	
	Taking others' belongings	8	3	7	18	
	Name-calling	1	1	2	4	

Detailed explanations are given respectively below for moral behaviors.

4.2.1.1. Hitting

As can be seen in Table 4.6, physical harm emerges as the most frequently mentioned response among teachers' responses. All twenty-six teachers reported that hitting includes physical harm. It is seen that it also includes psychological harm (N=11). Additionally, 11 teachers stated that hitting is a threat to the welfare of people. Below are some quotations from the interviews:

It is an abuse, both physical and emotional (P-09).

It could cause serious injuries (P-18).

It hurts the victim's self-confidence and friendship between the victim and the violent children (P-07).

Hitting injures the welfare of the community. People get hostile to each other (P-17).

Children could develop a feeling that stronger ones can hit weaker ones (P-01).

As manifested in the quotations, participants pointed out that hitting includes harm and could hurt children not only physically but also psychologically. It is also a threat to the welfare of the society. Moreover, it is mentioned that it could encourage children to use anger to solve social problems which cripple the healthy environment of the classroom. However, not all the participant teachers provided detailed explanations for this question. Some others mentioned that it was just not acceptable to hit others and each participant mentioned that hitting was wrong.

Furthermore, teachers reported the social conventional aspect of hitting. They stated that there is a rule against hitting and it could be generalizable to another context:

A harmful behavior is always bad regardless of where it happens (P-24).

We can harm people neither in school nor outside school (P-01).

Similar to the context dependency, almost all participants find hitting as an unacceptable behavior. Some answers of the participants are listed below:

An action is wrong if it involves violence. There's no need for be someone around us to tell it is wrong (P-09).

Hitting people is bad. It's bad even if there is no-one checking us (P-01).

Teachers' responses were also examined by asking about acceptability of a behavior considering its rule dependency. Again, teachers reported that not having a

rule or changing the rule does not make hitting an acceptable act. Some quotations from participants' answers are presented below:

Although people hit each other from time to time, they are aware that violence is not okay and we don't tolerate violent behaviors (P-02).

I think it is engraved in our DNA. We all know hitting, like other violent behaviors, is wrong. I mean whether there is a rule or not, we know it is wrong. It is universal (P-08).

In my opinion, there is this rule because human kind has an intrinsic motivation to survive. So, I believe this rule derived from survival needs. This rule could not be changed (P-11).

However, there were two teachers who mentioned that hitting could be acceptable in some kind of circumstances like martial arts. They added that in martial arts there would be a rule to hit the opponent. The quotations of these teachers can be seen below:

Hitting each other in some kind of sports is a rule, like boxing. I think it is against the rule that a boxer does not hit his opponent. This boxer would probably be disqualified. So, in certain circumstances there can be a rule to hit (P-06).

In martial arts, you can hit each other (P-15).

4.2.1.2. Breaking toys/classroom materials

Again, all the teachers said damaging school property is unacceptable. Teachers' responses showed that they consider damaging property as a behavior that is a threat to fairness (N=14) and the welfare of the people (N=14). There are some examples listed below:

All the materials inside the classroom belongs to all the children. They all have rights to use them. When somebody damages classroom materials, no one else can use it anymore (P-19).

If children break classroom material none of them use it anymore. Likewise, damaging goods outside school affects

our daily life. For example, if someone damages a bus, we cannot get where we want to be (P-08).

Children know that if they break a toy, they can no longer play with that toy (P-06).

Teachers did not mention anything about harm; however, some of their responses included the argument that damaging property was an act of violence. For example, one of the participants said,

The nature of the behavior is more important than where it happens. Damaging public property is a harmful behavior (P-18).

But she did not say how harmful it was. There were some examples similar to this one, but they could not be coded under harm category since with my co-coders, we could not decide whether to code these as physical or psychological.

Similar to hitting, the conception of damaging property is regarded as free from social conventional influences. When teachers were asked about the social conventional aspect of behavior, teachers mostly said it is neither an acceptable behavior nor dependent on social norms, rules or standards. They said there was no need for an applicable rule (N=8) to prevent people from damaging public property or an authority (N=7) figure to forbid them from doing the act. Additionally, almost all of them said it was an unacceptable behavior in any circumstance (N=5). Some of the examples can be seen below:

The only authority for me to do the right thing is an individual's inner conscience (P-08).

Normal people do not need any authority around to prevent them from acting bad behaviors, like damaging public property (P-11).

Damaging property is not right regardless of a rule that prevents people from doing the act. These properties belong to the public (P-16).

Some goods belong to the society. They are for everyone. No one has the right to damage public property no matter where it happens (P-26).

4.2.1.3. Taking others' belongings

Participant teachers did not mention anything about physical harm; however, 18 of them stated that taking others' belongings without asking was psychologically harmful. Some examples are below:

We cannot take others' belongings without asking. This causes them to feel sorry (P-11).

It makes the owner upset and even angry (P-14).

...because I would not want to live in such a world where stealing is okay (P-09).

Imagine a world where everybody gets what they want when they want without asking for the permission of the owners. It would be a chaotic world. No one wants to live in such a world (P-08).

They added that taking others' belongings was also a threat to justice and fairness among the children in the classroom.

There is justice, and stealing is against justice. We have to respect others' rights (P-22).

Others' belongings, as it is mentioned in the phrase, belongs to others. I am not sure if there is a life scenario without a rule about this act (P-08).

It would not be acceptable to encourage people to take what does not belong to them. Don't you think it is an abuse of personal rights? (P-05).

Like hitting and damaging property, teachers reported that social conventions had no influence on their conceptions of the behavior as the following examples illustrate:

If you asked me if people stole [things] when others were around, I would say yes. But if you asked me if it were wrong, yes, it is wrong. It is always wrong (P-04).

I cannot imagine that. In every classroom, there are some materials that every child has the right to use anytime, and also there are some materials that children are required to have permission for before using them (P-19).

It is not about where the behavior takes place; it is about the behavior itself (P-20).

You shall steal. Say it loudly. You can see how ridiculous it is (P-18).

4.2.1.4. Name-calling

It is revealed that name-calling is accepted as a psychologically harmful behavior by almost all the teachers, yet they did not mention anything about physical harm. Some of the quotations can be seen below:

It is a kind of bullying (P-16).

It makes people upset (P-10; P-13; P23).

People are emotionally hurt by name-calling (P-06).

We should not hurt people's feelings (P-03).

Still, two of the teachers stated that name-calling is not a harmful behavior. They said:

It is harmless (P-02).

Children might use some sort of nicknames to call their friends. Mostly, it is just a joke. No big deal (P-01).

Teachers' responses showed that they considered name-calling not only against fairness and justice, but also a threat to the welfare of other people. Some quotations are as follows:

It is unfair to allow children to tease each other. They would be upset if name calling was a common act in the classroom. They would hate each other (P-25).

It is about getting along with other people. People do not need an authority to understand name-calling is bad (P-19).

Rules are for our welfare. If changing a rule is a threat to the welfare of other children, you cannot make that change (P-18).

Similar to other behaviors within the moral domain, teachers also regard name calling as free from social conventional influences, as illustrated in the following quotations:

It is bad in any context because it is humiliating (P-08).

It is unacceptable for children to tease their friends. It is not about the context (P-26).

Bad behavior is always bad. It is not possible for a bad behavior in school to be called good behavior outside (P-12).

People do not let others tease them. The authority here might be the person who is teased (P-18).

4.2.2. Social conventional domain

Social conventions, as mentioned by social domain researchers, are social norms, standards and rules to set boundaries for the behaviors of individuals within a cultural context. In the current study, participant teachers seemed to consider some behaviors related to social conventional influences (N=278). For these particular behaviors, participants said nothing or very little about harm (N=1) and abuse (N=22).

Four behaviors were defined by researchers as social conventional events. As previously mentioned, the categorization has been made based on the teachers' social conventional and moral conceptions about selected behaviors. The social conventional behaviors are, spitting, leaving seat without permission, eating with fingers and inappropriate clothing. In Table 4.7, teachers' conceptions about behaviors are listed, based on the codes created by the researchers.

Table 4.7 Participant teachers' conceptions of social conventional events

Categories	Behaviors	Codes		<i>f</i>	<i>N</i>
Harm		Physical Harm	Psychological Harm		3
	Spitting	2	0	2	
	Leaving seat	0	0	0	
	Eating w/ fingers	0	1	1	
	Inappropriate clothing	0	0	0	
Abuse		Fairness	Welfare		30
	Spitting	0	17	17	
	Leaving seat	0	3	3	
	Eating w/ fingers	0	6	6	
	Inappropriate clothing	0	4	4	
Social Conventions		Context	Authority	Rule	247
	Spitting	3	3	23	29
	Leaving seat	22	24	26	72
	Eating w/ fingers	26	22	26	74
	Inappropriate clothing	26	22	24	72

4.2.2.1. Spitting

All of the teachers said that spitting is an unacceptable behavior for them. However, only a few of them defined it as a threat to fairness and justice or welfare of people (N=17). Some of the quotations are given below:

It is unhealthy. Spitting spreads contagious diseases (P-08).

It is not healthy. It threatens people's health (P-15).

It is disgusting. There are germs in the saliva (P-12).

Only two of the participants said it caused physical harm to the people around.

Some people spit in the face of others. This is disgusting (P-06).

On the other hand, they said existence of a rule (N=23) influences their conception about spitting. They said:

It is related to culture. In China, for example, it is bad to swallow their saliva (P-03).

If it is an acceptable behavior culturally, it is okay (P-07).

No problem if people think it is a normal behavior. But still I do not let my children spit inside my classroom (P-08).

There might be a rule saying you shall not swallow your saliva. Then you should spit when you need in order to prevent yourself from getting ashamed (P-23).

4.2.2.2. Leaving seat without permission

19 participant teachers responded to the question “Is it acceptable for children to leave their seat without permission?” negatively. The teachers indicated that the behavior was not acceptable; however, none of them mentioned about harmful consequences of the behavior and only three of them highlighted that it was a threat to the welfare of other children because the behavior was disruptive and time-consuming for teachers. Some quotations are as follows:

It is related to the order. To maintain order, they need to be where they should be (P-04).

The children walking around mostly want to be the center of attention. This is a problem. I have other children to take care of and teach. I cannot spend all my time on one child. We have an order in our classroom and I want to keep that order (P-09).

Children are allowed to leave their seats to drink water or to use the bathroom. Other than that they need to sit down. No one wants chaos in the classroom (P-08).

Children walking around are disrupting the class order (P-04; P-07; P-10; P-11; P-12; P-15; P-17; P-21).

Additionally, they pointed out that although a behavior was undesired, there would not be a universal rule against the act since the behavior could be acceptable in some circumstances (N=22) and the acceptability of the behavior relied on the existence of an authority (N=24) or a rule (N=26).

It is not a saying from God (P-25).

It is just a school rule (P-06).

In class I need that rule because mostly I cannot control children if they stroll around. But if I did not need that rule, it would be okay (P-08).

In class, strolling around may disrupt the learning process but I do not think that it is a general rule for all human kind (P-26).

In the theatre or cinema, we mostly sit. It would be awkward if we strolled around. If there were no rule we could move as we wanted (P-17).

4.2.2.3. *Eating with fingers*

Similar to other social conventional acts, in terms of eating with fingers, participant teachers said nothing or very little about harm and/or abuse. They added nothing about physical harm and only one of them said it was psychologically harmful. Participant 11 said that the following:

I hate those people. I feel nauseous when I see people eat with fingers. I think it is disgusting. In my opinion, hands are never clean enough to lick. Would you eat with your feet after you clean them? (P-11).

Again, they said nothing about fairness and justice and very little about welfare (N=6). Some examples are as follows:

It is not healthy (P-06; P-15).

It is against table manners (P-20).

The participant teachers indicated the social conventional aspect of the event in their responses. All of them highlighted that the acceptance of this behavior relied on the context (n=26), and the existence of authority (n=22) and rule (n=26). Some examples can be seen below:

It is related to culture. People in the Middle East and Africa eat with fingers. It is a custom for them. I cannot blame them for that. It is normal (P-08).

These kinds of behaviors are personal. Imagine if we had a rule saying people shall use spoon and fork. Do you think some police would come down to your home and take you into custody because you eat with fingers? (P-12)

If it is culturally acceptable, you can do it (P-21).

For children, eating with fingers is okay all the time. Even in a good restaurant they can use their fingers (P-08).

4.2.2.4. Inappropriate clothing

Another behavior categorized as social conventional is inappropriate clothing. Data analysis has shown akin findings to those of other social conventional behaviors. Participant teachers did not mention anything about physical and psychological harm. They said nothing about fairness and justice, either. Only four of them talked about welfare of people. They said:

Schools have dress codes, although they are not written most of the time. Parents should not break those rules. For example, children should not wear pjamas at school other than nap time. In addition, parents should not take their children to school with dirty clothes. That is harmful for children's self-confidence (P-04).

...one of my students wanted to wear shorts in winter and their parents allowed him. Then she got pneumonia. I don't want them to get sick. Another example might be from a summer class. One of my students came to class with a winter coat. She didn't want to take it off because her father didn't allow him to do so. Then she sweated a lot and luckily. I could make her take it off. But if she hadn't, she would probably have gotten sick (P-08).

This is a preschool and we work with young children. Their clothes should let them move freely. Some mothers love to dress their kids as they are models. Once, a child came to school walking in high heels. This is not acceptable (P-07).

There are people around us who rape children. There are bad people. There are perverts. So appropriate dressing is important. I get goose bumps when I think about those evil-minded people (P-26).

Most of the participants thought inappropriate clothing related to social conventional influences. They said it was context dependent (n=26) and the acceptability of the behavior relied on the existence of the rule (n=24) or attitude of the authority (n=22). Below are some quotations from participants' responses.

I think inappropriate clothing for adults and for children are different. For children it is more about the context and setting (P-08).

Authority is important for the maintenance of the rules but not all the rules have the same importance. Some rules are flexible. This one is a rule of that kind (P-16).

When there is no rule about it, what you wear is totally acceptable. Even pjamas (P-11).

...it is personal and you can wear everything (P-12).

4.2.3. Mixed domain events

As Turiel (2015) and Smetana (2006) mention, sometimes it is undoubtedly not applicable to distinguish between moral and social conventional components of an event. Indeed, some events have both moral and social conventional characteristics. Smetana (2006) asserts that although people realize the moral concepts in an event, they may place more importance on other concerns than morality, such as law. The following section includes those events, which are named mixed domain events or multifaceted events. Table 4.8 illustrates the characteristics of the events. As seen, there are two behaviors included within mixed domain events. The common characteristics of these two behaviors are that the participants considered them as

moral because they mentioned the harmful and abusive nature of those behaviors. However, they also mentioned that the acceptability of the behaviors might be dependent on the context and setting and/or the existence of rules.

Table 4.8 Participant teachers' conceptions of mixed domain events

Categories	Behaviors	Codes			<i>f</i>	<i>N</i>
Harm		Physical Harm	Psychological Harm			35
	Not getting in line	0	16		14	
	Inappropriate language	0	19		19	
Abuse		Fairness	Welfare			55
	Not getting in line	20	11		31	
	Inappropriate language	7	17		24	
Social Conventional		Context	Authority	Rule		72
	Not getting in line	14	16	13	43	
	Inappropriate language	2	18	9	29	

4.2.3.1. Not getting in line

The participant teachers have defined getting in line as a desired behavior during the interviews. It was the only desired behavior that emerged in the data analysis process because the teachers named its transgression as one of the most unaccepted behaviors inside their classroom.

Not getting in line was categorized under mixed domain events because teachers' responses involved both moral and social conventional concepts in a balanced way. They said it caused psychological harm (N=16) while being a threat to fairness and justice (N=20) and welfare of people (N=11).

Not getting in line is a kind of bullying (P-16).

It is hijacking. No one allows other people to invade their rights (P-12).

...when I consider it from the perspective of children, it is not okay because it is about justice (P-08).

I have two answers for this question. For some activities, like moving between classrooms, it is okay. However, for waiting in line to get something, it is not okay. It is about fairness (P-23).

Getting in line is about protecting the rights of other people. We may also need someone to protect our rights sometimes. It is about being just (P-16).

Children are not safe when they do not walk in line. It is hard to see every child. They may slip, they may hit each other, and they may interrupt other classes (P-04).

As previously mentioned, teachers' responses involve both moral and social conventional concepts in a balanced way. Most of the teachers indicated that the existence of an authority (N=16) or rule (N=13) impact their conception of the behavior. Additionally, fourteen teachers added context was another important factor for their conception. Below, some of the quotations from their responses are portrayed:

In kindergarten, teachers distribute things, so children do not need to get in line other than moving from one place to another. So, getting in line is not the same for children as what we understand it to be (P-26).

Walking in line helps me maintain order. I can control every child and adjust their speed. It is also the easiest way to keep them silent. So when they don't walk in line, I lose my control on children. But still it depends on the teacher (P-07).

I cannot define walking in line as right or wrong because it is a method for teachers to have children move from place to place. I don't use this method. I let children move as they want (P-25).

When I consider getting in line from teachers' perspective it is not a problem when there is not a rule (P-08).

4.2.3.2. Inappropriate language

Inappropriate language or profanity is one of the most unaccepted behaviors listed by teachers. Data analysis revealed that teachers had different perspectives about inappropriate language. Some of them said although it was an unaccepted behavior, most of the children were not aware of the inappropriateness of the words they used. Some teachers said:

In most cases children have no idea what they are saying. They don't know why a word is considered wrong. They don't even know a word is wrong (P-01).

Children are not aware of the meaning of the words they use; however, they are well aware that they use these words to express their negative feelings like anger (P-08).

Indeed, data analysis has shown that teachers tend to mention the harmful psychological outcomes of the behavior (N=19).

It is a kind of bullying. It includes violence (P-16).

Some children are more prone to get upset when somebody says bad things to them. Swearing threatens the psychological well-being of children (P-13).

It triggers violence in the classroom. I believe swearing makes people angrier; both the perpetrator and the victim (P-06).

Swearing involves violence. Violence does not need to be physical. It hurts people also. It hurts their feelings (P-08).

They also expressed fairness (N=7) and welfare (N=17) concerns.

Children learn that if you are having issues you could solve it aggressively (P-26).

If children's aggressive behavior is reinforced, it will probably be the first choice in other interactions with the people around them (P-02).

Similar to not getting in line, inappropriate language was considered by participant teachers as subject to social conventional influences. They said that the existence of

an authority might influence their conceptions about the acceptability of the behavior (N=18).

Harming people is bad. However, if a teacher does not care about profanity, probably it becomes acceptable in that class (P-04).

If the teachers or parents fail to respond to the use of inappropriate language, it becomes acceptable (P-08).

If parents swear in front of their children, children think it is normal to swear (P-17).

4.3. Teachers' Beliefs about Children's Social and Moral Judgment

After assessing teachers' conceptions about children's in-class behaviors, children's conceptions of social and moral events were also inspected from the perspective of the participant teachers. This part of the chapter is organized based on the participant teachers' responses about given behaviors. Each behavior has been defined in terms of the dimensions of social domain theory. Based on the justifications of the teachers for their beliefs about children's social and moral judgments, eight codes were defined within three categories. The first category is *Harm*, in which physical and psychological harmful features of an event are mentioned. The second category is *Abuse*. This category seems different from prior social domain research; however, this category was created after a series of discussions among the researchers of the present study. The category of *Abuse* was used to group events that threatened the fairness, justice and welfare of people. Fairness and justice were represented by a single code of *fairness*; the other code was *welfare*. The third and the last code was social conventions. According to the participant teachers, there were three social conventional factors that influenced children's social and moral judgments: Context, authority influence and rule existence (See Table 4.9).

This section is organized based on teachers' conceptions of moral and social conventional events in spite of the differences among the findings of the previous section. In the current section, social conventional and mixed domain events

demonstrate similar findings; however, for moral events some of the participant teachers believed children's conceptions of moral events were different from theirs.

Table 4.9 Participant teachers' beliefs about children's conception

Behaviors		Codes		<i>f</i> <i>N</i>	
Cat.		Physical Harm	Psychological Harm	109	
Harm	Hitting	26	14	40	
	Damaging	0	0	0	
	Taking others'	0	17	17	
	Spitting	0	0	0	
	Not getting in	0	14	14	
	Leaving seat	0	0	0	
	Inapp. language	0	18	18	
	Name-calling	1	18	19	
	Eating w/ fingers	0	1	1	
	Inapp. clothing	0	0	0	
		Fairness	Welfare	151	
Abuse	Hitting	8	9	17	
	Damaging	20	24	44	
	Taking others'	17	3	20	
	Spitting	0	9	9	
	Not getting in	14	2	16	
	Leaving seat	0	3	3	
	Inapp. language	8	5	13	
	Name-calling	12	7	19	
	Eating w/ fingers	0	6	6	
	Inapp. clothing	0	4	4	
		Context	Authority	Rule	466
Social Conventional	Hitting	4	12	12	21
	Damaging	4	11	13	28
	Taking others'	8	13	5	26
	Spitting	20	21	21	62
	Not getting in	14	26	23	63
	Leaving seat	26	26	26	78
	Inapp. language	2	18	5	25
	Name-calling	3	12	3	3
	Eating w/ fingers	26	26	26	78
	Inapp. clothing	19	22	19	60

4.3.1. Moral events

After teachers finished talking about their conceptions, they were asked about their beliefs as regards children's moral and social conventional conceptions. For social conventional and mixed domain events, it could be said that they expressed similar thoughts. As for moral events, however, there were some differences among their conceptions and beliefs regarding children's conceptions. With respect to the harm and abuse categories, they again mentioned the same things with similar frequencies. Surprisingly, they emphasized the influence of authority on children's conceptions. To illustrate the related findings, see Table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10 Teachers' beliefs about children's conceptions of moral events

Cat.	Behaviors	Codes		<i>f</i>	<i>N</i>
		Physical Harm	Psychological Harm		76
Harm	Hitting	26	14	40	
	Damaging property	0	0	0	
	Taking others' belongings	0	17	17	
	Name-calling	1	18	19	
		Fairness	Welfare		100
Abuse	Hitting	8	9	17	
	Damaging property	20	24	44	
	Taking others' belongings	17	3	20	
	Name-calling	12	7	19	
		Context	Authority	Rule	98
Social Conventional	Hitting	4	12	12	21
	Damaging property	4	11	13	28
	Taking others' belongings	8	13	5	26
	Name-calling	3	12	3	16

Behaviors in the moral domain are explained below with related examples.

4.3.1.1. Hitting

Teachers had a particular belief about children's conceptions of hitting. They thought it was wrong and children knew there was a rule against the act (n=26). Like their own conceptions, teachers said children were aware that hitting was harmful and abusive. They said it included both physical harm (N=26) and psychological harm (N=14).

Children know hitting could cause an injury (P-26).

When someone hits them, they get upset (P-05).

Teachers also mentioned that children thought that it was against fairness (N=8) and a threat to their welfare (N=9).

Children do not accept hitting in any case. It does not matter if there is a rule that forbids them from hitting or the teacher lets them hit. They do not feel safe and comfortable in such a class (P-09).

Children know using violence to solve a problem is unfair. They are very sensitive to hitting. They tune up if they are hit or they witness a child hitting another (P-17).

Twenty-two participant teachers believed children's conceptions were context independent while 4 of them believed that children might think it was acceptable when they were teased or hit by another child or in some particular circumstances like martial sports.

You have to hit each other in martial arts. In this case hitting each other is normal. Sportsmen are expected to hit each other in boxing and no one judges them because they hit each other. Some of the children practice martial arts. These children know hitting is okay in some particular circumstances (P-03).

If children are provoked by others, they think it is okay to hit to make them stop (P-16).

Almost half of the participant teachers believed children's conceptions about hitting were rule dependent (N=12). They also suggested that children's conceptions

of hitting could be different if there were a rule that demanded hitting. Furthermore, they said according to children, hitting could be acceptable if an authority figure like teachers or parents let them hit each other (n=12). Some examples of the participant teachers' statements are as follows:

Children are aware of how bad harmful behaviors are. They know the behavior itself is wrong. However, some parents tend to encourage their children to solve a violence issue by violence. Those children might think if someone taunts or hits them they have a right to do the same (P-08).

Children tend to accept and follow orders of their teachers. So, if I told them that I wanted them to hit each other in particular circumstances, they would obey (P-02).

Although children know hitting is a misbehavior, they think they have all the rights to hit others if they are hit (P-01).

4.3.1.2. Breaking toys/classroom materials

Almost all of the teachers were of the opinion that children knew there was a rule against damaging classroom property (n=24). Furthermore, in spite of telling nothing about harm, they added it was against fairness (N=20) and welfare abuse (N=24). Some illustrative quotations are as follows:

When children experience similar attitudes from their friends, they realize the consequences of their behaviors. They realize it is unjust to play carelessly (P-06).

Children know classroom materials are there for all of us. They know it is against equality of all children to play with a toy (P-13).

Damaging property prevents children's right to play with a material. When they want to play with a toy and they see it broken, they realize the importance of protecting classroom property (P-08).

Children know that some materials are for public use. They also know they should use these things carefully because everyone has the right to use them (P-25).

For social conventions, most of them thought it was not acceptable in any circumstances (n=22). However, 11 teachers said existence and/or attitude of the authority may influence children's conception.

If a teacher or parent allows children's rough play, they think it is acceptable (P-12).

Children are aware of the nature of the behavior. If they consider that an adult accepts their violent acts as game or accident, they do not care about the inappropriateness of a behavior. So, it is not a problem for them anymore (P-04).

If adults encourage children to hit public property, they think it is not a problem to damage property (P-11).

Additionally, 13 teachers said existence of a rule influences children's conceptions of damaging property, which is categorized as a moral event. To illustrate, below are some quotations from teachers' statements regarding children's conceptions.

If there is not a rule about this behavior, children play irresponsibly. They do not care if any material is broken or not during their play (P-24).

Children need a rule to help them behave. If there is not an applicable rule to prevent them from playing roughly, they might destroy the building (P-20).

If I change the rule and let them play as they want without limits, they not only break things but also injure themselves (P-03).

4.3.1.3. Taking others' belongings without asking

As can be seen in Table 4.10, data analysis shows similar results for harm and abuse. They stated that the behavior included psychological harm (n=17) but they did not mention anything about physical harm. Fairness concept was also mentioned by most of the participant teachers (n=17).

It is not stealing, still the owner gets upset (P-02).

There are two sides of this behavior. The perpetrator is not stealing but the victim still feels sorry. Children has a perfect sense of justice. I think they find it wrong but they cannot stop themselves from taking what they want. Their willpower has not developed yet (P-08).

When they see a toy, they want more than they can hold; they want to have it. There is nothing wrong with that from the perspective of children. Although the owner gets upset, it could be used as a tool to introduce them the joy of sharing (P-17).

However, half of the teachers believed authority influenced (n=13) children's conceptions about this behavior. Likewise, eight teachers talked about rule obedience. These teachers considered that children thought it was acceptable if the rule said children could take anything within the classroom without asking or the rules did not forbid them from acting in that manner. Some of the participant teachers' answers are illustrated below:

I have told my children that they have to share the toys they bring from home on toy day. So, they learn to share. They do not complain about their friends when others take the toy without asking. They just wait for them to bring the toy back (P-08).

If I allowed them to take anything they wanted, they would feel free to take it. It is about the rule. If there is not a rule to forbid them, they see it as sharing, nothing else (P-22).

That might be very bad in the adult world; however, it is very normal in my class. Of course, I do not encourage them to act in this manner. But they are children and they want to take a look at others' toys. When they are done with that thing, they bring it back to the owner (P-13).

Actually, children act as there were not a rule about the behavior. So if there is not a rule they think it is okay (P-06).

4.3.1.4. *Name-calling*

For name-calling or teasing teachers stated that children were aware there was a rule against name-calling (n=18). One of the teachers stated it is not different from being hit, saying “Children do not feel different when they are called a name from being hit” (P-13). Additionally, most of the teachers said it had harmful psychological outcomes (n=18). Some examples are listed below:

It hurts children’s feelings. They do not like others calling them names they do not like (P-12).

They know it is harmful. It harms children psychologically. It is a kind of bullying. Children are aware how bad it is to call others by a name they do not like, regardless of context. Still, they tease their friends by name-calling (P-08).

Sometimes it is just a joke. But still they know it is bad (P-06).

Some teachers are not aware how upsetting name-calling is (P-13).

Children know it is bad because when someone is called by a name, other children try to stop the perpetrator (P-19).

I believe children have a rule against name-calling in their hearts. Wherever it happens, it is bad for them. It does not matter if there is a rule or not (P-16).

Teachers also said that, considering name-calling, children found it unfair to be called by names they do not like (n=12).

For children, name-calling is humiliating. They find it unfair to be called by names by bullies (P-11).

Children know how unfair it is to tease others because of the way they look or talk (P-01).

Children do not feel safe in such a place. One of my children once said to me that school was not a fair place for her because of bad children (P-23).

As revealed in the quotations above, in the social domain framework, teachers believed that children conceptualized name-calling as a moral event. However, they also thought that children's conceptions of name-calling was subject to change in accordance with the existence of an authority figure (n=12).

Some teachers do not care about name-calling within their classrooms. The bullies in their classrooms do not get censured. In my opinion, those children do not accept name-calling as bad. They think if you are strong enough you can say anything (P-04).

If adults let children call their friends by names, children never understand its inappropriateness (P-13).

It is like profanity. If children's parents have the tendency to call people by names, children think it is not a problem, for sure (P-23).

4.3.2. Social conventional

As previously mentioned, the previous categorization has been used to analyze the data about teachers' beliefs regarding children's conceptions of moral and social conventional events. As in the previous part, spitting, leaving seat without permission, eating with fingers and inappropriate clothing are examined within the social conventional domain. Findings were similar. Teachers believed that children's conceptions of these events were prone to be influenced by conventions. Table 4.11 displays their responses. As can be seen in the table, they said nothing or very little about harm and abuse, while emphasizing social conventions.

4.3.1.5. Spitting

Spitting is another behavior within the social conventional domain. Like teachers' own conceptions, their beliefs about children's conceptions created a few quotations about harm and abuse. Five teachers said spitting had outcomes of physical harm and nine teachers said it was a threat to the welfare of people. Below are some examples:

Children can spit into the face of each other when they are angry (P-07).

There are two types of spitting. The first one is for fun or for sensory experiences. The second one is for taking revenge or humiliating others (P-08).

Table 4.11 Teachers' beliefs about children's conceptions of social conventional events

Cat.	Behaviors	Codes		<i>f</i>	<i>N</i>
		Physical Harm	Psychological Harm	6	
Harm	Spitting	5	0	5	
	Leaving seat	0	0	0	
	Eating w/ fingers	0	1	1	
	Inappropriate clothing	0	0	0	
		Fairness	Welfare	22	
Abuse	Spitting	0	9	9	
	Leaving seat	0	3	3	
	Eating w/ fingers	0	6	6	
	Inappropriate clothing	0	4	4	
		Context	Authority	Rule	278
Social Conventional	Spitting	20	21	21	62
	Leaving seat	26	26	26	78
	Eating w/ fingers	26	26	26	78
	Inappropriate clothing	19	22	19	60

Teachers believed that according to children, there was not a rule against spitting (n=26). They added that if there had been a rule against spitting, the rule would have been subject to change according to context and setting (n=20).

I had a Chinese child once. When she needed to spit, she always said she needed to spit and she went to the sink to spit (P-03).

Children think they can spit outside (P-10).

They also considered spitting was not an undesired behavior if there was not a rule against the act (n=21) and it would be a desired behavior if there were a rule that demanded people to spit when they needed to do so.

Children would obey if there were a rule against spitting. However, if there is no rule or cultural influences encouraging you to spit, children see it acceptable (P-04).

There could be a rule. But that rule probably has some extensions that define where to spit (P-22).

There could be a rule that ban people from spitting onto streets or the floor but a rule that banning people from spitting would not be applicable (P-26).

Finally, most of the teachers believed it is an authority independent behavior (n=21). Some quotations from interviews can be seen below:

Most of the adults do not accept it as a bad behavior. Children around them see what adults do and take it as normal (P-26).

If the class set a rule that banned children from spitting, they would not spit (P-11).

If it is common in a society like ours, children think it is normal (P-17).

4.3.2.1. Leaving seat without asking

Data analysis has shown similar results for the behavior of ‘leaving seat without asking’ with other social conventional behaviors. None of the participant teachers mentioned about harm and only a few of them talked about abuse (n=3). Participants said children considered leaving seat without permission as an acceptable behavior (n=20). All of them believed that children did not judge the behavior as an unacceptable one in any circumstance. They added that according to children it was okay to stroll around if there were no applicable rule against it or the rule were rewritten to employ a demanding discourse (n=26). Similarly, it was okay for children if the authority allowed them to do the act (n=26). Some illustrative quotations are listed below:

Children find it ridiculous to sit still when there is not a rule to force them to do so (P-15).

Actually, they think it is okay even when there is a rule against strolling around the class but the rule limits their behaviors (P-23).

I let them move freely. I think if I forbid them they would obey without accepting (P-16).

4.3.2.2. Eating with Fingers

Again, one of the social conventional behaviors, eating with fingers, was explained by teachers by mentioning very little about harm (n=1) and abuse (n=6). However, most of the participant teachers stated that children did not think there was a rule against eating with fingers (n=20).

All teachers believed that if there were a rule, children would follow it; when there is no rule, children do whatever they want (n=26). Furthermore, they stated that if it was allowed by the authority, it was not wrong for children to eat with fingers (n=26). Below are some examples from teachers' responses:

It is all about rules. If there is a rule about using the spoon, they follow it. If there is a rule against using the spoon they follow it too (P-19).

I think it is the same for every context and setting. It is normal for children to use their hands but they also know they should use the spoon and fork in a restaurant (P-05).

In a restaurant, adults generally use the fork and spoon; however, if their mothers allow them not to do so, children do not use them. And they know it is acceptable for them (P-11).

4.3.2.3. Inappropriate clothing

From the perspectives of the participant teachers, children knew inappropriate clothing in school was not acceptable (n=20); however, teachers said nothing or very little about harm and abuse. Teachers said children thought that it was a rule dependent behavior (n=22) and if the rule changed, children saw it acceptable. Similarly, if the authority allowed children to wear inappropriate clothes, it was okay for children to wear anything they wanted (n=19). Some of the participant teachers' answers are given below:

Children want to wear whatever they want. They also know school has a dress code and they follow the rule most of the time (P-04).

If I let them, they wear everything. They would come to school wearing pjamas (P-11).

It is all about rules and how we apply the rules within our schools. For children, if there is a dress code, they know it is not acceptable to test the boundaries of the school. However, if there is not an applicable dress-code they know any dress is acceptable (P-08).

4.3.3. Mixed domain events

With respect to the mixed domain events, data analysis has yielded similar results. Participant teachers seemed to emphasize both moral and social conventional dimensions of the appropriateness of these events. As can be seen in Table 4.12, more than half of the participant teachers believed that children thought there was harm in these behaviors and they also saw them as a threat to welfare and fairness. Still, they believe that the acceptability of these behaviors by children are subject to the effects of social conventional.

Table 4.12 Teachers' beliefs about children's conceptions of mixed domain events

Categories	Behaviors	Codes		<i>f</i>	N
		Physical	Psychological		
					129
Harm	Not getting in line	0	14	14	
	Inapp. language	0	18	18	
		Fairness	Welfare		151
Abuse	Not getting in line	14	2	16	
	Inapp. language	8	5	13	
		Context	Authority	Rule	419
Social	Not getting in line	14	26	23	63
Conventional	Inapp. language	2	18	5	25

4.3.3.1. *Not getting in line*

Teachers mentioned that children conceptualized not getting in line by its harmful psychological outcomes (n=14) and fairness (n=14).

No one wants their rights infringed by bullies (P-13).

I hate people who jump the queue. They make me angry. I think children feel the same (P-09).

Toy sharing is the most common example for lining up. Children are bad at problem solving and waiting for their turn. Although they know waiting in line for a toy or a game assures justice, they cannot wait (P-16).

It is about fair sharing of toys and time. They know it is not ok. I think they tune up if someone breaks the line somewhere (P-25).

According to teachers, children were not aware of a rule for getting in line (n=21). Slightly more than half of the teachers thought even if there were a rule within the classroom, children would consider the rule as a classroom rule and not applicable for all contexts (n=14).

Children know when they are required to line up (P-21).

We have certain rules about play in our classroom. All children know the rules and they wait for their turn (P-08).

Moreover, they believed that children considered not getting in line acceptable if there were no rule that forbade them (n=23).

Getting in line is not a tool that I use in my class, so my children do not care about getting in line. I think it is the same for all the children. If there is not a rule they do not want to get in line (P-19).

If the teacher says so, children get in line (P-13).

Furthermore, all the participants said not getting in line would be acceptable for children if the teacher or parents allowed children to do so or did not react when they did it (n=26). Below are some examples from teachers' responses:

During play, children weigh teachers' responses. Unless the teacher react to the bullies, they keep breaking the rule (P-12).

It is related to the adults. If teachers or parents let children abuse others' rights, of course, they think it is acceptable (P-08).

4.3.3.2. Inappropriate language

Participant teachers were asked about their beliefs regarding children's conceptions of moral and social conventional events. In terms of inappropriate language, they mostly mentioned harmful psychological outcomes (n=18) and fairness (n=8).

According to my experiences, children find it harmful. They get upset when someone swears at them (P-05).

It is verbal abuse (P-08).

It is like a substitute of physical violence (P-12).

Children get upset when they are targeted by swear words. Most of them find it unjust to handle problems with violence (P-19).

Participant teachers believed that children were aware there was a rule against inappropriate language or profanity (n=18). However, they said children also knew the rule was not applicable everywhere (n=14).

They know it is a misbehavior but they also think in some circumstances people are allowed to swear. They see their fathers swear in traffic and it gives children a wrong message (P-01).

I think children are aware it is not a universal rule. They see their fathers swear while watching TV or driving. They think it could be acceptable in some circumstances (P-11).

Some daily words could be used as swear words by children. In another location it could be a very normal word (P-17).

Moreover, if the law allows people to use profanity, children think it is acceptable to swear (n=21).

In Turkey, law does not protect people from being humiliated by bullies. Children are aware of this reality. So, they receive a message saying if there is not a rule you can do anything (P-23).

As regards authority dependence, the participant teachers said that children saw the behavior as an acceptable one if the authority allowed them (n=21). Some of the participant teachers' answers are presented below:

They see their parents swear in traffic or while watching sports. Because of this, they think it could be normal in some conditions although it is wrong (P-05).

Some older relatives encourage children to swear. We all witness these sorts of behaviors of immature adults. These types of behaviors send a message to children that if the adult allows it, then it is okay (P-24).

4.4. Findings Overview

4.4.1. Teacher's conception of moral and social conventional

Findings reveal that participant teachers categorize events or transgressions into three categories: (1) Moral, (2) Social conventional and (3) Mixed domains, which were also mentioned by Turiel (2015) and Smetana (2006) in their social domain reviews. Thus, the findings of the present study provide similar results with previous research.

As regards the moral domain, when participant teachers mostly emphasized the behavior as harmful and/or abusive, they had the tendency to ignore adult standards. For hitting, damaging property, taking others' belongings without asking and name-calling, most of the teachers suggested that the behavior included physical or psychological harm, or both, and/or it was abusive, and that it was a threat to fairness or the welfare of the children.

With respect to the social conventional domain, teachers mentioned harm and abuse little, if any. It seems that their conceptions of these events were created based on the social conventional perspective towards the behaviors. These behaviors are

spitting, leaving seat without permission, eating with fingers and inappropriate clothing.

As for mixed domain events, teachers believed that they were harmful both physically and psychologically and were also abusive; however, they did not totally ignore adult standards as they did in moral events. In fact, they attached more importance to social conventional rules or norms, like law, or power of authority. For instance, half of the teachers focused on the fact that not getting in line was psychologically harmful, against fairness and a threat for the welfare of other children. These teachers ignored adult standards. However, others emphasized that in an ECE classroom, getting in line was not required because it was just a tool to move children from one place to another. Consequently, it appears that adult standards have an influence on their judgments regarding this behavior.

4.4.2. Teachers' beliefs about children's conception of moral and social conventional events

Teachers' beliefs about children's conceptions provided similar results for social conventional and mixed domain events. However, in terms of moral events, findings were totally different from both the teachers' own conceptions and social domain research. Participant teachers emphasized social conventional influences when they were talking about moral events considering children's conceptions.

As can be seen in Table 4.10 (p.99), the teachers mentioned that hitting was harmful and abusive. However, almost half of them also stated that having an authority or rule that encourages to hit could change children's conceptions of the behavior. Damaging property was believed to be an abusive behavior for children; however, they believed that children did not judge it as a harmful behavior, and social conventions could influence children's conceptions. In terms of taking others belongings, teachers' conceptions and their beliefs regarding children's conceptions were almost similar; the behavior was considered both harmful and abusive; nevertheless, social conventions had an influence on the conceptions. Finally, for name calling, findings were similar to the teachers' own conceptions in that name-calling was harmful and abusive. Though, if there was not a rule that forbade children from calling their friends with

names they did not like, or when adults allowed or encouraged them to do so, it was acceptable for children to do the act.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The current study tried to answer the research questions, which were *'What do Turkish preschool teachers believe about young children's conceptions of moral and social conventional events?'*, *'How do Turkish preschool teachers' categorize young children's in-class behaviors'* and *'How do Turkish preschool teachers distinguish between social conventional and moral events?'*. The research evaluates the teachers' moral judgments and their beliefs about children's moral judgments about in-class behaviors they experienced in an ECE classroom. By means of the application of the four concepts of the moral and social domain theory, the research evaluated the desired and undesired behaviors. The focus of the research was to assess the four dimensions, namely rule independence, independence of authority, the rule alterability and generalizability. However, the coding process provided different codes from the above-mentioned dimensions. As mentioned in the findings section, three co-coders' common consideration was that the rule independence and rule alterability dimensions were a part of a code of rule obedience. The specific focus of the study was to understand what Turkish preschool teachers believed about children's moral judgments regarding social conventional and moral events. The second focus was to explore participant teachers' own moral judgments regarding the same events. Regardless of the main foci of the study, findings revealed that teachers regarded the school to be the most crucial element of moral education based on their life experiences. In this section, the main purpose is to summarize the findings and try to interpret them based on the context of prior research.

The theoretical analysis of the existing literature and the personal life experiences of the teachers helped in generating valuable conclusions regarding the research objectives. The early life years of the children are considered the most crucial years for the development of behaviors and attitudes in the children and the impact they have on the mental and social development of the child (Killen & Smetana, 2010). It is the best time when the care providers as parents and teachers may analyze the behaviors of children. Teachers perform their role in daily life situations by pinpointing the negative behavior and making the child adopt morally and socially acceptable behaviors, norms, and rules (Montessori, 1949). Teachers learn through their personal experience and this could be linked to the work of Killen and Smetana (2010), who demonstrated that the children used to adopt the moral and social concepts as part of their personal experiences and make judgements regarding a specific situation as right or wrong.

The responses of participant teachers demonstrated that peers at school were crucial for healthy social and moral development. One of the participants who was of the opinion that she used to belong to a permissive family gave assent to her spoiled habits. She added that those habits of hers were corrected by her friends at school. It is analyzed that children's early childhood experiences with their parents, family members, teachers and peers play a critical role in their mental, emotional, social, and cognitive development (Matthews et al., 2015). Consistent with the findings, Piaget (1932/1966) argues that peer relations provide more opportunities for social experiences because they are reciprocal. Likewise, some well-known research (Criss et al., 2002; Dunn et al., 2000; Hay et al., 1999; Hay, Payne & Chadwick, 2004; Howes & Phillipsen, 1998; Rubin et al., 2003) advocate that early peer relations are the predictors of social relations occurring in adulthood.

Further, findings revealed that teachers were also highly influential on their learning of social conventions. Social conventions play an essential role in the society and help in nurturing the morality of the children (Smetana, 2006). During the literature review of such studies as Hamlin (2013), Turiel (2002) and Killen (2010), contradictory views were observed regarding perceptions of the moral developments of the behaviors the children adopted during the ages of 0-3 years. Hamlin (2013)

indicates that toddlers' responses, as part of the psychological examinations under the age of one year, revealed that these children had the feelings of care and sympathy for other people in their ultimate surrounding. The study by Hamlin (2013) also revealed concepts of social knowledge regarding justice, fairness, and harm. However, Turiel (2002) and Killen (2010) are of the opinion that there is no connection between the early development of recognizing the feeling of caring for others or making judgments as for right or wrong specifically in toddlers. Regardless of this fact, these authors hold the opinion that such feelings are developed when the child interacts with others. As the level of interaction is increased, the more the child has chances of learning the established domains of the society (Turiel, 2002).

The teachers are of the opinion that they learned to discriminate the right from wrong, the justice or fairness at the school where they were being corrected by their teachers to adopt the corrected moral, ethical, and socially acceptable behaviors. In a study by Smetana, Jambon, and Ball (2014), it is reported that for the development of social moralities in a child during the childhood years, it is essential to increase their interaction with their peers. This is in line with the results of the current research in which the interviews from the teachers regarding their personal experiences revealed similar thoughts. Teachers' own social learning and social convention greatly enhanced during their early years when they used to go to school. The teachers shared the desired and undesired behaviors that they experienced during their early childhood years (Smetana, Jambon, & Ball 2014).

A study by Schmidt, Rakoczy, and Tomasello (2012) revealed that children have positive results related to their responses to the prevailing social environment and aspects pertaining to badness. These children were at a younger age and had not been exposed to the school context. The children showed aggressive behaviors at school or at home. The way the peers interacted as a response to the violation of the social order is essential for moral development. Jambon (2016) argued that the children aged between 0 and 5 years were immature in expressing their feelings and they showed aggressive behaviors while expressing their emotions. This is mainly because the children cannot speak or communicate effectively, and thus through their actions they show what they genuinely feel. The interview analysis regarding the personal

experiences of the teachers in the current study revealed similar results. For instance, one of the teachers shared her experience as regards her parents being strict with her at home and that she used to behave aggressively in the school environment. In such an instance, her teacher made her realize the negative behavior she was adopting and thus through corrective action, she appreciated the moral and social development. This example is based on the demonstration of aggressive feelings; however, the work of Jambon (2016) notified that children express their positive feelings in a similar manner as they demonstrate their negative feelings. Children admire their peers, show high sympathy and even share their lunch/toys etc. with their peers. Under such instances, the role of the teacher is again important to appreciate such social conventions so that the students could develop insights for differentiating the positive and negative emotions.

5.1. Teacher's Conceptions of Moral and Social Conventional Events

The first hypothesis of the current study was that teachers' judgments would be similar to those reported in prior studies in the literature. Data analysis supported the hypothesis. Violations of the rules for behaviors classified as moral, i.e. involve harm and/or abuse of fairness or welfare of people, were defined as unacceptable for every circumstance. Social conventions for these behaviors were mostly ignored. These behaviors are hitting, damaging property, taking others' belongings, inappropriate language and name calling. But teachers marked violations of rules of several behaviors as acceptable in some circumstances. These are spitting, getting in line, leaving seat without permission, eating with fingers and inappropriate clothing. These types of behaviors are categorized as social conventions in the social domain theory. The findings showed that preschool teachers differentiate social conventional and moral behaviors. Previous research has shown that people, both children and adults, can recognize violations of moral and social conventional rules (Nucci & Powers, 2014; Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015). Social domain studies conducted both in western and non-western countries have yielded similar results (For a review see Turiel, 2015, p.507). Turiel's review includes studies conducted until 2001 (Turiel,

2015). In 2009 Yau and colleagues in China and Vainio (2011) in Finland found similar results.

The justifications of teachers about the acceptability of a behavior was crucial for this study. These justifications were used to decide about the nature of the behavior from the perspective of the teachers. For the behaviors categorized as moral, teachers had the tendency to mention that the violation of a rule for those behaviors involved harm and abuse (Turiel, 2015). Additionally, the influence of social conventions was mentioned to be limited. As for hitting and name calling, the lowest frequencies of social conventions and highest frequency of harm were revealed. A few participants, who stated hitting and name calling could be acceptable in some circumstances, mentioned that the form of harm was the determinant of the judgment. These findings show that provoked and unprovoked harm are different for preschool teachers (Janbon, 2016; Hay, 2005; Dahl, 2014). Teachers believed that an unprovoked harmful behavior was more wrong than provoked behaviors (Jambon, 2016).

Findings of other moral behaviors revealed similar, but not the same results. They all regard moral transgressions as being more serious than social conventional ones (Nucci & Turiel, 1978; Smetana, Kelly, & Twentyman, 1984; Smetana, Schlagman, & Adams, 1993). However, findings of the current study revealed that teachers' judgments of moral events vary. They tend to describe harmful behaviors as more independent of context, rule and authority influence than abusive ones. These findings are different from previous research in which all moral transgressions are considered the same. Furthermore, the behaviors that have similar scores for harm and abuse and higher scores for abuse than harm are judged by teachers as being more dependent on social conventions.

Social conventional behaviors have similar results with those reported in previous research, i.e. they are dependent on context, rule and authority influence. Violation of rules for those behaviors are not judged as serious as violations of moral rules (Turiel, 2015). However, teachers suggested that the violations of rules regarding some behaviors are harmful and abusive, while they are dependent on social conventions. In social domain research, there is no clear line for all the violations and some events are multifaceted and coincide partially or completely with moral and

social conventional concerns (Helwig, 1995; Killen, 1990; Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 1983; Turiel, Killen & Helwig, 1987). These types of multifaceted behaviors are named mixed domain behaviors by domain researchers (Smetana, 2006).

5.2. Teachers' Beliefs about Children's Conception of Moral and Social Conventional Events

Analysis of teachers' beliefs about children's moral judgments yielded similar results, except that they emphasized on the obedience to authority. Teachers believe children make judgments based on the nature of an event to distinguish between morality and social conventions. When children think an event involves harm or abuse, they accept the event as moral. Different from previous research findings (Kim & Turiel, 1996; Laupa, 1995; Yau, Smetana, & Metzger, 2008), teachers believe that children respect authority influence for all the transgressions. In other words, teachers believe that children judge all events as acceptable if an authority allows the violation of the rule or change the rule although the event is a moral one.

Obedience to authority is a well-established (Milgram, 1963) social concept (Laupa, Turiel & Cowan, 1995; Turiel, 2015). Some of the well-known socialization theories suggest that social and moral understanding is derived from the society's influence on individuals' social and moral decisions (Benedict, 1938; Durkheim, 1961; Freud, 1961; Skinner, 1971). Moral values are created solely by the society; individuals do not have their own values (Durkheim, 1961). Individuals are reasonable beings who are aware of the consequences of their acts. As a result, they intrinsically (Skinner, 1971) and willingly (Benedict, 1938; Durkheim, 1961) accept the moral framework drawn by the society. Similarly, according to Freud (1961), individuals consciously obey the standards drawn by the society because of their sense of guilt. Individuals follow the rules because of their desire of pleasure and removal of suffering. Therefore, all individual social and moral decisions are the products of the society. Additionally, morality is subject to change for the greater good of the society, thus it is cultural, i.e. not universal. Because society itself is the source of the whole

authority, individuals' socialization process occurs under the influence of social authority.

Montessori defines the same situation as authority obedience (1948). She says there are three levels of obedience. The second level, which is named as 'blind obedience' might be another explanation of the situation. Children in this level, according to Montessori (1948), tend to follow the directions and commands coming from any respectable adult without hesitation and questioning. However, according to Piaget (1932/1966), most of the socialization (and deterministic) perspectives suggest that children socialize through society's norms and rules but they do not notice the obvious fact that children are not identical copies of their ancestors, nor do they passively intake what the society defines as culturally appropriate. Instead, they interpret their social experiences and create 'schema' about social and moral realities. Co-construction of social understanding is not a result of the power of influence of the adult (as an authority figure), rather it is a result of children's being egocentric and lacking understanding of others' perspectives. Because they have limited understanding of others' perspectives, they create their social and moral schema based on two concepts: fear and love. Thus, these two concepts might be the source of the influence of the authority on children's judgments from the perspective of the participant teachers. Piaget considers heteronomous morality as an initial stage for moral development. During this period, which continues until 7-8 years of age, children's sense of morality is derived from their autarchic respect for adults (preschool teachers for the current study). Kohlberg uses a similar concept for young children; because young children are at their initial periods of cognitive maturity, they use a modest way of moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1969). Like Piaget, Kohlberg affirms morality is a complex cognitive construct which is not developed during early years of life. On the other hand, conformity of rules or social conventions are more simple constructs and they develop at early ages. Therefore, based on those two perspectives, like the deterministic ones, teachers' beliefs about children's moral understanding seem to have reasonable foundations. However, studies on moral reasoning have found that children begin to distinguish between social conventions and morality at around 3 years of age (Nucci & Powers, 2014; Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015). As a result, there

is empirical evidence supporting that young children could use complex moral reasoning (For a review see Smetana, 2006).

Turiel's approach to moral development conceptualizes social conventions and morality as two distinct domains, which develop individually as a result of social interactions (1983). Based on their harmful experiences, children create schema for care and empathy (Turiel & Killen, 2010). According to Turiel and Killen (2010) children order their moral and conventional demands based on empathy or fear respectfully; however, they are still fully aware of what is moral and conventional. Thus, the "interactions with fundamentally different types of objects and events should result in the formation of distinct conceptual frameworks" (Turiel, 1977, p. 108). As a result, the influence of the authority on moral events is limited, if any for social domain research (Turiel, 1983; 2006; 2015) because obedience to authority is a social conventional construct that is not applicable for moral events. Although some situations demand both the implications of morality and social conventions (i.e. mixed domain events), judgments regarding moral transgressions like hitting, name calling or stealing are independent of social conventional influences.

According to Raz (1986), authority, in the political context, derives from "the reasons for actions which are relevant" (as cited in Krehoff, 2008, p.284). Raz (1990) considers obedience to authority as a well-thought-out and intentional act. That is to say, when individuals consider that the power of the authority is legitimate and the reasons are relevant, they have a tendency to obey the directions of the authority willingly. Raz adds that once individuals are tied to the power of an authority, they try to obey what the authority directs rather than to reason over the consequences. This sense of authority is named as practical authority. Teachers, parents, and doctors are some examples for practical authority. Hurd (2001) argues that Razian practical authority serves as a tool to resolve organizational difficulties in a certain way. From this perspective, practical authority encourages individuals to act in a certain way for practical reasons. Again, teachers' beliefs about children's moral judgments may have a stand point on Razian practical authority formation. However, there is another term for political authority, which is theoretical authority. These two terms are conceptually different. In theoretical authority, the authority provides explanations about an event;

taking these explanations as reasons to act upon is up to the individual. That is to say, it is about beliefs, not about actions.

There are some studies that support the Razian approach of authority to some extent. According to Yau and colleagues (2008), there is an obvious authority influence on children's conventional and moral judgments. They state that children believe they should obey what their mothers order in the home and what teachers order in school. Findings show that teachers at school have more authority than mothers at home. However, they found that children valued authority as generalizable across contexts for personal events more than moral events. In another research in which the concept of authority among children was studied, Laupa and Tse (2005) found that children queried legitimacy of authority in moral events more than that in personal events. These studies show that in moral events children do not consider the authority as legitimate and they do not take what authority orders into consideration voluntarily. In another study, Kim and Turiel (1996), found that children do follow adults' directions against violation of a moral rule without considering adults' position of authority. Additionally, children rejected to follow the command against preventing harm even when given by a legitimate authority figure. Turiel (1983) states that children believe school rules are necessary and they feel secure when they are aware of the limits. Subsequently, having rules that draw the boundaries for actions is essential and beneficial for children, and they are aware of its benefits. Moreover, they do not have problems to follow what an authority figure's commands. However, they become selective of the rules. They do not follow orders made even by a legitimate authority if they involve harm or abuse (Laupa & Turiel, 1986).

Research on children have found that children think through some aspects while considering the legitimacy of an authority (Laupa & Turiel, 1986). These are (1) authority attribute, (2) social context and (3) type of command. Although they accept the influence of the authority based on authority attribute and social context, they do not show obedience to authority if the command involves violation of a moral rule or personal autonomy (Laupa & Turiel, 1986). What can be clearly seen in the light of the above-mentioned research is that authority is a powerful social concept that influences children's social and moral judgments. Nevertheless, its influence on

judgments in moral events is limited. Thus, it can be said that preschool teachers may overestimate the power of authority on children's moral judgments. This could be a misconception about the moral development and moral reasoning of children.

Another important aspect of the findings of the current study is about teachers. As previously stated, the participant teachers mostly emphasize authority obedience when they are asked about their beliefs regarding children's conception of moral events. That is not what is expected because literature on the social domain theory clearly shows that children can distinguish moral and social conventional events while ignoring social rules, norms or standards for moral transgressions (Turiel, 2015). According to Robinson (1971), teachers could mention teacher domination and control when they are unsure about their role while teaching a topic. Moral education is an abstract topic, which teachers can feel unsure about regarding how to teach it. In fact, considering early childhood education, it might be harder than it is in higher grades. Furthermore, Narvaez and Lapsley (n.d.) mention that there are two alternative approaches to implement character education in classroom settings. According to the first view "character development is an outcome of effective teaching" (p.2) that is teacher-centered. The second one is about equipping and encouraging children to solve daily life problems by themselves while carefully watching them, which is child-centered. As mentioned by Narvaez and Lapsley (n.d.), it is common for teachers to choose a teacher-centered approach for moral education. Garrett (2008) reveals that it is about teachers' conception of classroom management based on behavioral theories.

According to Wolfgang's (2001) identification of discipline, there are three faces of classroom management based on a scale of teachers' use of power from minimum to maximum respectively: (1) relationship and listening, (2) confronting and contracting and (3) rules and consequences. For rules and consequences (Wolfgang, 2001), teachers have the tendency to use maximum power for discipline. The teachers' beliefs in the current study have more similarities than differences regarding the rules and consequences aspect of discipline defined by Wolfgang (2001). It can be easily said that most of the participants in the present study share a teacher-centered perspective which might not be a perfect way to teach morality and social conventions (DeVries & Zan, 1994; Narvaez & Lapsley, n.d.; Nucci, 2001) since in such kinds of

classrooms there is a hierarchical authority in which teachers always try to control children's actions. Accordingly, knowledge is directly transmitted to the children by teachers while disregarding meaning making processes (Bropy, 1999). Indeed, children have no idea why their teachers ask them to act in a particular way. Children lack the connections between pedagogical contents and daily life situations (Rogers & Freiberg, 1994) although Bruner (1962/1979) advocates the opposite.

In such a scenario, discipline comes from an external source, such as teachers or parents. It probably prevents children from internalizing the concepts of moral and social conceptions. They might be confused about the concepts of morality and social conventions. Additionally, there is a set of consequences which does not reflect individual differences in those classrooms. A fixed approach which does not respect individual differences might be a threat to maintain a reciprocal relationship with students. Additionally, it might also prevent a healthy development of self-determination and self-discipline.

5.3. Implications of the Study

According to Piaget (1932/1966), the basic responsibility of adults is to provide a facilitative environment for children to move from heteronomous perspective to an autonomous one. Accordingly, teachers have to act in a cooperative way with children during their path of development (DeVries & Zen, 1994). Participants of the current study have the same perspective. They believe children are immature moral agents and their moral judgments are dependent on social conventions, especially on authority influence. According to findings, social domain researchers would definitely advocate that participant teachers of the current study lack sufficient understanding of the moral capabilities of children.

Current research on moral development provides sufficient evidence, although it is still developing, regarding children's moral judgments and actions. One of the well-known theories regarding moral development is the social domain theory. Domain theory has provided a fruitful source to understand children's conceptions of social and moral events. The domain researchers develop a framework about

children's violation patterns of social and moral events. Familiarizing teachers with the findings of the social domain theory may help them develop better classroom management strategies. Additionally, this familiarity can help teachers embed moral education as an integral part of their daily schedule (Nucci & Turiel, 2009).

The social domain theory has an interactionist perspective of moral development. Turiel (1977) asserts that formation of moral development is a result of different types of experiences with various events within various contexts and settings. Thus, a school campus is resourceful in providing complex social events connected with moral development. According to the domain theory (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015) social experiences are classified as social and moral while Nucci and Turiel (1978) add another one: personal domain. As previously mentioned, children distinguish among domains and take domain appropriate actions. If teachers are aware of the conceptual differences of the domains, they could analyze the nature of children's judgments. This must be the first step to understand how moral judgments influence moral behavior.

The findings of the current study have a number of applicable implications. As mentioned above, teachers have misconceptions about the moral development of children, especially about moral reasoning. Based on teachers' responses, it can be said that teachers are not familiar with children's capability to differentiate between social and moral acts. As a result, the findings of the current study indicate that both pre-service and in-service trainings are required to help teachers understand moral development of children and its application to the classroom settings because application of developmental research in classroom is one of the most complicated practices (Nucci & Turiel, 2009).

'Moral Education' has been one of the most emphasized topics in the Turkish education system since 1950s (Kamer & Alabaş, 2017). Since then, teachers have been carrying the responsibility of providing moral education on their shoulders (Milson & Mehlig, 2002) because its success within classroom settings relies on the teachers' efficacy (Prestwich, 2004). However, Milson and Mehlig (2002) found that teachers feel pre-service training on moral development is insufficient. Teachers think that they are not well-equipped to implement moral education within classrooms when they are

newly graduated. Teacher training programs could help teacher candidates to develop the necessary pedagogical skills to implement moral education by introducing a moral development and education course. There might be two dimensions of such a course. The first part may involve fundamentals of moral development, moral formations of children, nature of children's moral behaviors, and moral reasoning, while the second part may involve the strategies that may help teachers to connect developmental research and practice. Scaffolding pre-service training with supplementary in-service training might reinforce teachers' knowledge and help them to not only develop a better understanding of classroom behaviors but also develop their own classroom management strategies.

The findings also have some implications for research. It is found that Turkish teachers use similar frameworks to conceptualize the nature of behavior with previous social domain research findings (Turiel, 2015). Consequently, the findings support that moral and social conventional events are naturally different domains. Findings provide similar results with studies conducted both within western and non-western countries. However, teachers' beliefs about children's moral judgments are different. They mostly emphasize the influence of the authority on children's judgments. Further research with a more homogenous sample involving participants from Turkey and different countries may help understand if the findings are related to the cultural background of Turkish teachers.

5.4. Limitations of the Study

Although the current study was conducted in a careful manner and has reached its objectives, I am still aware that there were some limitations. First, because of the time limit and financial considerations only Turkish preschool teachers who were willing to participate in the study were involved in the study. Therefore, the findings could not be generalized to larger groups or other cultures. Secondly, using in-depth interviews were appropriate and sufficient due to the explanatory nature of the study. However, participants answers might be biased because of social conventional influences on them. Turkey had been governed on the state of emergency for more

than a year when the data was collected. Consequently, the responses might not be the real intentions of the participants. Finally, data collection procedures might create some shortcomings on the study because I conducted interviews with the participants within their school mostly during or just after their working hours. Morality could be a sensitive topic for some people which they did not prefer to discuss in public. Hence, that might cause shyness in their responses.

REFERENCES

- Acat, M. B., & Aslan, M. (2012). Yeni Bir Değer Sınıflaması ve Bu Sınıflamaya Bağlı Olarak Öğencilere Kazandırılması Gereken Değerler. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 12(2), 1461-1474.
- Acuner, Y. (2004). *14-18 Yaş Arası Gençlerde Ahlaki Yargı Gelişimi ve Ahlak Eğitimi*. Samsun: Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi.
- Adıgüzel, O. C., & Ergünay, O. (2012). Türkiye'de değerler üzerine gerçekleştirilen lisansüstü tezlerin eğitim bilimleri ve öğretmen yetiştirme perspektifinden incelenmesi. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(41), 18-33.
- Adler, U. S., & P., F. (1997). A literature-based approach to teaching values to adolescents: Does it work? *Adolescence*, 32(126), 275-285.
- Akbaş, O. (2008). Değer Eğitimi Akımlarına Genel Bir Bakış. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 6(16), 9-27.
- Akyürek, P. G. (2008). *İlköğretim din kültürü ve ahlak bilgisi derslerinin öğrencilerin ahlaki gelişimine etkisi: Kohlberg'in ahlak gelişimi kuramı açısından bir değerlendirmesi*. Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi.
- Aladag, H. H. (2016). İnkılapsever bir cumhuriyet aydını: Hilmi Adnan Malik bey (d.1900- ö.1972). *Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(3), 711-726.
- Alan, Y. (2014). Değerler eğitimi açısından Kur'an kıssalarının Türkçe ders kitaplarında kullanılması. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(8), 60-76.
- Ardilla-Rey, A., & Killen, M. (2001). Middleclass Colombian children's evaluations of personal, moral, and social-conventional interactions in the classroom. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 25, 246-255.
- Arsenio, W.F., Adams, E. & Gold, J., (2009). Social information processing, moral reasoning, and emotion attributions: Relations with adolescents' reactive and proactive aggression. *Child development*, 80(6), 1739-1755.
- Arthur, J. (2003). *Education with Character*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Arthur, J., 2008. Traditional approaches to character education in Britain and America. *Handbook of moral and character education*, pp.80-98.

- Atkinson, P., & Hammersley, M. (2007). *Etnography: Principles in practice* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Bacanlı, H. (2006). *Duyuşsal davranış eğitimi*. Ankara: Nobel yayın dağıtım.
- Battistich, V. .., Watson, M., Solomon, D., Schaps, E., & Solomon, J. (1991). The Child Development Project: A comprehensive program for the development of prosocial character. In W. Kurtines, & J. Gewirtz, *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (pp. 1-34). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Bee, H., & Boyd, D. (2009). *Çocuk Gelişim Psikolojisi*. (O. Gündüz, Trans.) İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.
- Benedict, R. (1938). Continuities and discontinuities in cultural conditioning. In M. Mead, & M. Wolfenstein, *Childhood in contemporary cultures* (pp. 21-30). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berberoğlu, G., & Tansel, A. (2014). Does private tutoring increase academic achievement?: Evidence from Turkey. *International Review of Education*, 60(1), 683-701.
- Berkowitz, M. W. (2011). What works in values education? *International Journal of Educational Research*, 50(3), 153-158. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2011.07.003
- Berkowitz, M. W. (2012). Moral and Character Education. In K. Harris, S. Graham, & T. Urdan (Eds.), *APA educational psychology handbook* (Vols. 2: Individual differences, cultural variations, and contextual factors in educational psychology, pp. 247-264). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Berkowitz, M. W., & Bier, M. C. (2007). What works in character education? *Journal of Research in Character Education*, 5(1), 29-48.
- Berkowitz, M., & Bier, M. (2005a). *What works in character education: A research-driven guide for educators*. Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership.
- Bersoff, D. M., & Miller, J. G. (1993). Culture, context, and the development of moral accountability judgments. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 664-676.
- Blair, R. J. (1996). Morality in the autistic child. *Journal of autism and Developmental Disorders*, 65, 1054-1067.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

- Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teachers Education*, 16(2), 239-253.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, E., 2008. Teaching ethically as a moral condition of professionalism. *Handbook of moral and character education*, pp.601-617.
- Carey, N., & Ford, M. (1983). Domains of social and selfregulation: An Indonesian study. *The meeting of the American Psychological Association*. Los Angeles: American Psychological Association.
- Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M. L., Ryan, J. A., Lonczak, H. S., & Hawkins, J. D. (2002). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *Prevention & Treatment*, 5. doi:10.1037/15223736.5.1.515a
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Çiftçi, N. (2001). *Almanya ve Türkiye'deki Türk lise öğrencilerinin ahlaki yargı yeteneklerinin karşılaştırılması*. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Ciftci-Aridag, N., & Yuksel, A. (2010). Üniversite öğrencilerinin ahlaki yargı yetenekleri ile emai becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada eğitim bilimleri*, 10(2), 683-727.
- Çinemre, S. (2012). *Ahlak eğitimi bağlamında Kohlberg'in ahlak gelişim teorisi ve sorunları*. Samsun: Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi.
- Criss, M. M., Pettit, G. S., Bates, J., Dodge, K. A., & Lapp, A. L. (2002). Family adversity, positive peer relationships, and children's externalising behavior: A longitudinal perspective on risk and resilience. *Child Development*, 73(4), 1220-1237.
- Dahl, J. (2014). *Mothers'orientations to infants' moral, prudential and pragmatic transgression*. Unpublished dissertation, UC Berkeley: Berkeley, CA, USA.
- Davidson, M. (2005). Harness the sun, channel the wind: The art and science of effective character education. In D. K. Lapsley, & F. C. Power (Eds.), *Character Psychology and Character Education* (pp. 18-35). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Decety, J. & Svetlova, M., (2012). Putting together phylogenetic and ontogenetic perspectives on empathy. *Developmental cognitive neuroscience*, 2(1), 1-24.

- Decety, J. & Wheatley, T., (2015). *The moral brain: A multidisciplinary perspective*. MIT Press.
- DeRoche, E. F., & Williams, M. M. (1998). *Educating hearts and minds: A comprehensive character education framework*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- DeRosier, M. E., & Mercer, S. H. (2007). Improving student social behavior: The effectiveness of a storytelling-based character education program. *Journal of Research in Character Education*, 5(2), 131-148.
- DeRosier, M., & Loyld, S. (2010). The impact of children's social adjustment on academic outcomes. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties*, 27(2), 25-47. doi:10.1080/10573569.2011.532710
- DeVries, R. & Zan, B., (2012). *Moral classrooms, moral children: Creating a constructivist atmosphere in early education* (Vol. 47). Teachers College Press.
- Dilmaç, B., Bozgeyikli, H., & Çıkılı, Y. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının değer algılarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 6(16), 69-91.
- Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral education: A Study in the theory and application of the sociology of education*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The Impact of Enhancing Students' Social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405-432. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x
- Eğitim Reform Girişimi. (n.d.). *Türkiye'de kaynaştırma/bütünleştirme yoluyla eğitimin durumu*. İstanbul: Sabancı Vakfı.
- Ekşi, H. (2003). Temel insani değerlerin kazandırılmasında bir yaklaşım: Karakter eğitimi . *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, s. 82-83.
- Ekşi, H. (2003a). Temel insani değerlerin kazandırılmasında bir yaklaşım: Karakter eğitimi programları. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(1), 76-96.
- Ekşi, H., & Katılmış, A. (2015). *Karakter Eğitimi: El Kitabı* (4th ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayın.
- Eyyam, R., Menevis, I., & Dogruer, N. (2012). The moral development and self-realization levels of university students: North Cyprus context. *Eğitim Araştırmaları- Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 49(A), 83-102.

- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103, 1013-1055.
- Flay, B., Berkowitz, M. W., & Bier, M. C. (2009). Elementary school-based programs theorized to support social development, prevent violence, and promote positive school climate. *Journal of Research in Character Education*, 7(2), 21-49.
- Flick, U. (2009). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Frankel, J., & N, W. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (5th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Freud, S. (1960). *The ego and the id*. New York: Norton.
- Freud, S. (1961). *Civilization and its discontents*. New York: Norton.
- Güler, E. D. (2006). *Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında Beden Eğitimi Dersinin Çocuğun Ahlaki*. Sakarya: Sakarya Üniversitesi.
- Galanter, M. (1989). *Cults: faith, healing, and coercion*. London: Oxford Press.
- Galvis, H. A. (2012). Understanding beliefs, teachers' beliefs and their Impact on the use of computer technology. *Issues in Techers' Professional Development*, 14(2), 95-112.
- Gewirth, A. (1978). *Reason and morality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gielen, U., & Lei, T. (1994). The measurement of moral reasoning. In L. Kuhmerker, U. Gielen, & R. L. Hayes, *The Kohlberg legacy for the helping professions* (p. 63). Birmingham, Alabama: Doxa Books.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., & Antanucci, J. (1988). Two moral orientations: Gender differences and similarities. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 34, pp. 223-237.
- Greenberg, M. T., Domitrovich, C., & Bumbarger, B. (2001). The prevention of menal disorders in school-aged children: Current state of the field. *Prevention & Treatment*, 4(1), 1-67.
- Goswami, U. ed., 2011. *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of childhood cognitive development* (Vol. 32). John Wiley & Sons.

- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hamlin, J.K., 2013. Moral judgment and action in preverbal infants and toddlers: Evidence for an innate moral core. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22(3), pp.186-193.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Haser, Ç. (2016). Matematik eğitimi alanında inanışlar. In S. Arslan, E. Bingölbalı, & İ. Ö. Zembat, *Matematik Eğitiminde Teoriler* (pp. 747-765). Ankara: Pegem.
- Haser, C. (2006). *Investigation of preservice and inservice teachers' mathematics related beliefs in turkey and the perceived effect of middle school mathematics education program and the school contexts on these beliefs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.
- Hay, D. F., Castle, J., Davies, L., Demetriou, H., & Stimson, C. A. (1999). Prosocial action in very early childhood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 40(6), 906-916.
- Hay, D. F., Payne, A., & Chadwick, A. (2004). Peer relations in childhood. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 45(1), 84-108.
- Heidegger, M. (2005). *Introduction to phenomenological research*. (D. O. Dahlstrom, Trans.) Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hester, P. P., Baltodano, H. M., Hendrickson, J. M., Tonelson, S. W., Conroy, M. A., & Gable, R. A. (2004). Lessons learned from research on early intervention: What teachers can do to prevent children's behavior problems. *Preventing School Failure*, 49(1), 5-10.
- Hollos, M., Leis, P. E., & Turiel, E. (1986). Social reasoning in Ijo children and adolescents in Nigerian communities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17, 352-374.
- Horowitz, J. L., & Garber, J. (2006). The Prevention of Depressive Symptoms in Children and Adolescents: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 74(3), 401-415.
- Howard, R. W., Berkowitz, M. W., & Schaeffer, E. F. (2004). Politics of character education. *Educational Policy*, 18(1), 188-215.
- Howard, R. W., Berkowitz, M. W., & Schaeffer, E. F. (2004). Politics of character education. *Educational Policy*, 18, 188-215.

- Howes, C., & Phillipsen, L. (1998). Continuity in children's relations with peers. *Social Development*, 7(3), 340-349.
- İlk Ders, 53 (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı September 08, 2010).
- İz, F. B. (2009). *Kohlberg'in bilişsel ahlak gelişimi kuramına göre hemşire öğrencilerin ahlaki yargı yeteneklerinin belirlenmesi*. İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi.
- Jambon, M., 2016. *Moral judgments and aggression in young children: a social domain approach to conceptualizing individual differences in early moral understanding*. University of Rochester.
- James, R., & Blair, R. (2005). Morality in the autistic child. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 26, 571-579.
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. . *Educational Psychologist*, 27, 65-90.
- Kamer, T., & Alabaş, R. (2017). Ahlak terbiyesi kongresi ve basına yansımaları. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 25(2), 821-848.
- Kanad, H. F. (1930). *Terbiye ve tedris tarihi*. İstanbul.
- Kanad, H. F. (1934). *Muassır Terbiye Ülküleri ve Terbiyede Yenilikler*. İstanbul.
- Kanad, H. F. (1942). *Milliyet ideali ve topyekûn terbiye*. Ankara.
- Kanad, H. F. (1947). *Ailede çocuk terbiyesi*. Ankara.
- Kangal, S. B. (2010). *Normal ve üstün yetenekli çocukların ahlaki yargılarının karşılaştırılması ve yaratıcı drama programının çocukların ahlaki yargılarına etkisi*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Kaya, M. (1993). *Bazı kişisel değişkenlere göre üniversite öğrencilerinin ahlaki yargıları*. Samsun: Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi.
- Killen, M., & Smetana, J. (1999). Social interactions in preschool classrooms and the development of young children's conceptions of the personal. *Child Development*, 70, 486-501.
- Killen, M., & Smetana, J. G. (2010). Future directions: Social development in the context of social justice. *Social Development*, 19(3), 642-657.
- Kim, J. M., & Turiel, E. (1996). Korean and American children's concepts of adult and peer authority. *Social Development*, 5(3), 310-329.

- Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health*, 74, 262–273.
- Koca, G. (1981). *İlkokul birinci sınıfa devam eden yedi yaşındaki çocukların ahlaki yargılarını etkileyen faktörler*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin, *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 347-480). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Kohlberg, L. (1970). Reply to bereiter's statement on kohlberg's cognitive developmental view. *Interchange*, 41.
- Kohlberg, L. (1971). From is to ought: How to commit the naturalistic fallacy and get away with it in the study of moral development. In T. Mischel, *Psychology and genetic epistemology* (pp. 151-235). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1973). Continuities and Discontinuities in Childhood and Adult Moral. In P. B. Baltes, & L. R. Goutlet, *Lifespan Developmental Psychology: Research and* (pp. 179-204). New York: Academic Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1974). Education, moral development and faith. *Journal of Moral Education*, 5-16.
- Kohlberg, L. (1978). Revisions in the theory and practice of moral development. *New Directions for the Child and Adolescent*, 2, pp. 83-87.
- Kohlberg, L. (1980). Exploring the moral atmosphere of institutions. In L. Kohlberg, *The meaning and measurement of moral development* (pp. 32-52). Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on moral development* (Vols. II, The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages). San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Kohlberg, L. (1985). The Just Community approach to moral education in theory and practice. In M. Berkowitz, & F. Oser, *Moral education: Theory and application* (pp. 27-86). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kohlberg, L. (1987). *Child psychology and childhood education: A cognitive-developmental view*. New York: Longman.
- Kohlberg, L. & Hersh, R.H., (1977). Moral development: A review of the theory. *Theory into practice*, 16(2), 53-59.

- Kohlberg, L., & Kramer, R. (1969). Continuities and discontinuities in childhood and adult moral development. *Human Development*, 12.
- Kuşdil, M. E., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerin değerler yönelimi ve Schwartz değer kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(45), 59-76.
- Kurt, Y. (1996). *Rehber öğretmenler ve öğretmenlerin ahlak gelişim düzeyleri ve denetim odağı algılamaları*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Kuyel, N., & Glover, R. J. (2010). Moral reasoning and moral orientation of U.S. and Turkish university students. *Psychological Reports*, 107(2), 463-479.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2008). *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: Sage Publications.
- Lamanna, M. A. (2002). *Emile Durkheim on the family*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Laupa, M. (1995). Children's reasoning about authority in home and school contexts. *Social Development*, 4(1), 1-16.
- Laupa, M., & Tse, P. (2005). Authority Concepts Among Children and Adolescents in the Island of Macao. *Social Development*, 14(4), 652-663.
- Laupa, M., & Turiel, E. (1986). Children's conceptions of adult and peer authority. *Child Development*, 57, 405-412.
- Legard, R., Keegan, J., & Ward, K. (2003). In-depth interviews. In J. Ritchie, & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 139–169). London: Sage Publications.
- Lerner, R.M., Liben, L.S. & Mueller, U., 2015. *Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science, Cognitive Processes* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.
- Leslie, A., Mallon, R., & Dicorcia, J. (2006). Transgressors, victims and cry babies: Is basic moral judgement spared in autism. *Social Neurosciences*, 1, 270-283.
- Lewis, D. (1969). *Convention: A philosophical study*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lickona, T. (1976). Critical issues in the study of moral development and behavior. In T. Lickona, *Moral development and behavior*. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. New York: Bentam.

- Lickona, T. (1996). Eleven principals of effective character education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 25, 93-100.
- Lickona, T., & Davidson, M. (2005). *Smart and good high schools: Integrating excellence and ethics for success in school, work, and beyond*. Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership.
- Logan, R., Snarey, J., & Schrader, D. (1990). Autonomous versus heteronomous moral judgment types: A longitudinal cross-cultural study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21(1), 71-89.
- Madden, T. (1992). *Cultural factors and assumptions in social reasoning in India*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Marshall, J. C., Caldwell, S. D., & Foster, J. (2011). Moral Education the CHARACTER"plus" Way[R]. *Journal of Moral Education*, 40(1), 51-72. doi:10.1080/03057240.2011.541770
- Marshall, J. C., Caldwell, S. D., & Foster, J. (2011). Moral education the CHARACTERplus way. *Journal of Moral Education*, 40(1), 51-72.
- Martin, D., & Martin, M. (2007). Implementing a family/school partnership in an urban elementary school to reduce negative behavior and increase academic achievement. *Family Therapy*, 34(3), 141-152.
- Matthews, T., Danese, A., Wertz, J., Ambler, A., Kelly, M., Diver, D., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., & Arseneault, L. (2015). Social isolation and mental health at primary and secondary school entry: a longitudinal cohort study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 54(3), 225-232.
- Miller, J. G., & Bersoff, D. M. (1992). Culture and moral judgment: How are conflicts between justice and interpersonal responsibilities resolved? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 541-554.
- Milnitsky-Sapiro, C., Turiel, E., & Nucci, L. (2006). Brazilian adolescents' concepts of autonomy and pa. *Cognitive Development*, 317-331.
- Milson, A. J. (2002). Elementary school teachers' sense of efficacy for character education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(1), 47-53.
- Milson, A. J., & Mehlig, L. M. (2002). Elementary school teachers' sense of efficacy for character education. *Journal of Educational Research*, 96(1), 47-54.
- Milson, A. J., & Mehlig, L. M. (2002). Elementary school teachers' sense of efficacy for character education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96, 47-53.

- Ministry of National Education (Turkish: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı). (1949). *1948 İlkokul programı*. İstanbul: MEB Basımevi.
- Mithra, H.G., 2001. Moral Education with Special Reference to Lawrence Kohlberg's Moral Development. *Indian Journal of Theology*, 43, 1-2.
- Mohanty, J. N. (2008). *The Philosophy of Edmund Husserl: A Historical Development*. London: Yale University Press.
- Moran, D. (2000). *Introduction to phenomenology*. New York: Routledge.
- Morgan, D. L. (2007). Paradigms lost and paradigms regained. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 48-76.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nefes, T. S. (2013). Ziya Gökalp's adaptation of Emile Durkheim's sociology in his formulation of the modern Turkish nation. *International Sociology*, 28(3), 335-350.
- Nisan, M., & Kohlberg, L. (1982). Universality and variation in moral judgment: A longitudinal and cross-sectional study in Turkey. *Child Development*, 53, 865-876.
- Nucci, L. (1996). Morality and the personal sphere of actions. In E. Reed, E. Turiel, & T. Brown, *Values and knowledge* (pp. 41-60). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nucci, L. (1981). The development of personal concepts: A domain distinct from moral and social concepts. *Child Development*, 52, 114-121.
- Nucci, L. (2008). Social cognitive domain theory and moral education. In *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 291-309). Routledge.
- Nucci, L., Krettenauer, T. & Narváez, D. (2014). *Handbook of moral and character education*. Routledge.
- Nucci, L. P., Camino, C., & Milnitsky-Sapiro, C. (1996). Social class effects on Northeastern Brazilian children's conceptions of areas of personal choice and social regulation. *Child Development*, 67, 1223-1242.
- Nucci, L., & Turiel, E. (1978). Social interactions and the development of social concepts in pre-school children. *Child Development*, 49, 400-407.
- Nucci, L. & Turiel, E., 2009. Capturing the complexity of moral development and education. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 3(3), 151-159.

- Nucci, L., Turiel, E., & Encarnacion-Gawrych, G. (1983). Children's social interactions and social concepts in the Virgin Islands. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 14, 469–487.
- OECD. (2013, June 20). *Education at a Glance 2013: OECD Indicators*. Retrieved from OECD: [http://www.oecd.org/edu/eag2013%20\(eng\)--FINAL%2020%20June%202013.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/edu/eag2013%20(eng)--FINAL%2020%20June%202013.pdf)
- Oktay, S. (2001). *A Multidimensional analysis of disparities between individuals moral*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent Üniversitesi/Ankara.
- Olson, K. R., & Dweck, C. S., (2008). A blueprint for social cognitive development. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(3), 193-202.
- Onur, B. (1976). *Ortaöğretimde ahlak eğitimi, ahlak eğitimi açısından lise son sınıflarda öğrenci-eğitimci ilişkilerini belirleyen koşulların araştırılması*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Oser, F. K., & Veugelers, W. (2003). *Teaching in moral and democratic education*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- Oxford English Dictionary. (n.d.). *Phenomenology*. Retrieved from Oxford English Dictionary: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/phenomenology>
- Paige, R. (2002). An overview of America's education agenda. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83(9), 708-716 .
- Pajares, E. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up the messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Parker, J. G., Rubin, K. H., Erath, S. A., Wojslawowicz, J. C., & Buskirk, A. A. (2006). Peer relationships, child development, and adjustment: A developmental psychopathology perspective. In D. Cicchetti, & D. J. Cohen, *Developmental psychopathology* (pp. 419-493). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Piaget, J. (1966). *The moral judgment of the child* (2nd ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Piaget, J. (1995). *Sociological studies*. London: Routledge.
- Plack, M. M. (2005). Human nature and research paradigms: Theory meets physical therapy practice. *The Qualitative Report*, 10(2), 223-245. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol10/iss2/3>

- Prestwich, D. L. (2004). Character education in America's schools. *The School Community Journal*, 14, 139-150.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Raz, J. (1986). *The Morality of Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raz, J. (1990). *Authority*. New York: New York University Press.
- Richardson, C. B., Mulvey, K. L. & Killen, M., (2012). Extending social domain theory with a process-based account of moral judgments. *Human Development*, 55(1), 4-25.
- Romanowski, M. H. (2005). Through the eyes of teachers: High school teachers' experiences with character education. *American Secondary Education*, 34(1), 6-23.
- Roulston, K. (2012). *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: the art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Rubin, K. H., Burgess, K. ..., Dwyer, K. M., & Hastings, P. D. (2003). Predicting preschoolers' externalizing behaviors from toddler temperament, conflict, and maternal negativity. *Developmental Psychology*, 39(1), 164-176.
- Ryan, K. (2001). The missing link's missing link. *Journal of Education*, 179(2), 81-90.
- Şahin, M. (2009). Cumhuriyet'in kuruluşundan günümüze hayat bilgisi dersi programlarının gelişimi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(8), 404-416.
- Sahin, M. C. (2012). Demokrat parti dönemi Türkiye'sinde din, siyaset ve eğitim ilişkileri. *Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(12), 31-54.
- Schmidt, M. F., Rakoczy, H. & Tomasello, M., (2012). Young children enforce social norms selectively depending on the violator's group affiliation. *Cognition*, 124(3), 325-333.
- Schrader, D., Tappan, M., Kohlberg, L., & Armon, C. (1987). Assessing heteronomous and autonomous moral types. In A. Colby, & L. Kohlberg, *The Measurement of Moral Judgment* (pp. 909-997). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Şemin, R. (1979). *Çocukta ahlaki gelişim ve ahlaki yargı* (2nd b.). İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Silverman, D. (2015). *Interpreting qualitative data*. London: Sage Publications.
- Skaggs, G., & Bodenhorn, N. (2006). Relationships between implementing charter education, student behavior, and student achievement. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 18(1), 82-114.
- Skinner, B. F. (1971). *Beyond freedom and dignity*. New York: Knopf.
- Smetana, J. G. (1981). Preschool conceptions of moral and social rules. *Child Development*, 52, 1333-1336.
- Smetana, J. G. (2006). Social domain theory: Consistencies and variations in children's moral and social judgments. In M. Killen, & J. G. Smetana, *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 119-153). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Smetana, J.G., Jambon, M. and Ball, C., (2014). The social domain approach to children's moral and social judgments. *Handbook of moral development*, pp.23-45.
- Smetana, J. G., Rote, W., Jambon, M., Tasopoulos-Chan, M., Villalobos, M., & Comer, J. (2012). Developmental changes and individual differences in young children's moral judgements. *Child Development*, 83, 683-696. doi:doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01714
- Smith, D. W. (2016). *Phenomenology*. (E. N. Zalta, Editor) Retrieved 03 31, 2017, from The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/phenomenology>
- Snell, M., Berlin, R., Voorhees, M., Stanton-Chapman, T., & Hadden, S. (2012). A survey of preschool staff concerning problem behavior and its prevention in head start classrooms. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 14(2), 98-107. Türk Dil Kurumu: <http://tdk.gov.tr> adresinden alındı
- Song, M. J., Smetana, J. G., & Kim, S. Y. (1987). Korean children's conceptions of moral and conventional transgression. *Developmental Psychology*, 23, 577-582.
- Sosyal Hizmetler ve Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu Kanunu. (1983, 5 27). 2882 Sayılı *Sosyal Hizmetler Kanunu*, 5(22). Ankara, Türkiye: Resmi Gazete. 5 13, 2017

tarihinde

<http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/Birimler/kanunlar/2882%20SAYILI%20SOSYAL%20H%20C4%B0ZMETLER%20KANUNU.pdf> adresinden alındı

- Stice, E., Shaw, H., Bohon, C., Marti, C. N., & Rohde, P. (2009). A Meta-Analytic Review of Depression Prevention Programs for Children and Adolescents: Factors that Predict Magnitude of Intervention Effects. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77(3), 486-503.
- Stone, C., & Dyal, M. (1997). School counselors sowing the seeds of character education. *Professional School Counseling*, 1-22.
- Sugawara, T., (2011). Emergence and stability of social conventions in conflict situations. *IJCAI*. 371-378.
- Taşkıran, T. (1943). *Türk ahlakının ilkeleri*. İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası.
- Tappan, M., Kohlberg, L., Schrader, D., Higgins, A., Armon, C., & Lei, T. (1987). Heteronomy and autonomy in moral development: Two types of moral judgment. In A. Colby, & L. Kohlberg, *The measurement of moral judgment* (Vol. I, pp. 315-380). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- The National Education Foundation Ordinance. (1973, 6 24). Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu (The National Education Foundation Ordinance). *Resmi Gazete*(14574), pp. 1-17. Retrieved 6 12, 2016, from http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/temkanun_0/temelkanun_0.html
- Thomas, M. T. (1997). *Moral development theories-secular and religious: A comparative study*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Tisak, M. S. (1995). Domains of social reasoning and beyond. *Annals of Child Development*, 11, 95-130.
- Turiel, E. (1974). Conflict and transition in adolescent moral development. *Child Development*, 45, 14-29.
- Turiel, E. (1975). The development of social concepts: Mores, customs, and conventions. In J. M. Foley, & D. J. Palma, *Moral development: Current theory and research* (pp. 7-38). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Turiel, E. (1977). Distinct conceptual and developmental domains: Social convention and morality. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, 25, pp. 77-116.
- Turiel, E. (1978). Social regulations and domains of social justice. In W. Damon, *Social cognition: New directions for child development* (pp. 45-74). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Turiel, E. (1983a). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Turiel, E. (2002). *The culture of morality: Social development, context, and conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Turiel, E. (2006). The development of morality. In W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner, *Handbook of child psychology* (6th ed., Vol. 3, pp. 789-857). New York: Wiley.
- Turiel, E. (2015). Moral development. In W. F. Overton, & P. C. Molenaar (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science* (7th ed., Vol. 1: Theory & Method).
- Turiel, E., & Killen, M. (2010). Taking emotions seriously: The role of emotions in moral development. In W. Arsenio, & E. A. Lemerise, *Emotions, aggression, and morality in children: Bridging development and psychopathology* (pp. 33-52). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Turiel, E., Edwards, C. P., & Kohlberg, L. (1978). Moral development in Turkish children, adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Crosscultural Psychology*, 9, 75-85.
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Character Education...Our Shared Responsibility*. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education: <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/character/brochure.pdf>
- Ugurel-Semin, R. (1952). Moral behavior and moral judgment of children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 47, 463-474.
- UNESCO. (n.d.). *Inclusion in education*. Retrieved from UNESCO.
- Veugelers, W., (2010). Moral values in teacher education. *International encyclopedia of education*, 7, 650-655.
- Wakefield, D. (1997). Who's teaching teachers about character education. *Current Issues in Middle Level Education*, 1-19.
- Watson, J. B. (1924). *Behaviorism*. New York: The People's Institute.
- Webb, S., & Webb, B. P. (1932). *Methods of social study*. London: Longmans, Green.
- Weston, D., & Turiel, E. (1980). Act-rule relations: children's concepts of social rules. *Developmental Psychology*, 16, 417-424.
- White, R., & Warfa, N. (2011). Building Schools of Character: A Case-Study Investigation of Character Education's Impact on School Climate, Pupil

- Behavior, and Curriculum Delivery. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(1), 45-60. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00701.x
- Willis, J. W. (2007). *Foundations of Qualitative Research: Interpretive and Critical Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri (Qualitative Research Methods in Social Sciences)*. (8th b.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.
- Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu. (2007, June). *Eğitim Fakültesi Öğretmen Yetiştirme: Lisans Programları*. Retrieved September 21, 2016, from Yüksek Öğretim Kurulu: <http://www.yok.gov.tr/documents/10279/30217/E%C4%9E%C4%B0T%C4%B0M+FAK%C3%9CLTES%C4%B0%20%C3%96%C4%9ERETMEN+YET%C4%B0%C5%9ET%C4%B0RME+L%C4%B0SANS+PROGRAMLAR I.pdf/054dfc9e-a753-42e6-a8ad-674180d6e382>
- Yau, J., & Smetana, J. G. (2003). Conceptions of moral, social conventional, and personal events among Chinese preschoolers in Hong Kong. *Child Development*, 74, 647-658.
- Yin, R. K. (2010). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. UK: Guilford Press.
- Yucel, H. A. (1959). *Felsefe dersleri*. İstanbul: Maarif Basımevi.
- Zelazo, P. D. (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of Developmental Psychology, Vol. 1: Body and Mind*. Oxford University Press.
- Zimba, R. F. (1987). *A study of forms of social knowledge in Zambia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (2004). *Building school success through social and emotional learning*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Consent Form

GÖNÜLLÜ KATILIM FORMU

Bu çalışma, ‘*okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin, çocukların ahlaki yargılarına dair inanışlarının incelenmesi*’ başlıklı bir araştırma çalışması olup *çocukların ahlaki ve toplumsal olaylara dair kavrayışlarını, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin bakış açısından değerlendirme* amacı taşımaktadır. Çalışma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Doktora öğrencisi, Muhammet Ali Karaduman tarafından yürütülmekte ve sonuçları ile ahlaki yargı ve ahlak eğitimi konularına dair bazı veriler sunması beklenmektedir.

Bu çalışmaya katılımınız gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır.

- Çalışmanın amacı doğrultusunda, yüz yüze görüşme yapılarak sizden veriler toplanacaktır.
- İsminizi yazmak ya da kimliğinizi açığa çıkaracak bir bilgi vermek zorunda değilsiniz. Araştırmada katılımcıların isimleri gizli tutulacaktır.
- Araştırma kapsamında toplanan veriler, sadece bilimsel amaçlar doğrultusunda kullanılacak, araştırmanın amacı dışında ya da bir başka araştırmada kullanılmayacak ve gerekmesi halinde, sizin yazılı izniniz olmadan başkalarıyla paylaşılmayacaktır.
- İstemeniz halinde sizden toplanan verileri inceleme hakkınız bulunmaktadır. Araştırmacı her görüşmenin yazıya dökülmesinin ardından, size ait dökümün bir kopyasını sizinle paylaşacaktır.
- Sizden toplanan veriler araştırmacı tarafından korunacak ve araştırma bitiminde arşivlenecek veya imha edilecektir.
- Veri toplama sürecinde size rahatsızlık verebilecek herhangi bir soru/talep olmayacaktır. Yine de katılımınız sırasında herhangi bir sebepten rahatsızlık hissederseniz çalışmadan istediğiniz zamanda ayrılabilirsiniz. Çalışmadan ayrılmanız durumunda sizden toplanan veriler çalışmadan çıkarılacak ve imha edilecektir.

Gönüllü katılım formunu okumak ve değerlendirmek üzere ayırdığınız zaman için teşekkür ederim. Çalışma hakkındaki sorularınızı Artvin Çoruh Üniversitesi Temel Eğitim Bölümünden Arş. Gör. Muhammet Ali Karaduman’a yöneltebilirsiniz.

Araştırmacı : Muhammet Ali Karaduman
Adres : Artvin Çoruh Üni. Eğitim Fakültesi, No:215, Artvin
İş Tel : 0466 215 1000-2347
Cep Tel : 0532 717 3941

Bu çalışmaya tamamen kendi rızamla, istediğim takdirde çalışmadan ayrılabilceğimi bilerek verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.

(Lütfen bu formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra araştırmacıya iade etmeyi unutmayınız. Teşekkürler)

Katılımcı Adı ve Soyadı:

İmza

Tarih:

Appendix B: Interview Protocols - INTERVIEW 1

- 1) ICEBREAKERS
 - a. Memleket,
 - b. Memleketinize dair en sevdiğiniz şey ne?
 - c. Kardeşiniz var mı?
 - i. Çocukluğunuzda kardeşlerinle nasıl vakit geçirirdiniz?
 - ii. En sevdiğiniz etkinlik neydi?
 - d. Çocukluğunuzda yazlarınızı nerede geçirirdiniz?
 - i. Neler yapardınız?
 - e. Bunu sadece ben yaparım dediğiniz eylemler var mı?
 - f. Yaptığınız en garip şey neydi?
- 2) Ailenizin size karşı tavırlarından bahseder misiniz?
 - a. Sizinle nasıl vakit geçirirlerdi?
 - b. Yaptığınız hatalara ne şekilde tepki verirlerdi?
 - c. Başarılarınıza/olumlu davranışlarınıza ne şekilde tepki verirlerdi?
- 3) Ne tür bir öğrenciydiniz?
 - a. Tecrübeleriniz ışığında, öğrenci olmayı nasıl tanımlıyorsunuz?
 - b. Bir öğrenci olarak güçlü ve zayıf yönleriniz nelerdi?
 - c. Öğrenciyken yaptığınız ama şimdi pişmanlık duyduğunuz tecrübeleriniz var mı?
- 4) Öğretmenlerinizin size ve arkadaşlarınıza karşı tavırları nasıldı?
 - a. Öğretmenleriniz öğrencilerin yaptığı hatalara ne şekilde tepki verirlerdi?
 - b. Öğretmenleriniz olumlu davranışlarınıza ne şekilde tepki verirlerdi?
- 5) Öğrenci davranışlarının olumlu ya da olumsuz olduğunu kim belirlerdi?
 - a. Bir davranışı olumlu ya da olumsuz diye tanımlarken kullandığınız kriterler nelerdi?
- 6) Okulda ve evde hayatımızı çevreleyen kurallar vardır. Sizin çocukluğunuzda evde hangi kurallar vardı?
- 7) Okuldaki kurallardan hatırladıklarınızı sayar mısınız?
- 8) Kurallar hakkında ne düşündüğünüzü merak ediyorum. Size göre bu kuralların hepsi aynı etkiye sahip miydi?
 - a. Kuralları sınıflar mıydınız?

b. Bu sınıflamayı yaparken dikkate aldığınız kriterler nelerdi?

Appendix C: Interview Protocols - INTERVIEW 2

- 1) Hangi bölümden mezun oldunuz?
- 2) Hangi üniversite?
- 3) Kaç yıldır öğretmenlik yapıyorsunuz?
- 4) Öğretmenliği nasıl seçtiniz?
- 5) Meslekteki ilk yılınız nasıldı? Nasıl özetlersiniz?
- 6) Meslekte geçirdiğiniz yıllar size ne kattı?
- 7) Çocuklarla zaman geçirmenin kolay ve zor tarafları neler?
- 8) Okul öncesi sınıfındaki çocuklar neler yapar?
 - a. Sizden sınıfınızda karşılaştığınız davranışları sınıflamanızı isteseydim bu sınıflandırmayı nasıl yapardınız?
 - b. Grupları nasıl isimlendirirdiniz?
 - c. Yani size göre sınıf içi davranışlar nasıl gruplanır?
- 9) Sınıfınızda meydana gelmesinden hoşlanmadığınız davranışları söyler misiniz?
 - a. Bu davranışların hepsini tanımlayan bir isim var mı?
- 10) Sınıfınızda karşılaştığınızda hoşunuza giden davranışlardan bahseder misiniz?
 - a. Bu davranışların hepsini tanımlayan bir isim var mı?
- 11) Sınıfınızda en sık karşılaştığınız 3 davranışı söyleyebilir misiniz? (Olumlu-Olumsuz)
- 12) Sınıfınızda meydana gelen ve size göre en kabul edilemez olan 3 davranışı söyleyebilir misiniz?

Appendix D: Interview Protocols - Interview 3

(Behaviors listed based on participant teachers' responses during the second interview)

1. Çocukların birbirine vurması:
2. Sınıftaki eşyalara ya da oyuncaklara zarar verilmesi:
3. Başkalarının eşyalarını izinsiz almak:
4. Tükürme
5. Sırayı bozma/Sıraya girmeme:
6. Yerinden kalkma ve sınıf içinde dolaşma:
7. Uygunsuz dil kullanma
8. Lakap takma
9. Elleriyle yemek yeme:
10. Uygunsuz giyinme

- i. Bu kabul edilebilir bir davranış mı?

Neden?

- ii. *(Genellenebilirlik)* Aynı davranış okul dışında bir ortamda meydana gelseydi kabul edilebilir miydi?

Neden bu şekilde düşündüğünüzü açıklayabilir misiniz?

- iii. *(Kuraldan bağımsız olma)* Bahsedilen davranış yasaklayan bir kural olmadığında, davranış kabul edilebilir miydi?

Neden bu şekilde düşündüğünüzü açıklayabilir misiniz?

- iv. *(Otoriteden bağımsız olma)* Bu davranış yetişkinlerin olmadığı bir ortamda meydana gelseydi, kabul edilebilir miydi?

Neden bu şekilde düşündüğünüzü açıklayabilir misiniz?

- v. *(Kural değişkenliği)* Yetişkinler bu davranış yasaklayan kuralı tam tersi yönde değiştirdiklerinde, davranış kabul edilebilir miydi?

Neden bu şekilde düşündüğünüzü açıklayabilir misiniz?

Sizece aynı davranışlar için çocukların yargıları ne şekildedir?

- i. Çocuklar bu davranış ile alakalı bir kural olduğunun farkındalar mı?

Neden?

- ii. (*Genellenebilirlik*) Davranış okul dışında bir ortamda meydana geldiğinde çocukların bu davranışa dair yargıları ne şekilde olurdu?

Neden bu şekilde düşündüğünüzü açıklayabilir misiniz?

- iii. (*Kuraldan bağımsız olma*) Bahsedilen davranışı yasaklayan bir kural olmadığında, çocukların bu davranışa dair yargıları ne şekilde olurdu?

Neden bu şekilde düşündüğünüzü açıklayabilir misiniz?

- iv. (*Otoriteden bağımsız olma*) Bu davranış yetişkinlerin olmadığı bir ortamda meydana gelseydi, çocukların bu davranışa dair yargıları ne şekilde olurdu?

Neden bu şekilde düşündüğünüzü açıklayabilir misiniz?

- v. (*Kural değişkenliği*) Yetişkinler bu davranışı yasaklayan kuralı tam tersi yönde değiştirdiklerinde, çocukların bu davranışa dair yargıları ne şekilde olurdu?

Neden bu şekilde düşündüğünüzü açıklayabilir misiniz?

Appendix E: Approval of Human Subjects Ethics Committee

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
ueam@metu.edu.tr
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 / 299

11 MAYIS 2018

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Doç.Dr. Feyza ERDEN

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız Muhammet Ali KARADUMAN'ın **"Turkish preschool teachers' beliefs on children's conception of social conventional and moral events"** başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay **2018-EGT-076** protokol numarası ile **11.05.2018 - 30.12.2018** tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN

Başkan V

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL

Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR

Üye

Doç. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI

Üye

Doç. Dr. Zana ÇITAK

Üye

Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK

Üye

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

Appendix F: Curriculum Vitae

M. Ali Karaduman

+90 (532) 717-3941, makaraduman@gmail.com

EDUCATION

Middle East Technical University (METU)	Ankara, Turkey
<i>PhD, Early Childhood Education</i>	July 2018
Research Interests: Early Childhood Education, Social Domain Theory, Moral Reasoning, Social Understanding, Teachers' Beliefs, Morality, Social Conventions	
Dissertation: Turkish preschool teachers' beliefs about children's conception of social conventional and moral events	
University of California, Berkeley	Berkeley, CA, USA
<i>Visiting Research Student</i>	Feb-Dec 2015
Advisor: Prof. Dr. Elliot Turiel	
METU	Ankara, Turkey
<i>M.S., Early Childhood Education</i>	December, 2011
Thesis: Pre-service early childhood education teachers' attitudes towards the profession of early childhood education in terms of sex and gender role	
METU	Ankara, Turkey
<i>B.A., Early Childhood Education</i>	June 2008

SELECTED GRANTS AND HONORS

• Scientific Research Projects Grant, METU	2016-18
• Faculty Development Programme, State Planning Organization, Turkey	2009-18
• PhD Research Scholarship, TUBITAK (National Science Foundation of Turkey)	2015-16
• Scientific Research Projects Grant, METU	2009-11
• METU Alumni Merit Scholarship, METU	2007-08
• SONMAK Merit Scholarship, METU	2002-08

PUBLICATIONS

Karaduman, M. A. & Erden, F. (in preparation). A categorization of preschool children's in-class behaviors.	
Karaduman, M. A. & Erden, F. (in preparation). Early childhood education teachers' beliefs about children's conception of moral and social conventional events.	
Karaduman, M. A., Garip, B. & Cansu-Kurt, U. (in preparation). 'Teaching engineering self-efficacy scale (TESS) for K-12 teachers': Turkish adaptation.	
Güney-Karaman, N., Karaduman, M. A., Turiel, E., & Acar, M. (in preparation) Turkish children's conception of moral and conventional rules.	
Karaduman, M. A. (in preparation). Sosyal Alan Kuramı (Social Domain Theory).	
Karaduman, M. A. (in preparation). Kapsamlı bir inceleme: Lawrence Kohlberg.	

- Güney-Karaman, N., Turiel, E., Acar, M., & **Karaduman, M. A.** (Projelendirme aşamasında). Turkish children's conception of moral and social conventional rules
- Karaduman, M. A.** (2018). Pre-service ECE teachers' attitudes towards their profession in terms of sex and gender role. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

- Karaduman, M. A.** (May 2018). Turkish early childhood teachers' beliefs about children's moral and social conventional judgments. *Jean Piaget Society 48th Annual conference*,
- Karaduman, M. A.** (Agust 2014). ECE teachers' perceptions about science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) integration. *European Conference on Educational Research (ECER)*
- Karaduman, M. A.** (2014). Preschool teachers' environmental literacy levels: effect of eco- school application. *European Conference on Educational Research (ECER)*
- Karaduman, M. A.** (July 2014). Assessing the early childhood education teachers' environmental literacy level in Ankara, Turkey. *World Organization for Early Childhood Education (OMEPE) International Conference*
- Karaduman, M. A.,** Garip, B. & Cansu Kurt, Ü. (2013). Assessing the needs of elementary science and mathematics education teachers about engineering aspect of STEM. *The International Organization for Science and Technology Education (IOSTE)*
- Karaduman, M. A.,** Kiran, D. & Çetinkaya, G. (2013). A comparison of nature of science understandings of preservice early childhood and science teachers. *European Conference on Educational Research (ECER)*
- Karaduman, M. A.,** & Olgan, R. (2012). Pre-service early childhood education teachers' attitudes towards the profession of early childhood education in terms of sex and gender role. *European Conference on Educational Research (ECER)*

TRANSLATIONS IN PROGRESS

- Berger, E. H. & Riojas-Cortez, M. (2016). *Parents as partners in education: Families and schools working together* (9th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, with Dr. Zeynep Berna Erdiller-Yatmaz, Dr. Hasibe Özlen Demircan, Dr. Tuğçe Karaduman, Dr. Şenil Ünlü-Çetin, Dr. Çağla Şendil, Dr. Ramazan Sak, Dr. İkbāl Sak, Dr. Asiye Parlak-Rakap, Dr. Zeynep Temiz, Dr. Tuba Ocal and Dr. Metehan Buldu
- Morrison, G. S. (2018). *Early childhood education today*. (14th ed.). New York: Pearson. with Assoc. Dr. Sibel Sonmez, Dr. Tugce Akyol, Aysun Turupcu Dogan, Gamze Bilir Seyhan, Irem Gurgah Ogul, Tugce Karaduman, Umran Alan, Hatice Berna Ture Kose, and Isil Betul Kolasinli
- Turiel, E. (2015). Moral development. In W. F. Overton & P. C. Molenaar (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science, Vol. 1: Theory & method*, (7th ed.). Editor-in-chief: R. M. Lerner (pp. 484-522). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

- **Instructor**, Early Childhood Education (Self-designed), Artvin Coruh University (Spring 2017).
- Received 4,71/5 average rating for teaching effectiveness from student evaluations.
- **Instructor**, Early Childhood Education (Self-designed), Artvin Coruh University (Spring 2016). Received 4,64/5 average rating for teaching effectiveness from student evaluations.
- **Teaching Fellow**, Classroom Management and Discipline in ECE, METU, (2011-2014)
- **Teaching Fellow**, Probability and Statistics, METU, (Fall, 2016)

- **Teaching Fellow**, Practice Teaching, METU, (2016)
- **Teaching Fellow**, Maternal and Child Health & First Aid, METU, (Spring 2014)
- **Teaching Fellow**, School readiness and transition to elementary school, METU, (2012-2014)
- **Teaching Fellow**, Parent Involvement and Education, METU, (2009=2011)
- **Teaching Fellow**, Introduction to Early Childhood Education, METU, (2009-2011)

SKILLS

- Proficient in statistical analysis and software (SPSS)
- Basic use of qualitative data analysis software (Atlas.ti)
- Turkish (Mother tongue), English (Fluent), German (Basic)

SERVICE AND AFFILIATIONS

- **Reviewer**, Studies in Educational Research and Development (SERD)
- **Reviewer**, Turkish Journal of Social Research (TSAD)
- **Member**, The Children's Foundation of Turkey
- **Member**, The Association of Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect of Turkey
- **Member**, The Turkish Foundation for Combating Soil Erosion, for Reforestation and the Protection of Natural Habitats (The TEMA Foundation)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- | | |
|--|--|
| Faculty of Education, Artvin Coruh University | Artvin, Turkey |
| <i>Instructor</i> | January, 2017 - present |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and Implement undergraduate classes for preservice primary education teachers | |
| Faculty of Education, METU | Ankara, Turkey |
| <i>Research and Teaching Fellow</i> | Aug. 2009-Dec. 2016 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist in preparation and implementation of undergraduate classes • Participate in planning and conducting research related to teacher training | |
| Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley | Berkeley, CA, USA |
| <i>Visiting Research Fellow</i> | Jan.-Dec. 2015 |
| TUBITAK (National Science Foundation of Turkey) | Kocaeli and Ankara, Turkey |
| <i>Instructor (Robotics)</i> | Summer, 2007; Spring, 2008; Summer, 2008 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and implement robotics workshops for primary grade children | |

Appendix G: Turkish Summary / Türkçe Özet

Giriş

Ahlak, insanlık için din, siyaset, toplumsal yapı ve kültür açısından önem taşıyan bir konudur. Bu bağlamda uzun zamandır ahlak ve bireylerdeki gelişimi antropoloji, sosyoloji ve psikoloji alanlarının ilgisini çekmiştir. Ahlak, Sokrat, Aristo ve Plato'dan beri felsefe için de önemli bir konudur. Bu düşünürlerin ahlâki felsefe alanındaki eserleri, Immanuel Kant, John Stuart Mill, Adam Smith ve David Hume gibi daha sonra gelen filozofların klasik eserleri gibi hala incelenmekte ve tartışılmaktadır. Ahlak felsefesinin psikolojik teorilere taşınan tartışmalarından biri, ahlaki pratik ve kararlarda akıl yürütme ve duyguların rolü ve önemi üzerinedir. Brandt (1959) ve Frankena (1963) tarafından da tartışıldığı üzere, Kant ve Hume, akıl yürütme ve duygular üzerine farklı bakış açılarıyla kendi geleneklerini şekillendirmişlerdir. Kant, ahlaki kararları yönlendiren akıl yürütmenin duygulardan bağımsız çalıştığını vurgular. Öte yandan Hume, ahlaki değerlerin sempati gibi bazı duygulardan kaynaklandığını düşünmektedir. Geleneksel olarak tartışılan bir diğer konu da ahlakın toplumsal sistemler, kültürler ve hatta bireylere göre olup olmadığı ya da insanların birbirlerine nasıl davranması gerektiği konusundaki somut yargıları içerdiği için bağlamlar arasında evrensel olarak uygulanabilirliği konusudur. Bu bağlamdaki tartışmalar günümüzde de devam etmektedir (Benedict, 1934; Hatch, 1983; Kohlberg, 1971; MacIntyre, 1981; Shweder, 1982).

Her ne kadar duyguların ve akıl yürütmenin ahlak kavramı içindeki yeri hakkında tartışmalara devam etse de bazı düşünürlere göre ahlak, 'duyguların ahlaki yargı ve akıl yürütme için çok önemli olduğu' gibi bir değerlendirmedense 'insanlar akıl yürütme süreçlerini içeren yargılarda bulunur' gibi daha sağlam temelleri olan bir bakış açısıyla tahlil edilmelidir. Rawls (1993), Nussbaum (1999, 2000), Dworkin (1977, 1993), Gewirth (1978, 1982), Habermas (1993), Okin (1989) ve Walzer (2007) bu filozofların en ünlülerinden birkaç tanesidir. Bu kişilerce tanımlanan ve tahlil edilen

ahlaki hususlar, insan refahını ve eşit muamele unsurlarını besleyen adalet, sivil haklar ve özgürlükler gibi konuları içermektedir.

Tüm ahlak düşünürleri aynı bakış açısına sahip değildir hatta bu durumdan çok uzaktadırlar ancak hepsinin birden kabul ettiği bazı temel dayanaklar bulunmaktadır. Bunlardan biri insanın düşünen ve yargıda bulunan bir varlık olduğudur. Nussbaum (1999) tarafından belirtildiği üzere, insanlar tüm akılcı varlıkların üstündedir ve akıl yürütme onuru insan eşitliğinin başlıca kaynağıdır. Sen (1999) ekonomik gelişme ve insan özgürlüğü üzerine yaptığı tezinde, mantığa vurgu yapmaya devam ederek, adalet duygusunun yargı, düşünce ve çıkarsamayı içerdiğini savunur: “çıkarlarımızı ve avantajlarımız kadar yükümlülüklerimiz ve ideallerimizi de göz önüne almamıza sebep olan akıl yürütmenin gücüdür. Düşünce özgürlüğünü inkâr etmek, akılcılığımızın ulaştığı alan üzerinde ciddi bir kısıt oluşturacaktır” (s.272). Akıl yürütme, seçim yapma ve toplumsal durumlara uyma anlamına da gelmektedir. Sen (2006), insan hayatını yöneten merkezin seçme ve akıl yürütme sorumlulukları olduğunu iddia etmektedir.

Turiel (1977; 2015), ahlak kavramını toplumsal etkileşim içerisindeyken meydana gelen davranışlar ve bu davranışları kontrol eden mekanizmalar olarak tanımlar. Bu tanımlama daha önce Piaget (1966) ve Kohlberg (1969) tarafından yapılan tanımlamalara paralellik göstermektedir. Bilindiği gibi Piaget dışa-bağımlılık ve özerklik olarak ikiye ayırdığı ahlak gelişimini, kişinin toplumsal yapıları anlamaya çalıştığı ve bilişsel gelişime paralel olarak yorumlayıp davranışa döktüğü bir süreç olarak tanımlar. Piaget tarafından ortaya atılan ahlaki gelişim modeli, Kohlberg (1969) tarafından tekrar yorumlanmış ve 3 dönemli ve 6 basamaktan oluşan yeni bir modelden bahsedilmiştir. Bu modele göre kişi tamamen dış etkenler bağlamında meydana gelen ahlaki yargı süreçlerinden başlayan ve sonunda sadece evrensel doğruların etkin olduğu bir düşünce yapısına ulaşılan basamaklar boyunca ilerler. Ancak Kohlberg (1969), beşinci ve altıncı basamağa herkesin ulaşamayacağını iddia etmektedir.

Mevcut çalışmaya temel oluşturan sosyal alan kuramı (Social Domain Theory), pek çok ahlak gelişimi ve ahlak felsefesi bakış açılarından etkilenmiştir ancak Piaget (1966) ve Kohlberg (1969;1971) tarafından tanımlanan ahlaki yargı bu kuram için önemli bir dayanak noktasıdır. Sosyal alan kuramı, ahlaki yargı ve akıl

yürütme sonucu ortaya çıkan iki alan tanımlar: ahlaki alan (moral domain) ve toplumsal-geleneksel alan (social conventional domain) (Nucci & Powers, 2014; Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015). Sosyal alan kuramcıları bu iki alana dair genel bir çerçeve çizmişlerdir. Bu bağlamda, ahlaki alan fenalık, toplumsal haklar ve özgürlükler ve eşitlik kavramları üzerinden tanımlanır. Ahlak kavramının en önemli özelliği toplumsal etkilere karşı dirençli olmasıdır. Yani, otorite etkisi, kurallar ve/veya kültürel bağlam ahlaki alan üzerinde etkiye sahip değildir ve bu durum evrenselidir. Toplumsal-geleneksel alan ise tamamen o anda içerisinde bulunan toplumsal yapıya göre şekillenen yargı süreçlerini ifade eder. Yapılan çalışmalar şiddet içeren vurma, itme, ısırma, hakaret etme gibi davranışları ahlaki alan içerisinde tanımlarken; kültürel yapılar göre şekillenebilecek büyüklere abi/abla deme ya da statü olarak kendimizden yukarıda olanlara siz diyerek hitap etme gibi davranışları toplumsal-geleneksel alan içerisinde tanımlar. Bahsi geçen çerçeveler, çocuklar, ergenler ve yetişkinlerle yapılan çalışmalarda katılımcıların davranışlara dair yaptıkları ahlaki yargılamalar (judgment) ve gerekçelendirmeler (justifications) üzerinden çizilmiştir.

Yapılan pek çok çalışmada çocuklar oyun alanlarında ve okullarda gözlemlenmiştir. Gözlemler çocuklar günlük rutinleri içerisindeyken yapılmaktadır. İstenmedik bir davranış meydana geldiğinde araştırmacılarından bir tanesi olayı gözlemleyen bir çocuğa yaklaşır ve bazı sorular sorarak davranışa dair ahlaki yargılarını anlamaya çalışır. Çocukların ahlaki yargılarının anlaşılması amacıyla ‘Bu davranış doğru mu?’ ve ‘bu davranışa yönelik bir kural var mı?’ soruların takip eden; ‘Okul dışında bunu yapmak doğru olur muydu?’, ‘Bu davranışa yönelik bir kural olmasaydı ne olurdu?’ ya da ‘Bu kural değiştirilebilir mi?’ ve ‘Kural olmasına rağmen öğretmen ya da ebeveynler yapmana izin verseydi ne olurdu?’ sorularına verilen cevaplar ve bu cevaplara ilişkin gerekçelendirmeler kullanılmıştır. Bu sorular sırasıyla genellenebilirlik (generalizability), kurala bağılılık (rule independence) ve otoriteye bağılılık (authority independence) bağlamındaki ahlaki yargıların (moral judgment) anlaşılmasına yöneliktir (Jambon & Smetana, 2016; Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015). Yetişkinler ve ergenler ile yapılan çalışmalarda ise hikayeler ya da video gösterimleri

kullanılmıştır. İzletilen ya da anlatılan olay bağlamında ahlaki yargıları değerlendirilmiştir.

Gelişim yaklaşımlarında, bulguların eğitim alanına aktarılmasında zaman zaman sorunlarla karşılaşmaktadır (Nucci & Turiel, 2009). Aslında olan aktarmada yaşanan sorun değil de nasıl aktarılacağına belirlenememesi olabilir. Benzer bir durum sosyal alan kuramı için de geçerlidir (Nucci & Turiel, 2009). Özellikle Nucci ve Smetana bu bağlamda çeşitli çalışmalar yapmışlardır (Nucci & Powers, 2014; Nucci & Turiel, 2009; Smetana, 2006).

Eğitim kurumları toplumsal değişimin sağlanması ve ahlaki ve toplumsal değerlerin nesilden nesile aktarılması bağlamında önemli bir aygıttır (Velea & Farca, 2013). Berkowitz'e (2012) göre okul ahlaki, toplumsal ve kültürel değerlerin aktarılması amacıyla kullanılması gereken çok değerli bir kaynaktır çünkü okulun akademik bilgileri vermek dışında böyle bir amacı da vardır. Okulun ahlak gelişimine nasıl bir katkı sunması gerektiğine dair iki baskın görüş ortaya çıkmıştır. Bunlar öğretmen merkezli ve anlatıma dayalı öğretim yöntemi ve yaparak ve yaşayarak öğrenmeye dayalı, karşılıklı iletişimin ve etkileşimin önemli olduğu çocuk merkezli öğretim yöntemidir. Yapılan çalışmalar (Berkowitz, 2012; Harecker, 2012; Nucci & Powers, 2014) hangi yöntem kullanılırsa kullanılsın okulun toplumsal ve ahlaki değerlerin kazandırılmasında vazgeçilmez bir kaynak olduğunu göstermektedir çünkü çocuklar okulda hayata dair sorunlar yaşamakta ve bu sorunlara dair çözümler üretmektedirler. Dolayısıyla okul çocuklara toplumsal beceriler kazanma yolunda fırsatlar sunmaktadır.

OECD verilerine göre çocukları yılın yaklaşık 800 saatini okulda geçirmektedirler. Bu sürenin önemli bir bölümü sınıfta öğretmenle geçen zamandır. Doğal olarak öğretmen ahlak eğitiminde en önemli unsurlardan birisidir. Öğretmen sınıf içinde süreçleri yöneten ve çocukları yönlendiren kişi olarak karşımıza çıkar. Aynı zamanda çocuklar tarafından model alınan en önemli yetişkin öğretmenlerdir. Öğretmenin sınıf yönetimi yaklaşımı, istenmedik davranışlara verdiği tepkiler, öğrencilerle iletişimi ve konuyu anlatırken kullandığı yöntemler çocuklar tarafından gözlemlenir ve benzer durumlarda kullanılmak üzere repertuarlarına eklenir. Yani

öğretmenin sınıf içinde attığı her adım, toplumsal alanı şekillendiren önemli bir kaynak olarak karşımıza çıkar.

Öğretmenin, öğretmenlik mesleği, anlattığı konular ve öğrencilere yaklaşımını belirleyen unsurlardan biri, belki de en önemlisi, öğretmenin bu kavramlara ilişkin inanışlarıdır (Pajares, 1992). İnanışlar uzun zamandır çalışılmasına rağmen halen ortak bir tanım üzerinde uzlaşamamıştır (Galvin, 2012) ancak gözlemlenebilir davranışlarımızın ardındaki zihinsel süreçler olduğu söylenebilir (Galanter, 1989). Daha anlaşılır bir çerçeve çizebilmek ve sınırları belirlemek adına mevcut çalışmada inanış dendiğinde bir şeyin/durumun doğru olduğuna dair sahip olunan bilinçli ya da bilinçsiz bakış açısı ya da anlayıştan bahsedilmektedir (Galvin, 2012). Benzer bir durum öğretmen inanışları için de geçerlidir, dolayısıyla bu kavrama dair bir çerçeve de çizilmesi gerekmektedir. Haser (2006), öğretmen inanışlarını, öğretmenin sınıf içindeki gözlemlenebilir davranışlarının ardındaki zihinsel süreçler olarak tanımlamaktadır. Öğretmen inanışları evrenseldir ve her ortamda aynı kalma eğilimindedir (Pajares, 1992) çünkü bu süreçleri ortaya çıkaran şey öğretmenlerin kişisel tecrübeleridir. Öğretmenler öğrettikleri her konu hakkında o konuya özel inanışlara sahiptir (Borg, 2001) çünkü öğretmen inanışları sadece okul dışındaki yaşam tecrübelerinden değil öğretmenlik tecrübelerinden de etkilenir.

Bu çalışmaya temel olan sosyal alan kuramı kişilerin çocukluktan itibaren toplumsal-geleneksel olan ile ahlaki olanı birbirinden ayırdığını söylemektedir (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015). Daha önce de belirtildiği üzere bu bulgular gelişim çalışmaları için değerli olmakla birlikte eğitim çalışmalarında nasıl kullanılacağına dair daha fazla çalışma yapılmasına ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır (Nucci & Turiel, 2009). Mevcut çalışma bu bağlamda yapılmış çalışmalardan biridir. Çalışma sırasında öğretmenlerin toplumsal-geleneksel ve ahlaki olaylara ilişkin kavrayışlarından (conception) sonra öğretmenlerin çocukların kavrayışlarına dair inanışları incelenmektedir. Bu sayede sosyal alan araştırmalarından elde edilen bulguların sınıf içi kullanımına dair literatüre katkı sağlanması planlanmaktadır. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmanın yapılmasının amacı okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin, çocukların ahlaki ve toplumsal-geleneksel olaylara dair kavrayışlarının incelenmesidir. Amaca ulaşılmasına katkı sağlanması amacıyla öğretmenlerin sınıf içi davranışları ne şekilde

sınıflandırdığı da incelenmiştir. Bunun yanında öğretmenlerin kendi kavrayışları da incelenmiş bu sayede literatüre katkı sağlanırken, temel araştırma sorusu için de temel oluşturması amaçlanmıştır.

Bu çalışma yapılmaya değer ve önemli bir çalışma olarak kabul edilmektedir. Bu görüş üç temel üzerinde durur.

1. Çocukların ahlaki yargılarına dair öğretmen inanışlarını inceleyen çalışmaların sayısı artırılmalıdır. Sosyal alan kuramı bağlamında daha fazla çalışmaya ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır.
2. Sosyal alan kuramına dair kültürel çeşitlilik sunması açısından bu çalışma dikkate değer bir çalışma olarak gözükmektedir.
3. Sosyal alan çalışmaları genelde gözlem ve varsayıma dayalı hikayeler üzerinden yürütülmektedir. Mevcut çalışmada sınıf içi davranışlar öğretmenler tarafından tanımlanmıştır. Bu davranışlar üzerinden mevcut çalışma yürütülmüştür. Seidman (2006) bu tarz çalışmaların daha net ve kapsamlı bilgi sağlaması bakımından önemli olduğunu düşünmektedir.

Yöntem

Bu çalışma yorumlayıcı fenomenolojik bir çalışmadır. Bireysel gerçeklik çalışmanın temelini oluşturur. Çalışmada kullanılan fenomen ahlaki yargıdır. Ahlaki yargı fenomeninin, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin bireysel tecrübelerinden yararlanılarak anlamlandırılması amaçlanmaktadır. Dolayısıyla bu çalışma aynı zamanda tanımlayıcı bir çalışmadır yani öğretmen inanışlarına dair bireysel tecrübelerden yola çıkarak oluşturulan bir anlamlandırma çalışmasıdır denebilir.

Örneklem

Yukarıda belirtildiği gibi bu fenomenolojik çalışma, katılımcılarının deneyimlerinin tanımlanması amacıyla yapılmıştır. Katılımcıların açıklamaları sayesinde araştırmacı araştırma sorularına cevap aramaktadır. Dolayısıyla, araştırmanın amaçlarına uygun, zengin ve yararlı veri sağlayabilecek bireylerden veri toplamak önemlidir (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Bryman, 2012; Silverman, 2000). Çünkü araştırmacı bu şekilde bir fenomene aşina olan bireylerden topladığı verilerle bu bireylerin deneyimlerine dayanan geniş bir tanımlama yapabilir (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Nicel çalışmalarda karşımıza çıkan genelleme kaygılarından uzaklaşarak konu

ve temel fenomen hakkında verimli bilgi sağlayacağı düşünölen katılımcıların seçimi ön plana çıkar (Bogdan ve Biklen, 2007; Bryman, 2012; Flick, 2009; Irving, 2006; Silverman, 2000; Smith, 2016; Willis, 2007). Sonuç olarak, temel fenomen olan ahlaki yargı hakkında çocukların kavrayışlarını okul öncesi öğretmenlerin gözünden inceleyebilmek adına amaçlı örneklem yöntemi kullanılmıştır.

Örneklem tanımlanırken hiçbir kültürel kimlik dikkate alınmamıştır ancak pilot çalışma sırasında katılımcıların tamamı, *öğretmen gibi hissetmek* ve *çocukları tanımak* için belirli bir süre geçmesi gerektiğini vurgulamışlardır. Bunun üzerine çalışmanın verileri, 5 yıldan fazla öğretmenlik tecrübesi olan okul öncesi öğretmenlerinden toplanmıştır. Toplamda 81 öğretmene kartopu yöntemiyle ulaşılmış ve çalışmaya katılmaya gönüllü olan 38 kişiyle çalışma başlatılmıştır. Ancak dört katılımcı daha sonra çekilmek istediklerini belirtmiştir. Geriye kalan 34 öğretmenin sekiz tanesiyle pilot çalışma tamamlanmıştır. Pilot çalışma yardımıyla görüşme süreçleri ve soruları tanımlanmıştır. Sonuç olarak mevcut çalışma 34 katılımcı öğretmen ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Öğretmenlerin 20 tanesi özel ve 14 tanesi devlet okulunda çalışmaktadır. Ana çalışmada yer alan öğretmenler ise 14 özel kurum ve 12 devlet okulu çalışanıdır. Öğretmenler beş farklı ilde çalışmaktadır: Samsun (14), Ankara (12), Trabzon (4), Artvin (2) ve Rize (2). Bunun yanında 27 öğretmen üniversitelerin okul öncesi öğretmenliği bölümünden ve yedi öğretmen çocuk gelişimi ve eğitim bölümünden mezun olmuştur. Altı öğretmenin okul öncesi eğitimi bölümünden yüksek lisans diploması bulunmaktadır. Bu öğretmenlerden bir tanesi aynı bölümde doktora eğitimine devam etmektedir.

Veri Toplama Yöntemleri ve Süreci

Ana çalışmanın verisi, Seidman (2006) tarafından tarifi yapılmış olan üçlü görüşme yöntemi kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Görüşme süreçleri planlanırken Seidman (2006) tarafından hazırlanmış yönergeler dikkate alınmıştır. Bunun yanında literatürdeki sosyal alan kuramı çalışmaları (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015) ve öğretmen inanişına dair çalışmalar incelenmiştir. Bütün görüşmeler yarı yapılandırılmıştır süreçlerden oluşmaktadır. Görüşmeler 20-60 dakika arasında sürmektedir. Görüşmelerin yeri ve zamanı katılımcılar tarafından belirlenmiş ve biri dışındakiler katılımcıların çalıştığı kurumdaki yönetici odasında gerçekleşmiştir. Görüşmeler

arasında 2-10 gün arası boşluklar bulunmaktadır. Seidman (2006) görüşmeler arası boşlukların 5 günü geçmemesini tavsiye eder ancak mevcut çalışmada, 3. görüşme, 1. ve 2. görüşmede toplanan veri temel alarak oluşturulmuştur. Dolayısıyla ilk iki görüşmeden toplanan verinin analiz edilmesi ve son görüşme süreçlerinin hazırlanması için süreç uzatılmıştır.

Yukarıda bahsedildiği üzere data toplanırken üç farklı görüşme süreci kullanılmıştır. Birinci görüşmede temel amaç öğretmenlerle yakınlık kurmak ve öğretmenlerin toplumsal ve ahlaki gelişimine ilişkin bireysel tecrübelerine dair farkındalık oluşturmaktır. Bu sayede ikinci ve üçüncü görüşmelerde daha detaylı veri elde edilmesi amaçlanmaktadır (Seidman, 2006). Katılımcı öğretmenlerle daha sıcak bir ortam oluşturmak ve görüşme sürecinde daha rahat olmalarını sağlamak için ilk görüşme dikkatle hazırlanmıştır. Katılımcılarla görüşmeden önce kişiler hakkında bilgi toplanmış ve sorulara eklemeler yapılmıştır. Örneğin, en büyük hobisi örgü olarak tanımlanan bir katılımcıyla görüşmeden önce örgü hakkında bilgi toplanmış ve bu konuya yönelik sorular sürece eklenmiştir.

İkinci görüşmede öğretmenlerin sınıfta karşılaştıkları öğrenci davranışlarını listelemeleri ve sınıflandırmaları istenmiştir. Bu bölümün amacı, katılımcı öğretmenlerin sosyal ve ahlaki gelişim bağlamındaki öğretmenlik deneyimlerini somut detayları ile yeniden yapılandırmaya yardım etmektir (Seidman, 2006). Bu yüzden ikinci görüşmede öğretmenlerin sınıf içi deneyimleri üzerinde yoğunlaşıldı yani ilgili deneyimlerin detaylarına ulaşmak temel hedefti. Ayrıca, bu görüşme, katılımcı öğretmenlerin hem kişisel hem de mesleki deneyimleri ışığında çocuk davranışlarını ve sınıf içi ihlal durumlarını nasıl tanımladıklarını ve sınıflandırdıklarını anlamak için kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen veri üçüncü görüşmede kullanılmak üzere düzenlenmiştir.

Üçüncü görüşmede ise çalışmanın öncelikli araştırma sorusuna cevap aranmıştır. Bu görüşmede ikinci görüşmeden elde edilen veri doğrultusunda sınıflandırılmış davranışlar öğretmenlere sunulmuştur. Öğretmenlere sosyal alan kuramında kullanılan ahlaki yargı ve gerekçelendirme soruları sorulmuştur; yani bir davranış belirtilmiş, bu davranışa dair görüşleri ve gerekçeleri istenmiştir. Daha sonra bu davranışa dair bir kural olup olmadığı sorulmuştur. Ardından ‘Bu davranış okul

dışında meydana gelse ne olurdu?', 'Kural olmasaydı ne olurdu?' ve 'Öğretmen ya da ebeveynlerden biri izin verseydi ne olurdu?' soruları sorulmuş ve öğretmenlerin cevaplarını gerekçelendirmeleri istenmiştir. Ardından öğretmenlerin aynı davranışları öğrencilerin bakış açısından değerlendirmesi istenmiştir.

Özetle, ilk iki görüşmede katılımcıların sosyal ve ahlaki gelişim bağlamındaki anı ve deneyimlerini yansıtabilmeleri için uygun bir ortam hazırlanmaya çalışılmıştır. Son görüşme ise katılımcıların mesleki deneyimlerini yansıtmaları için teşvik etmek amacıyla hazırlanmış ve uygulanmıştır. Sonuç olarak ilk iki görüşme, katılımcıların temel fenomeni anlamasına ve geçmiş anılarını yorumlamasına ve yeniden yapılandırmasına yardımcı olmak; son görüşme de çalışmanın temel sorusunu cevaplamak ve sonuç çıkarmak içindir.

Veri Analizi

Veri analizi, nitel çalışmalarda en zorlayıcı süreçlerdendir. Mevcut çalışmada yaklaşık 55 saatlik sözel veri toplanmıştır. Veri analiz süreci tüm görüşmelerin dökümünün hazırlanmasıyla başladı. Veri toplama süreçlerinde anlatıldığı üzere, ilk iki görüşme tamamlanır tamamlanmaz dökümü oluşturuldu ve yazıya döküldü. Döküm tamamlandıktan sonra, veriye aşinalık oluşması adına yazılı metin birkaç kez okundu. Görüşme verilerinin ve ilgili literatürün incelenmesinin ardından bulgular iki farklı bölüme ayrılmıştır: sınıf içi davranışların tanımları ve sınıflandırılması ve okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin kavrayışları ve çocukların kavrayışlarına ilişkin inançları. Daha sonra açık kodlama yöntemi kullanılarak benzer kategoriler oluşturulmuş ve kodlar bu kategoriler altında toplanmıştır. İkinci görüşme sonucunda iki kategori oluşturulmuştur: (1) istendik davranışlar ve (2) istenmedik davranışlar. Ardından katılımcıların tanımlamaları temel alınarak davranışlar bu kategoriler altına dağıtılmıştır. Ardından benzer süreçler son görüşmeden elde edilen veri için tekrarlanmıştır. Bu verilerden elde edilen veriler sonucunda üç kategori altında toplam yedi kod belirlenmiştir. Kategoriler ve içine aldığı kodlar şu şekildedir: (1) Fenalık (Harm)- (a) fiziksel fenalık, (b) psikolojik fenalık; (2) İstismar – (a) Eşitlik/Adalet, (b) Refah; (3) Toplumsal/geleneksel yapılar – (a) Genellenebilirlik, (b) Otoriteye bağlılık, (c) Kurala bağlılık.

Veri analizi Moustakas (1994) tarafından hazırlanmış yönergeler doğrultusunda tamamlanmıştır.

Bulgular ve Tartışma

Mevcut çalışmada elde edilen veriler üç başlık altında incelenmiştir: (1) Türk okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin çocukların sınıf içi davranışlarını sınıflandırması ve yaptığı tanımlamalar; (2) Öğretmenlerin toplumsal/geleneksel ve ahlaki olaylara ilişkin kavrayışları; (3) Çocukların toplumsal/geleneksel ve ahlaki olaylara ilişkin kavrayışlarına dair öğretmen inanışları.

Birinci bölümde, katılımcı öğretmenlerin sınıf içi davranışları ne şekilde sınıflandırdığına dair tanımlamalar verilmiştir. Öğretmenlerin sınıf içi davranışları istendik ve istenmedik olarak ikiye ayırdıkları görülmüştür. İkinci bölüm, öğretmenlerin belirlenen davranışlara dair kavrayışlarını incelemektedir. Son bölümde ise öğretmenlerin çocukların kavrayışlarına ilişkin inanışları incelenmiştir. Son iki bölüm üç kategori altında toplanmış olan toplam yedi kod kullanılarak detaylandırılmıştır. Bahsi geçen kategori ve kodlar yöntem bölümünde anlatılmıştır.

Aşağıda mevcut çalışmanın bulguları sunulacaktır.

Sınıf içi Davranışların Sınıflandırılması

Çalışmanın katılımcıları, okul öncesi dönem çocuklarının sınıf içi davranışlarını iki gruba ayırmıştır: ‘İstendik Davranışlar’ ve ‘İstenmedik Davranışlar’. İki katılımcı "Kabul Edilebilir davranışlar" adlı üçüncü bir kategori tanımlamış olmasına rağmen bu tanım mevcut çalışmaya dahil edilmemiştir, çünkü katılımcıların ortak bir tanımlama yapamadığı düşünülmüş ve bütün araştırmacıların ortak kararıyla bu sınıflama kaldırılmıştır.

İstendik davranışlar, “sınıftaki çocukların istenen ve onaylanmış eylemleri (P-09)” ve “öğrenme sürecinin sürekliliğinin sağlanmasına yardımcı olan davranışlardır” (P-05). Bu nedenle, “... her çocuk kendi öğrenme ortamını ve sosyal çevresini etkilemeyecek davranışlar sergilemelidir (P-08).” Bu kategorideki davranışlar toplumun beklentileri ve değer yargıları ile şekillenen olumlu sosyal davranışlar (P-01) olarak tanımlanmıştır. Bu davranışlar öğrenme sürecinin verimliliğine zarar vermez ve hem öğretmenlerin hem de sınıf içindeki diğer çocukların fiziksel ve psikolojik refahını tehdit etmez (P-21). Özetle, öğretmenin sınıf içi düzeni

sağlamasına ve sürdürmesine yardımcı olan davranışlara istendik davranışlar denir (P-09).

Öte yandan, istenmedik davranışlar, “öğrenme sürecini ve öğrenme ortamındaki diğerlerinin refahını tehdit eden herhangi bir can sıkıcı ve rahatsız edici eylem (P-03)” olarak özetlenmiştir. Benzer şekilde başka bir katılımcı istenmedik davranışları, “oyuncaklara veya sınıf içindeki diğer eşyalara zarar verme, kötü kelimeler kullanma gibi çocukların kendilerinin veya çevredeki diğer çocukların fiziksel, psikolojik ve duygusal refahını tehdit eden herhangi bir eylem (P-05)” olarak tanımlamıştır. Dolayısıyla bu tür davranışlar için öğrenme ortamını ve gelişim süreçlerini olumsuz yönde etkileyecek davranışlardır denilebilir.

Özetle, öğretmenler davranışları istendik ve istenmedik olarak iki gruba ayırmıştır. Toplam 25 davranış tanımlanmıştır: 8 istendik ve 17 istenmedik davranış. Öğretmenlerin istenmedik davranışlar hakkında konuşurken ve bu davranışları tanımlarken daha rahat oldukları gözlemlenmiştir. Sonuç olarak istenmedik davranışlar sayısı olarak istendiklerin iki katından fazladır.

Öğretmenlerin Toplumsal/Geleneksel ve Ahlaki Olaylara İlişkin Kavrayışları

Katılımcı öğretmenlerin toplumsal/geleneksel ve ahlaki davranışlara ilişkin kavrayışlarını tanımlamak için, daha önce yapılmış olan araştırmalarda kullanılanlara benzer sorular sorulmuştur. Sorular, katılımcı öğretmenlerin sınıf içi davranışlar hakkındaki kavrayışlarını dört boyut (genellenebilirlik, kuraldan ve otoriteden bağımsız olma ve kural değişkenliği) üzerinden tanımlamak için kullanılmıştır. Yargılar hakkında sorular basit evet / hayır sorularıdır; ancak, bu soruların hemen ardından, öğretmenlerin gerekçelerini anlamak için yeni sorular sorulmuştur. Gerekçelendirme amacıyla verilen cevaplar temel alınarak araştırma sorularına cevap aranmıştır.

Bu bölümde öğretmenlerin daha önce tanımladıkları davranışlar üzerinden toplumsal/geleneksel ve ahlaki olaylara ilişkin kavrayışları incelenmiştir. Ancak pilot çalışma yapılırken öğretmenler ondan fazla davranış için sürecin uzun olacağını belirtmişlerdir. Bu bağlamda ana çalışmada öğretmenlerden en kabul edilemez davranışları tanımlamaları istenmiştir. Frekansı en yüksek on davranış seçilmiş ve

daha sonraki süreç bu davranışlar üzerinden işletilmiştir. On en kabul edilemez davranışın dokuzu istenmedik davranışlardan oluşmaktadır; istendik davranışlardan gelen diğer davranışın olumsuz hali öğretmenler tarafından listeye eklenmiştir.

Katılımcıların ihlal davranışlarını ahlaki (moral), toplumsal-geleneksel (social conventional) ve karma/melez (mixed) olarak sınıflandırma eğiliminde oldukları görülmüştür. Bu durum sosyal alan kuramı çalışmalarıyla paralellik göstermektedir (Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015).

Öğretmenler içerisinde fenalık (harm) ve kötü niyet/istismar (abuse) unsurları bulunduğunu belirttikleri davranışları koşulsuz olarak kabul edilemez olarak tanımlamışlardır. Bu davranışların bağlamdan bağımsız olarak yanlış olduğu belirtilmiştir. Otorite ve kural etkisi yok sayılmıştır. Yani toplum tarafından belirlenen kurallar ve standartlar göz ardı edilmektedir. Vurma/itme, mülke zarar verme, başkalarının eşyalarını izinsiz alma, lakap takma/dalga geçme davranışları fiziksel ve/veya psikolojik fenalık olarak tanımlanmıştır. Aynı zamanda yanında bütün bu davranışları kötü niyet/istismar içerdiği belirtilmiştir. Örneğin vurma davranışına dair verilen cevaplarda fenalık (N=26) ve kötü niyet/istismar (N=11) vurgulanmıştır ve toplumsal/geleneksel etkiler göz ardı edilmiştir (N=2). Belirtilen diğer davranışlar için de benzer veriler elde edilmiştir.

Toplumsal/geleneksel davranışlarda ise davranışın meydana geldiği ortam ve bağlam katılımcıların davranışa dair kavrayışlarında farklılıklar meydana getirmektedir. Fenalık ve kötü niyet/istismar bu davranışlar için yok sayılmış ya da çok az vurgulanmıştır. Bu davranışlar: tükürme, sınıf içinde izinsiz dolaşma, elleriyle yemek yeme ve uygunsuz kıyafet olarak belirlenmiştir. Uygunsuz kıyafete dair verilen cevaplarda öğretmenler davranışın nerede meydana geldiğinin (N=26), davranışı yasaklayan bir kural olmasının (N=24) ve/veya gözetleyen bir yetişkin olmasının (N=22) davranışa dair kavrayış üzerinde etkisi olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Dolayısıyla bu davranışlara dair kavrayışın temelinde toplumsal bakış açısının ve standartların olduğu görülmektedir.

Karma alan için ise davranışın yanlış olduğunu düşünmekle birlikte belli bazı durumlarda davranışın doğru kabul edilebileceğine dair gerekçelendirme yaptıkları görülmüştür. Yani davranışın fenalık ve istismar içerdiğini düşünmelerine rağmen

toplumsal/geleneksel kuralları ve standartları tamamen göz ardı etmedikleri görülmüştür. Sırayı bozma ve uygunsuz dil kullanma bu davranışın örnekleridir. Katılımcı öğretmenlerin yarısından fazlası uygunsuz dil kullanmanın psikolojik etkilerine değinmiş (N=19) ve bu davranışın toplumsal huzuru bozduğunu belirtmiştir (N=17). Ancak katılımcıların çoğu bu davranışın yapılmasını destekleyen bir otorite (N=18) ya da kural (N=19) olması durumunda, davranışın olumsuz olarak nitelendirilemeyeceğini belirtmişler.

Çocukların Toplumsal/Geleneksel ve Ahlaki Olaylara İlişkin Kavrayışlarına Dair Öğretmen İnanışları

Katılımcı öğretmenlerin sınıf içi davranışları hakkındaki kavrayışlarının ardından, çocukların toplumsal/geleneksel ve ahlaki olaylar hakkındaki kavrayışları katılımcı öğretmenlerin bakış açısından incelenmiştir. Bölümün bu kısmı, katılımcı öğretilerin verilen davranışlarla ilgili yanıtlarına dayanarak düzenlenmiştir. Davranışlar tanımlanmış olan kategoriler ve kodlar kullanılarak incelenmiş ancak sosyal alan kuramınca belirlenmiş olan kriterlere göre gözden geçirilmek yerine öğretmenlerin kendi kavrayışlarında ortaya çıkan sınıflama kullanılmıştır. Bu bağlamda bir önceki bölümde yapılmış olan sınıflandırma aynen kullanılmıştır. Yani vurma/itme, mülke zarar verme, başkalarının eşyalarını izinsiz alma, lakap takma/dalga geçme davranışları ahlaki alanda; tükürme, sınıf içinde izinsiz dolaşma, elleriyle yemek yeme ve uygunsuz kıyafet toplumsal/geleneksel alanda; sırayı bozma ve uygunsuz dil kullanma davranışları da karma alanda yer almıştır. Öğretmenlerin gerekçelendirmeleri daha önce tanımlanmış olan ve yukarıda detaylı anlatılan kategori ve kodlar aracılığıyla incelenmiştir.

Öğretmenlerin toplumsal-geleneksel davranışlar ve karma davranışlar ile ilgili inanışları kendi kavrayışlarıyla paralellik göstermektedir ancak ahlaki davranışlara yönelik inanışlarında farklılıklar gözlemlenmiştir. Yani öğretmenlerin çocukların kavrayışlarına dair inanışlarında sosyal alan kuramı alan yazınına çok uymayan bazı bulgulara ulaşılmıştır. Hatırlanacağı üzere sosyal alan kuramına göre iki buçuk yaşından itibaren çocuklar ahlaki davranışlara dair bir kavrayış oluşturur. Ahlaki davranışların her ortamda kural ve otoriteden bağımsız olarak yanlış olduğunu kabul ederler. Ancak, öğretmenler çocukların ahlaki davranışlara dair kavrayışlarının otorite

etkisiyle değişebileceğini belirtmişlerdir. Bu sosyal alan kuramının bulgularıyla çelişmektedir.

Öğretmenlerin tamamı (N=26), çocukların vurma davranışının fiziksel şiddet içerdiğini bildiğini söylemiş ve bir kısmı çocukların gözünde bu davranışın eşitlik (N=8) ve toplumsal refaha (N=9) tehdit oluşturan bir davranış olduğuna inandığını belirtmiştir. Ancak neredeyse yarısı çocukların bu davranışa ilişkin kavrayışlarının otoritenin aldığı konuma (N=12) ve kuralın bağlayıcılığına (N=12) göre değişebileceğine inandıklarını belirten cevaplar verdi. Mülke zarar verme, başkalarının eşyalarını izinsiz alma ve lakap takma/dalga geçme davranışları için de benzer bulgulara ulaşılmıştır.

Sonuç ve Öneriler

Katılımcı öğretmenlerin sınıf içi davranışlardan bahsederken istenmedik davranışları ön plana çıkardıkları görülmüştür. Tanımlanmış istenmedik davranışlar miktar olarak istendik davranışların iki katından fazladır. Bunun yanında pilot görüşmelerde sınıf içinde karşılaştıkları çocuk davranışları sorulduğunda öğretmenler, her zaman önce istenmedik davranışlardan bahsetmiştir. Genellikle araştırmacının teşvik etmesi neticesinde istendik davranışlara dair tanımlamalar yapılmıştır. Sonuç olarak ana çalışmada, katılımcı öğretmenlerin istendik davranışlar ve istenmedik davranışları ayrı ayrı sınıflandırması istenmiştir. Bunun yanında öğretmenler, okul öncesi dönem çocuklarının ahlaki gelişimi hakkında konuşurken dönemin önemini vurgulamaktadırlar. Bütün öğretmenler istendik ve istenmedik davranışa dair kavrayışın bu dönemde oluşturulduğunu düşünmektedir. Benzer bir şekilde, Hamlin (2013) bir yıl boyunca okul öncesi dönem çocuklarını incelemiş ve sonuç olarak çocukların bir yaşından itibaren çevreden gelen duygusal geri dönütlere göre davranışlarını sınırlama eğiliminde olduğunu bulmuştur. Ayrıca, Hamlin (2013) çalışmasında okul öncesi dönem çocuklarının toplumsal sözleşmelere dair farkındalığa sahip olduğunu bulmuştur. Ancak Turiel (2002) ve Killen (2010)'e göre çocukların çevrelerinden gelen geri dönütleri anlıyor olmaları onların doğru ve yanlış kavramını da anladıkları anlamına gelmez. Fakat bu araştırmalar meydana gelen etkileşimlerin ahlaki ve sosyal gelişim açısından önemli olduğunu vurgulamaktadırlar.

Etkileşim düzeyi ve miktarı arttıkça çocuğun toplumsal/geleneksel normları ve standartları anlamlandırma ve öğrenme ihtimali de artar.

Katılımcı öğretmenler, okul öncesi eğitim kurumlarının çocukta olumlu davranış ve tutum gelişmesi ve ayrıca çocukların ahlaki gelişim süreçleri açısından kritik bir rol oynadığını belirttiler. Killen ve Smetana (2010) tarafından yapılan tanımlamalarla paralellik gösteren bu bulguların yanında, öğretmenler kendilerini genellikle çocukların hayatındaki ilk profesyoneller olarak tanımlamaktadırlar. İstenmedik davranışları tanımlamak, çocukların ahlaki olarak kabul edilebilir davranışları ve kuralları benimsemelerini sağlamak ve çocukların kuralların günlük hayattaki kullanımlarını öğrenmelerini sağlamak öğretmenlerin en önemli görevlerinden birkaçı olarak sıralanmaktadır. Montessori (1949) okul öncesi dönem öğretmenlerinin sorumlulukları tanımlanırken de benzer bazı kriter belirlenmiştir.

Çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre katılımcı öğretmenler, ahlak gelişimi bağlamında okul öncesi öğretmenin ebeveynler kadar önemli bir role sahip olduğunu düşünmektedirler. Öğretmenlerin kişisel ve mesleki tecrübelerini soruşturduğumuz ilk görüşmede, katılımcıların öğretmenlerin kendilerini profesyoneller olarak tanımladıkları ve ahlaki ve sosyal gelişim açısından ailelerden daha donanımlı olduklarını düşündükleri bulunmuştur. Özellikle ahlak eğitimi ile ilgili yapılan çalışmalar (DeRosier & Lloyd, 2010; DeRosier & Mercer, 2007; Flay, Berkowitz, & Bier, 2009; Marshall, Caldwell, & Foster, 2011; Royal & Baker, 2005; Skaggs & Bodenhorn, 2006; White & Warfa, 2011) mevcut çalışmanın bulgularını desteklemektedir. Bahsi geçen çalışmalarda okulun ve özellikle öğretmenin ahlak eğitimi açısından önemine değinilmiştir. Bu çalışmalara göre öğretmen ahlak gelişimi ve karakter eğitimi konusunda en önemli bileşendir denilebilir. Okulda meydana gelen ve toplum tarafından kabul görmeyen davranışlar öğretmenlerin müdahaleleri neticesinde düzelme eğilimindedir (Lickona, 1991). Jambon (2016), 0-5 yaş arası çocukların duygularını ifade etmede zorlandıklarını ve duygularını ifade ederken saldırgan davranışlar sergileyebildiklerini ileri sürer. Bu durumun temel nedeni olarak çocukların henüz etkili iletişimi becerilerine sahip olmamalarını gösterir. Dolayısıyla çocuklar gerçekte hissettikilerini aktaramamakta ve bu durum onların kaygılanmalarına ve saldırgan davranış göstermelerine sebep olmaktadır. Öğretmenler

bu durumun farkında olduklarında gerekli önlemleri alabilir ve çocukların kendilerini ifade etmelerine yardımcı olabilir. Bu tarz tecrübeler çocukların istedik ve istenmedik davranışları daha iyi anlamaları açısından önemlidir (Jambon, 2016).

Öğretmenin yanı sıra akranlar ile etkileşiminin de sağlıklı ahlaki gelişim için önemli olduğunu vurgulanmıştır. Daha önce değinilen çalışmalarda okul içinde meydana gelen olayların çocuklar için günlük hayata ve yetişkinliğe hazırlık fırsatları sunduğuna değinilmiştir. Matthwes ve arkadaşlarının (2015) yaptığı çalışmada, çocukların ebeveynleri, akrabalar, öğretmenleri ve akranlarıyla olan erken çocukluk deneyimlerinin zihinsel, duygusal, sosyal ve bilişsel gelişiminde kritik bir rol oynadığı bulunmuştur. Smetana, Jambon ve Ball (2014) tarafından yapılan başka bir çalışmada, çocukluk çağında sosyal ve ahlaki gelişimin desteklenmesi için akran etkileşimini arttırmanın önemli olduğu bildirilmektedir. Elde edilen bulgular ile tutarlı olarak Piaget (1932/1966), akran ilişkilerinin toplumsal deneyimler için yetişkinlerle olan etkileşimden daha fazla ve içerik olarak daha zengin fırsatlar sağladığını öne sürmektedir, çünkü akran ilişkileri karşılıklıdır ve yetişkinlerle olan iletişimlerdeki gibi hiyerarşik yapıda değildir. Aynı şekilde, bazı iyi bilinen araştırmalar (Criss ve ark., 2002; Dunn ve ark., 2000; Hay ve ark., 1999; Hay, Payne ve Chadwick, 2004; Howes & Phillipsen, 1998; Rubin ve ark., 2003) erken çocukluk dönemi akran ilişkilerinin yetişkinlikte ortaya çıkan sosyal ilişkilerin belirleyicileri olduğunu savunur.

Sosyal alan kuramına dair yapılmış çalışmalarda yargılar ve gerekçeler incelenirken dört boyut kullanımı öne plana çıkmaktadır (Jambon, 2015; Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015). Bu boyutlara daha önce değinilmiştir. Ancak mevcut çalışmanın bulguları neticesinde üç boyutlu bir yapı ortaya çıkmıştır. Kural bağımsızlığı ve kural değişkenliği boyutları mevcut çalışmada kurala bağlılık şeklinde ve tek boyut altında incelenmiştir. Kültürel yapı ve dil bilimsel farklardan kaynaklandığı düşünülen bu değişim uzman görüşünün ardından uygun bulunmuş ve çalışma bu doğrultuda devam ettirmiştir.

Çalışmanın hipotezlerinden bir tanesi öğretmenlerin toplumsal/geleneksel ve ahlaki olaylara ilişkin kavrayışlarının literatür ile paralellik göstereceğiydi. Veri analizi bu hipotezimizi destekleyen bulgular sunmaktadır. Ahlaki olarak

sınıflandırılan davranışlara yönelik kural ihlali, yani fenalık ve/veya istismar içeren davranışlar her koşulda kabul edilemez olarak tanımlanmıştır. Bu davranışlar için toplumsal sözleşmelerin göz ardı edildiği görülmektedir. Öğretmenler toplumsal/geleneksel olarak tanımlanmış çeşitli kural ihlallerini bağlamsal olarak kabul edilebilir bulduklarını belirtmektedirler. Yani bu tarz davranışlara dair yaptırımların ya da kuralların evrensel olmadığını ve değişime uygun olduğuna inandıkları söylenebilir. Bunlara ek olarak öğretmenler bazı durumlarda davranışın fenalık ve/veya istismar içermesine rağmen toplumsal sözleşmelere bağlı olarak kabul edilebilir olacağına inanmaktadırlar. Karma alan davranışları olarak isimlendirilen bu davranışlar da sosyal alan kuramı tarafından tanımlanmıştır. Dolayısıyla öğretmenlerin kavrayışları çerçevesinde yapılmış olan sınıflandırma sosyal alan kuramının önceki bulgularıyla paralellik göstermektedir (Nucci ve Powers, 2014; Smetana, 2006; Turiel, 2015). Çeşitli ülkelerde yapılmış olan çalışmalar benzer bulgular sunmaktadır (Turiel, 2015, s.507). Turiel'in gözden geçirmesi, 2001 yılına kadar yapılan çalışmaları içermektedir (Turiel, 2015) ancak son yıllarda Çin'de (Yau ve ark., 2009) ve Finlandiya'da (Vainio, 2011) yapılmış olan araştırmalarda da benzer sonuçlara ulaşılmıştır.

Ek olarak, katılımcılar fenalık ve/veya istismar davranışlarının doğasının davranışa dair kavrayış üzerinde etkisi olduğunu söylemektedirler. Yani provoke edilmiş bir davranışın provoke edilmemiş bir davranışa göre daha kabul edilebilir olduğunu söylemektedirler. İlk vuran ile karşılık olarak vuran çocuk davranışı arasında fark olduğunu ancak ikisinin de hala kötü olduğunu vurgulamışlardır. Son yıllarda yapılmış bazı çalışmalar benzer bulgular sunmaktadır (Janbon, 2016; Hay, 2005; Dahl, 2014). Bulgular neticesinde ulaşılan bir başka sonuç ise, öğretmenlerin fenalık içeren davranışların istismar içerenlerden daha yıkıcı olduğunu düşünmeleridir. Mevcut çalışmada öğretmenler tarafından karma davranış olarak kabul edildiği düşünülen davranışların istismar skorlarının fenalık skorlarından daha düşük olması da bu bulguyu desteklemektedir. Dolayısıyla katılımcılar ahlaki alan içerisinde gözüken bütün davranışların aynı olmadığını düşünmektedirler. Bu bulgu mevcut alan yazını ile çelişmektedir (Nucci & Turiel, 1978; Smetana, Kelly, & Twentyman, 1984;

Smetana, Schlagman, & Adams, 1993). Çünkü sosyal alan kuramı çerçevesinde incelenmiş olan çalışmaların bu tarz bir iç sınıflama yapmadığı görülmektedir.

Öğretmenlerin, çocukların kavrayışlarına ilişkin inanışları hakkında konuşurken otoriteye itaat konusunu özellikle vurguladıkları görülmüştür. Öğretmenlere göre çocuklar yetişkinlerin yaptığına benzer bir ayırım yaparlar ancak önceki araştırma bulgularından (Kim & Turiel, 1996; Laupa, 1995; Yau, Smetana ve Metzger, 2008) farklı olarak, çocukların olaylara dair kavrayışlarında dikkate aldıkları en önemli etkenin otorite etkisi olduğuna inanmaktadırlar. Başka bir deyişle bir olay meydana geldiğinde -bu olay ahlaki alan içerisinde bile olsa- ortamda bulunan otorite figürü çocuklara davranışın kabul edilebilir olduğu yönünde yönerge verirse, artık bu davranış çocuklar için kabul edilebilir bir davranış olur. Bu bakış açısı Miligram (1963) tarafından detaylı olarak kurgulanmış olan otoriteye itaat kavramı, sosyalleşme kuramları (Benedict, 1938; Durkheim, 1961), davranışçı ekoller (Skinner, 1971; Watson, 1924) ve psikanalitik teori açısından kabul edilebilir bulunabilir. Bu akımların ortak özellikleri toplumun bireylerin sosyal ve ahlaki kararları üzerindeki etkisinin olduğunu ileri sürmeleridir. Yani ahlaki değerler toplum tarafından yaratılır; bireylerin kendi değerleri yoktur (Skinner, 1971). Farkında olarak ve isteyerek toplum tarafından çizilen ahlaki çerçeveyi kabul ederler. Benzer şekilde, Freud'a (1961) göre, bireyler suçluluk duygusu nedeniyle toplumun standartlarına bilinçli olarak uymaktadırlar. Bu nedenle, tüm bireysel, toplumsal/geleneksel ve ahlaki kararlar toplumun ürünleridir. Ahlaki çerçeve, toplumun iyiliği için değişebilir, bu nedenle kültürel; evrensel değildir. Toplumun kendisi bütün otoritenin kaynağı olduğundan, bireylerin sosyalleşme süreci otoritenin etkisi altında gerçekleşir. Turiel (2006) bu kuramların insanların bilinçsiz cevaplar verdiğini kabul eden psikoloji akımının (people are stupid school of psychology) bakış açısına sahip olduklarını ve insanların öznel ahlaki yargı süreçlerini yok saydıklarını düşünmektedir oysa bireyler, eylemlerinin sonuçlarının farkında olan makul varlıklardır (Turiel, 2006).

Turiel'in ahlaki gelişime yaklaşımı, toplumsal sözleşmeler ve ahlaki bakış açısının, öznel olarak ve toplumsal etkileşimler neticesinde kavramsallaştırılan iki ayrı alan olduklarını savunur (1983). Çocuklar öznel deneyimlerinden yola çıkarak şemalar yaratırlar (Turiel ve Killen, 2010). İstendik ve istenmedik davranışlara ilişkin çerçeve

oluşturulurken, empati ve korku devreye girer ancak çocuklar her zaman ahlaki ve toplumsal/geleneksel ayrımının farkındadırlar. Dolayısıyla, temelde farklı nesne ve olay türleri ile etkileşimler, farklı kavramsal çerçevelerin oluşumuyla sonuçlanmalıdır (Turiel, 2015). Bu durumda, otoriteye itaat, ahlaki olaylar için geçerli olmayan bir toplumsal/geleneksel yapı olduğundan, otoritenin ahlaki olaylar üzerindeki etkisi sınırlıdır (Turiel, 1983; 2006; 2015). Her ne kadar bazı durumlar hem ahlâkî hem de toplumsal sözleşmelerin (ör. Karma alandaki olaylar) etkilerine maruz kalsa da lakap takma veya hırsızlık gibi ahlaki ihlallere ilişkin kararlar toplumsal/geleneksel etkilerden bağımsızdır.

Robinson'a göre (1971), öğretmenler bir konuyu dair rollerinden emin olmadıklarında otoriteye dayalı sınıf yönetiminden söz edebilirler. Ahlak eğitimi, öğretmenlerin nasıl öğretilceği konusunda emin olamadıkları soyut bir konudur. Özellikle okul öncesi dönem için üst sınıflarda olduğundan daha zor olabilir. Ayrıca, Narvaez ve Lapsley (n.d.), sınıf ortamlarında karakter eğitimi uygulamak için iki alternatif yaklaşımın olduğunu belirtmektedir: öğretmen merkezli ve öğrenci merkezli. Narvaez ve Lapsley (n.d.) öğretmenlerin ahlaki eğitim için öğretmen merkezli bir yaklaşım seçme eğiliminde olduklarını savunur. Benzer şekilde Garrett (2008) de, öğretmenlerin ahlak eğitimi konusunda davranışçı yaklaşımları tercih ettiklerini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu durum Wolfgang (2001) tarafından öğretmenlerin maksimum güç kullanma eğiliminde oldukları kurallar ve sonuçlar bakış açısıyla benzerlik göstermektedir. Sorun şu ki, öğretmen merkezli ahlak eğitimi, çocukların toplumsal ve evrensel ahlaki ilkeleri anlamlandırdıkları ahlaki gelişim süreçlerine zarar verebilir (DeVries & Zan, 1994; Narvaez & Lapsley, nd; Nucci, 2001). Çocuklar davranış kalıpları oluştururken çevresel pekiştireçlere ihtiyaç duyarlar. Ülkemizde çok dile getirilen toplumsal sorunlardan bir tanesi doğru davranış için ya da yanlış davranıştan uzak durmak için sürekli bir pekiştireç ihtiyacı olduğudur. Katılımcıların bakış açısından yola çıkarak Türk okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin benzer süreçleri destekleyen ve çocukların ahlaki gelişim süreçlerinde otorite etkisini öne alan bir bakış açısına sahip oldukları kanısı oluşabilir. Böyle bir durumda, disiplin, öğretmenler veya ebeveynler gibi harici bir kaynaktan gelir ve muhtemelen çocukların ahlaki ve toplumsal kavramları içselleştirmelerini yavaşlatır belki de engeller. Ayrıca, öz-

disiplinin sağlıklı gelişimini de olumsuz etkilemesi muhtemeldir. Ek olarak, DeVries ve Zan'a (1994) göre, sınıftaki bireysel farklılıklar göz ardı edildiğinde çocuklarla karşılıklı bir ilişkiyi sürdürmek mümkün olmayabilir. Sonuç olarak sınıf yönetimi konusunda kabusa dönüşmüş bir sınıftan bahsetmek yerinde olacaktır.

Uygulamaya Yönelik Öneriler

Piaget'ye (1932/1966) göre, yetişkinlerin temel sorumluluğu, çocukların dışa bağımlı ahlaki yargı sürecinden özerkliğe geçişi kolaylaştırıcı bir ortam sağlamaktır. Buna göre, öğretmenler ahlaki ve sosyal gelişim süreçlerinde çocuklarla işbirliği kurarak hareket etmek zorundadırlar (DeVries ve Zen, 1994). Mevcut çalışmadaki katılımcıların aynı bakış açısına sahip olmadığı düşünülmektedir. Katılımcılar, çocukların olgunlaşmamış ahlaki unsurlar olduklarına ve ahlaki yargılarının otorite etkisine karşı hassas olduğuna inanmaktadırlar. Şüphesiz, sosyal alan araştırmacılarının bulgulara doğrultusunda katılımcı öğretmenlerin çocukların ahlaki yargı yeteneklerini yeterince anlamadıklarını savunacaklardır.

Hala gelişmekte olmakla birlikte, ahlak gelişimi üzerine yapılan güncel çalışmalar çocukların ahlaki yargıları ve bunlara bağlı eylemleri hakkında detaylı bilgi sunmaktadır. Özellikle ahlak gelişimi ve toplumsal kavrayış üzerine yaptığı çalışmalarla bu alanları anlamamıza yardımcı olan sosyal alan kuramı, ahlaki ve toplumsal/geleneksel kalıpları anlamamız için kabul edilebilir bir çerçeve çizmektedir. Öğretmenleri sosyal alan teorisinin bulgularıyla tanıştırmak, daha iyi sınıf yönetimi stratejileri geliştirmelerine yardımcı olabilir. Ayrıca, bu aşinalık öğretmenlerin ahlak eğitimini günlük programlarının ayrılmaz bir parçası olarak yerleştirmelerine yardımcı olacaktır (Nucci ve Turiel, 2009). Öğretmenler ahlaki ve toplumsal/geleneksel alanların kavramsal farklılıklarının ayırdına vardıklarında çocukların kararlarının niteliğini daha iyi anlayabilirler. Ahlaki yargıların ahlaki davranışı nasıl etkilediğini anlamak için ilk adım bu olmalıdır.

Yukarıda belirtildiği üzere, öğretmenlerin, özellikle ahlaki yargı açısından eksik bilgiye sahip oldukları düşünülmektedir. Verdikleri cevaplardan yola çıkarak, öğretmenlerin çocukların ahlaki ve toplumsal/geleneksel olayları veya ihlalleri ayırt edebildikleri gerçeğine aşina olmadıkları söylenebilir. Sonuç olarak, bu çalışmanın bulguları, okul öncesi öğretmenlerinin çocukların ahlaki gelişimini anlamalarına ve

sınıf içi uygulama geliřtirmelerine yardımcı olmak adına hem hizmet öncesi hem de hizmet içi eğitimlerin gerekli olduđunu göstermektedir çünkü sınıfta gelişimsel arařtırmaların uygulanması karmařık olabilir (Nucci ve Turiel, 2009) ve yeterli eğitimle bu zorluđun üstesinden gelmek mümkündür.

“Ahlak Eğitimi”, Cumhuriyetin kuruluşundan bu yana Türk eğitim sisteminde en çok vurgulanan konulardan biri olmuřtur (Kamer ve Alabař, 2017). Konunun sınıf ortamındaki bařarılı řekilde uygulanabilmesi öğretmen verimliliđine bađlı olduđu için (Milson ve Mehlig, 2002), sorumluluđun büyük oranda öğretmenlerin omzuna yüklendiđi düşünölmektedir (Prestwich, 2004). Ancak Milson ve Mehlig (2002) yaptıkları çalışmalarda öğretmenlerin ahlak gelişimi ve eğitimi konusunda aldıkları hizmet öncesi eğitimi yetersiz buldukları sonucuna ulaşmışlardır. Öğretmenler, yeni mezun olduklarında ahlak gelişimi ve eğitimi konusunda yeterli donanımına sahip olmadıklarını düşünmektedir. Bu bağlamda, öğretmen yetiřtirme programları, ahlak gelişimi ve eğitimi konusunda kapsamlı eğitimler sunmalıdır. Böylece öğretmen adaylarının sınıf içi uygulamalar için gerekli pedagojik beceriler geliřtirmelerine yardımcı olabilirler.

Böyle bir eğitimin iki boyutu olabilir. Birinci bölümde çocuklarda ahlak gelişimi, toplumsal kavrayıř ve ahlaki yargılar üzerine kuramsal eğitimler verilebilir. İkinci bölümdeyse öğretmen adaylarının gelişim teorileri ve eğitim uygulamaları arasında bađ kurmalarına yardımcı olacak kapsayıcı ahlak eğitimi yöntemleri öğretilir. Öğretmen adaylarının mezuniyetini takip edecek řekilde hizmet içi eğitimlerle bu süreç desteklenmelidir. Bu řekilde öğretmenlerin mevcut bilgileri tazelenirken kendilerine özgü ahlak eğitim yöntemi kurmalarına yardımcı olacak bir sistem kurulmuş olacaktır. Bilindiđi üzere Türk eğitim sistemi tanımlanırken iki yapısal temelden yani eğitim ve öğretimden bahsedilir. Öğretmenlerin ahlak eğitimi konusunda daha becerikli hale gelmesi eğitim boyutunun da güçlenmesini sağlayacaktır.

Kısıtlılıklar

Mevcut çalışma dikkatli bir řekilde uygulandı ve hedeflerine ulařtıđı düşünölmüyor ancak hala bazı kısıtlılıkları bulunmaktadır. Birincisi, zaman sınırı ve mali

kaygılar nedeniyle, çalışmaya sadece katılmaya gönüllü olan Türk okul öncesi öğretmenleri dahil edilmiştir. Bu nedenle, bulgular daha büyük gruplara veya diğer kültürlerle genellenemez. İkinci olarak, derinlemesine görüşmelerin kullanılması araştırmanın açıklayıcı niteliğinden dolayı uygun ve yeterli görülmüştür ancak katılımcıların cevapları, bunların üzerindeki toplumsal etkiler nedeniyle önyargılı olabilir. Çünkü verilerin toplandığı sürede Türkiye bir askeri darbe tehlikesi yaşamıştı ve olağanüstü hal ile yönetilmekteydi. Dolayısıyla, cevaplar katılımcıların gerçek niyetleri olmayabilir. Ahlak, halkın içinde tartışmayı tercih etmedikleri hassas konulardan olabilir.

Gelecek Araştırmalar İçin Öneriler

Öncelikle daha geniş katılımcı grubuyla daha kapsamlı bir çalışma gerçekleştirilebilir. Bu çalışma farklı kültürel grupları içerecek şekilde genişletilebilirse bulgular daha anlamlı olacaktır. Benzer şekilde sınıf içi gözlemler yapılarak öğretmenlerin sınıf içinde karşılaştıkları toplumsal/geleneksel ve ahlaki durumlara ne şekilde tepki verdikleri ve bu tepkileri aktarırken ne tarz kalıplar kullandıkları incelenebilir. Uygulamaya yönelik öneriler kısmında bahsi geçen hizmet öncesi eğitim modeli uygulanarak öğretmen adaylarının öz-yeterlik seviyeleri karşılaştırılabilir. Böylece uygun şekilde hazırlanmış ve ihtiyacı karşılayan bir ahlak gelişimi ve eğitimi dersi meydana getirilebilir.

Appendix H: Tez Fotokopi İzin Formu

TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU / THESES PHOTOCOPY PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

☐

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname :

Adı / Name :

Bölümü / Department :

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) :

.....

.....

.....

.....

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master ☐

Doktora / PhD ☐

1. Tezimin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılsın ve kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla tezimin bir kısmı veya tamamının fotokopisi alınsın. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide and photocopy whether all or part of my thesis providing that cited. ☐
2. Tezimin tamamı yalnızca Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi kullanıcılarının erişimine açılsın. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) / Release the entire work for Middle East Technical University access only. (With this option your work will not be listed in any research sources, and no one outside METU will be able to provide both electronic and paper copies through the Library.) ☐
3. Tezim bir (1) yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olsun. (Bu seçenekle tezinizin fotokopisi ya da elektronik kopyası Kütüphane aracılığı ile ODTÜ dışına dağıtılmayacaktır.) / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of one year. ☐

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date