

# Examining the Relationship Between Moral Literacy and Art Literacy of University Students

Büşra USLUOĞLU<sup>1</sup>

Metin ELKATMIŞ<sup>2</sup>

Cited:

Usluoğlu, B., Elkatmış, M. (2023). Examining the Relationship Between Moral Literacy and Art Literacy of University Students, *Journal of Interdisciplinary Educational Research*, 7(16), 458-477, DOI: 10.57135/jier. 1368029

## Abstract

It can be said that individuals who socialize under the roof of education express their artistic understanding of the creatures they choose or be influenced by the moral understanding they choose and are influenced by. It is important how individuals paint the world with the paint of their moral character on the basis of the education they receive, rather than in which field they are educated. Painting here is a kind of art. Art is individual and has a place in almost every branch. For example, with their own morals, architects build the world, doctors heal the world, painters draw and color the world, teachers educate the world, and musicians gift the world with melodies. These created worlds are manifested by the representation of the moral aspects of the minds. Within the scope of this study, it is aimed to examine the relationship between moral literacy and art literacy of university students studying in different departments in terms of various variables. The relational screening model, one of the quantitative research methods, was used in the research. The sample of the study consists of 242 university students studying in different departments of Kırıkkale University. As data collection tools in this study, the scales developed by Tekin (2022) in "The Moral Literacy" and Yücetoker (2014) "The Art Literacy" were used. SPSS 25.0 statistical package program was used in the analysis of the data. According to the results obtained, it has been observed that there is a positive and 'moderate' relationship between the moral literacy and art literacy levels of university students studying at different faculties and having different socioeconomic levels. With the results of this research, it is thought that it may be beneficial for higher education authorities to carry out studies in order not to limit the moral and artistic ideas and skills of young university students with their socioeconomic levels.

**Keywords:** Morality and art relationship, moral literacy, art literacy, university students

## INTRODUCTION

Tunalı (1996) who has a doctorate in philosophy, psychology and art history and is a philosophy professor, stated in an interview that "There is a deep relationship between aesthetics and ethics, between aesthetic values and ethical values in terms of individual and social life." If we human beings want to live in a society, we have to follow certain rules. In order for the society to communicate and develop in a healthy way, there are silent rules, sometimes expressed verbally and sometimes written. What do these "silent rules" mean? Most of us have childhood memories where we understood what our parents meant by one look at us. Or the school years when life changed with a move of our teacher... Thanks to these silent signals, we correct ourselves and adapt to the house or the classroom. So silent rules help us "fit in" with others and be a member of society. In other words, the understanding that a person controls his/her behavior by distinguishing good from bad, right from wrong, beautiful from ugly, and acts accordingly, in accordance with the principles and norms of the society in which he exists, is called 'morality'. Therefore, morality is an important concept for living in harmony with social interaction and norms and forms the basis of the social structure of society.

<sup>1</sup>PhD student, Kırıkkale University, Social Sciences Institute, Kırıkkale-Türkiye busrausluoglu38@hotmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-7152-6419

<sup>2</sup>Assoc. Prof. Dr., Kırıkkale University, Faculty of Education, Kırıkkale-Türkiye, [metinelkatmis@hotmail.com](mailto:metinelkatmis@hotmail.com), ORCID: 0000-0002-6132-8865

Akyol (2002) defined morality as the norms, value judgments, principles of a certain society or the set of behaviors, attitudes and rules that individuals living in the society must comply with. In fact, this situation not only affects the harmony of our behavior towards society, but also helps us make choices by considering the differences in the behavior of other individuals in society. In other words, with morality, we determine criteria such as right-wrong and good-bad in the behavior of others and create our individual and social criteria. Elkatmış (2021) stated that morality is the process of humanization and that morality is a state of mind that feels and makes one feel the depth of its roots rather than being fictional or mechanical. Moral maturation occurs when people begin to listen to their conscience in childhood. According to Onur (1995), the conscientious reasoning that develops in childhood helps people create their own judicial systems, and when they reach the maturity level, they regularly reflect the moral principles they have internalized into their behaviors, thus characterizing their own moral maturity (Transferred by: Çelik, 2017). Therefore, the moral foundations of adulthood are laid in the courts of conscience established in childhood. Children ensure the continuity of societies. Children who have reached moral maturity are effective in the development of societies. Especially parents and teachers have great responsibilities.

It is very important to transfer these "more" from past to present in a qualified way so that societies can reach healthy competencies such as better, more correct, more understanding, more fair, more aesthetic, more useful within their culture. For this to happen, a moral social system must have a moral education approach. The Ahi Organization, which was established in the 13th century by the Turks who settled in Anatolia to protect themselves against other tradesmen and merchants, is an example of transfers made with morality. The merchants who joined the Ahi organization combined their arts, which they call 'craft', with the understanding of being moral and spreading morality and formed the roof of trade. In other words, morality is covered with art. Özköse (2011) explains that moral education in 'Ahilik'; He stated that it is based on the foundations reflected in the Ahi characters, such as the culture of sharing, the spirit of solidarity, professional equipment, identity texture, production ethics, determination to work, and the principle of pioneering in respect and respect. Under the title of "Our Values" in the curriculum of the Ministry of National Education (2018), morality is mentioned as one of the important elements that affect the future of society, "*Acting with the aim of providing each member of our education system with the competence to make appropriate moral decisions and display them in their behavior*". Of course, morality is handled within the framework of education and training, just like other competencies and values. Morality is one of the most important elements in the relations of societies, both within themselves and with other societies, through art, sports, educational sharing and cultural organizations.

Since primitive times, people have constantly strived to improve and change what they have. This effort was not only limited to concrete development and change, but also manifested itself through acts of imagination and thinking. In fact, the process of transforming these abstract ideas into concrete reality is considered the birth of art. People have expressed their existential qualities in harmony with nature, and thus "more" categories have constantly proliferated in art. Solutions were sought for concepts such as better and more aesthetic, and those found were presented to nature through art. Therefore, with the development of art and aesthetics, societies are constantly evolving towards "newer" understandings. Schiller (2020) stated that what develops society is the search for beauty and the development of communication, because these are the common aspects of all humanity.

Art is an important element that has an impact on the increase and development of relations between societies. In parallel with this proposition, Uçan (1996) defined art as a context that supports people's recognition of the cultures in which they grew up, establishing connections between these cultures, and international communication. One of the ways to develop this relationship and ensure communication is art literacy. As individuals interact with society, their own cultural understanding, sociological definitions, moral criteria, aesthetic views and temperaments emerge. They acquire these values through direct cultural transmission or the

development of literacy skills. By entering into the process of thinking about their own values, they make distinctions such as good-bad, beautiful-ugly, right-wrong, and produce solutions. This is a kind of speaking state of the mind and the individual develops cognitive awareness and reveals higher order thinking skills. Brown (2017) defines this way of thinking as the nature of metacognition and explains this process as "awareness".

One of the benefits of the understanding of awareness is literacy skills. In many recent studies, many areas such as economic literacy, media literacy, visual literacy, policy literacy, information literacy, health literacy, technology literacy, moral literacy and art literacy have emerged and their effects on individuals, their relationships with each other and their development have been examined. The framework of this study is limited to moral literacy and artistic literacy. Tekin (2022), in his study, defines moral literacy as the set of knowledge and skills that play a role in individuals' moral choices and are observed at different levels of proficiency, as well as thinking about their own moral values, determining the possible consequences of various options and their effects, determining which option is compatible with the person's values. He expressed it as making logical decisions and taking responsibility for his own actions. Based on the definitions of information literacy, Yücetoker (2014) revised art literacy as knowing the information needed about art, being able to access the artistic information needed, being able to evaluate the artistic information accessed, being able to use the artistic information evaluated and transferring the acquired artistic information to one's own performance. When both definitions are examined, it is seen that their commonly adopted thought infrastructure is based on identifying one's own perception with the outside world, reinterpreting it and putting it into practice. Both literacy absolutely carries an understanding of results towards behavior or practice. Morality is the basic building block that shapes a person's stance, perspective and understanding towards life and guides him. As Davutoğlu (2017) puts it, this building is an architecture built with ethical and aesthetic elements. This relationship is similarly seen in Tolstoy; People communicate by conveying moral messages through art, and build and integrate societies by uniting (Efil, 2020). Gazali, one of the great philosophers and mystics of the 11th century, defines aesthetics as "beauty seen with the eye", and on the other hand, "goodness" towards behavior. The fact that it also means "to do" is important as it shows that the relationship between ethics and aesthetics or morality and beauty has an ancient and deep-rooted history (Şahin, 2011).

A social being is required for the expression of morality. Socialized people express themselves through the boundaries they draw within their own moral framework. To look at it from another perspective, education lies at the basis of socialization. In fact, education plays a leading role in the emergence and representation of important skills such as art. According to Alp (2013), individuals represent their aesthetic understanding with art, and therefore art and representation are two concepts that cannot be separated from each other. To summarize these concepts in general terms; It can be said that individuals socialized within the framework of education choose or are influenced by creatures and express their understanding of art with the moral understanding they choose and are influenced by. It is important how individuals paint the world with the paint of their moral characters based on the education they receive, rather than the field in which they are educated. The painting job here is a kind of art. Art, on the other hand, is individual and has a place in almost every branch. For example, with their own moral understanding, architects build the world, doctors heal the world, painters draw and color the world, teachers cultivate the world, and musicians gift the world with melodies. These created worlds are manifested by the demonstration of the moral aspects of the minds. Supporting this idea, Sivrikaya et al. (2018) stated that, as a result of their study, university students with a high level of moral maturity developed a positive and conscious attitude towards sports. On the other hand, the STEM teaching approach, which carries out studies in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics, is now expected to include the field of art, develop creativity in this field and contribute to teaching holistically with other disciplines (Gülhan and Şahin, 2018). In their study, Çakır and Yalçın (2021) mentioned the existence of moral behaviors that STEM activities impart to the individual. Therefore, it has always been considered important to establish

the bond between art and morality, with the belief that performing them together exists in every branch of science.

### ***Purpose of the Research***

Within the scope of this study, it is aimed to examine the level of relationship between moral literacy and art literacy of university students studying in different departments in line with various variables. The sub-problems of the research are as follows:

1. What are the moral literacy scores of university students?
2. Does the moral literacy of university students show a significant difference in terms of gender?
3. Does the moral literacy of university students show a significant difference in terms of their socioeconomic levels?
4. Does the moral literacy of university students differ significantly in terms of the faculty variable?
5. Does the moral literacy of university students differ significantly in terms of the type of art they are interested in?
6. What are the art literacy scores of university students?
7. Does the art literacy of university students show a significant difference in terms of gender variable?
8. Does the art literacy of university students show a significant difference in terms of their socioeconomic levels?
9. Does the art literacy of university students differ significantly in terms of the faculty variable?
10. Does the art literacy of university students differ significantly in terms of the type of art they are interested in?
11. Is there a significant relationship between moral literacy and artistic literacy of university students?

## **METHOD**

### ***Model of The Research***

In this research, the relational screening model, one of the quantitative research methods, was used. Relational screening model; It is a research model that aims to determine the existence of a parallel change between two or more variables and to what extent they are related (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2009). In the study, a relational screening model was used to examine the relationship between moral literacy and art literacy of university students studying in different departments. Since this study aims to examine the relationship between two different concepts, this model was preferred.

### ***The Sample Group***

The population of this research is all students studying at the university; The study group consists of university students studying in different departments of Kırıkkale University, determined by purposeful sampling method. In the study, data were collected and evaluated from 242 university students randomly selected. Descriptive statistics for the study group are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the Study Group

<b>Gender</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>
Female	157	64.9
Male	85	35.1
<b>Socioeconomics Level</b>		
Sub	24	9.9
Mid	183	75.6
Top	35	14.5
<b>Faculty</b>		
Faculty of Education	45	18.6
Faculty of Theology	31	12.8
Faculty of Fine Arts	50	20.7
Faculty of Sports Science	40	16.5
Engineering Faculty	34	14.0
Faculty of Science and Letters	42	17.4
<b>Type of Art</b>		
Music	47	19.4
Literature	42	17.4
Painting	31	12.8
Statue	10	4.1
Architectural	27	11.2
Calligraphy	27	11.2
Theatre	19	7.9
Dance	16	6.6
Cinema	20	8.3
Opera	3	1.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100</b>

As stated in Table 1, the study group of the research consists of a total of 242 university students, 157 of whom are female and 85 of whom are male. The majority of the students (75.6%) stated that they had a mid-level socioeconomic status. In addition, 45 of the students are studying in the Faculty of Education, 31 in the Faculty of Theology, 50 in the Faculty of Fine Arts, 40 in the Faculty of Sports Sciences, 34 in the Faculty of Engineering and 42 in the Faculty of Science and Letters. In addition, among the art genres that students are most interested in are music (19.4%), literature (17.4%) and painting (12.8%).

### **Data Collection Tools**

In this study, Tekin (2022)'s 'Moral Literacy Scale', Yücetoker's (2014) 'Art Literacy Scale' and the 'personal Information form' developed by the researchers were used as data collection tools. Necessary permissions were obtained from the owners for the use of the scale. Before the scale questions, university students were asked to fill out the form in which they stated their personal information. In addition, ethics committee approval was obtained from Kırıkkale University, Institute of Social and Human Sciences, where the students constituting the sample studied.

#### *Personal Information Form*

This form was prepared by the researchers to obtain information about the participants. In the form prepared for university students, participants were asked to indicate their gender, socioeconomic level, the faculty they studied at, whether they were interested in artistic activities, and if so, which type of art they were interested in.

#### *Moral Literacy Scale*

The scale developed by Tekin (2022) consists of 20 items. The researcher stated that the scale consists of five factors called moral reasoning, moral awareness, moral imagination, moral



sensitivity and moral determination. The scale is a 5-point Likert type consisting of the expressions 'Not Suitable for Me at All', 'Not Suitable for Me', 'Somewhat Suitable for Me', 'Suitable for Me Quite' and 'Suitable for Me Completely'. The highest score to be obtained from the scale is 100 and the lowest score is 20. Hussey et al. (2023) stated that this widely used value of .70 and above is reliable. As a result of the reliability analysis conducted for the entire scale, it was stated that the Cronbach alpha coefficient had a high reliability of  $\alpha = 0.86$ .

#### *Art Literacy Scale*

The scale developed by Yücetoker (2014) consists of 26 items and four factors. The researcher named the factors as using artistic knowledge, defining the need for artistic knowledge, transforming theoretical research into performance and accessing artistic knowledge. The scale is a 5-point Likert type consisting of the expressions 'I have a little difficulty', 'I have difficulty', 'I am undecided', 'I do not have difficulty' and 'I do not have difficulty at all'. The highest score to be obtained from the scale is 130 and the lowest score is 26. Hussey et al. (2023) stated that this widely used value of .70 and above is reliable. The Cronbach Alpha internal reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated and found to be  $\alpha=0.91$ , indicating that it has high reliability.

#### **Analysis of Data**

SPSS 25.0 statistical package program was used to analyze the data. One-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to determine whether the distribution of the data showed normal distribution. The normality test results are given in the table below. According to the results obtained, it was determined that the moral literacy and art literacy scale data showed a normal distribution. For this reason, it was decided to use the Independent Samples T-Test (Two independent samples T-Test) and ANOVA (One-Way Analysis of Variance) tests, which are parametric techniques, to answer the research question. Additionally, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to determine whether there was a significant relationship between the moral literacy and art literacy levels of university students. A significance level of .05 was accepted in the analysis of the data.

#### Test of Normality

Kolmogorov-Smirnov (a)			
Data	Statistic	df	sig.
Moral Lit.	.081	242	.010
Art Lit.	0.78	242	.000

## **RESULTS**

This section contains data on the level of relationship between moral literacy and art literacy of university students, which were examined in line with the various variables that constitute the sub-problems of the research.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for the General and Sub-Dimensions of the Moral Literacy Scale of University Students

Scale	Dimensions	Min	Max	n	$\bar{X}$	sd
Moral Literacy	Moral Reasoning	4	20	242	15.57	2.72
	Moral Awareness	8	25	242	16.35	2.60
	Moral Imagination	9	25	242	19.54	3.32
	Moral Sensitivity	5	15	242	11.45	2.02
	Moral Determination	4	15	242	9.54	2.34
	Total	43	92	242	71.47	8.85

When the scores obtained from the moral literacy scale and sub-dimensions of university students in Table 2 are examined, it is seen that the highest mean score belongs to the moral imagination sub-dimension ( $X = 19.54$ ). In addition, the average of the scores obtained from the total of the scale is  $X = 71.47$ .

Table 3. t-Test Results of Moral Literacy Levels of University Students by Gender

Dimensions	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	df	t	p
Moral Reasoning	Female	157	15.56	2.75	240	-.092	.927
	Male	85	15.60	2.69			
Moral Awareness	Female	157	15.42	2.51	240	.541	.589
	Male	85	15.23	2.79			
Moral Imagination	Female	157	19.65	3.28	240	.664	.507
	Male	85	19.35	3.40			
Moral Sensitivity	Female	157	11.62	1.89	240	1.846	.066
	Male	85	11.12	2.21			
Moral Determination	Female	157	9.43	2.40	240	-1.004	.316
	Male	85	9.74	2.21			
Total	Female	157	71.70	8.53	240	.534	.594
	Male	85	71.06	9.46			

\*p&lt;.05

Table 3 shows the t-test results regarding whether the moral literacy levels of university students differ significantly according to the gender variable. Accordingly, it was determined that there was no significant difference on the basis of  $p>0.05$  in the total and sub-dimensions of the scale according to the gender variable of the students.

Table 4. One-Way Variance (ANOVA) Results of University Students' Moral Literacy Levels According to Socioeconomic Status Variable

Dependent variable	Dimensions	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Socioeconomics Level	Moral Reasoning	Between groups	4.250	2	2.125	.284	.753
		Within groups	1790.496	239	7.492		
		Total	1794.746	241			
	Moral Awareness	Between groups	1.393	2	.696	.102	.904
		Within groups	1639.708	239	6.861		
		Total	1641.100	241			
	Moral Imagination	Between groups	50.429	2	25.214	2.312	.101
		Within groups	2606.793	239	10.907		
		Total	2657.221	241			
	Moral Sensitivity	Between groups	1.481	2	.741	.180	.835
		Within groups	983.434	239	4.115		
		Total	984.915	241			
	Moral Determination	Between groups	45.976	2	22.988	4.308	.015*
		Within groups	1275.261	239	5.336		
		Total	1321.237	241			
	Total	Between groups	149.255	2	74.628	.950	.388
		Within groups	18765.948	239	78.519		
		Total	18915.203	241			

\*p&lt;.05

According to Table 4, there was no significant difference between the groups according to the socioeconomic situation variable. The students' moral literacy scale included moral reasoning ( $F=.284$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), moral awareness ( $F=.102$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), moral imagination ( $F=2.312$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), moral sensitivity ( $F=.180$ ;  $p>0.05$ ). However, a significant difference was found in the moral determination sub-dimension ( $F=4.308$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) depending on the socioeconomic level variable.

To determine the source of this difference, Tukey HSD test was performed and the results are given in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Tukey HSD Test Results

Dimensions	Groups	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	df	F	p	Tukey HSD
Moral Determination	Sub	24	9.91	2.63				
	Mid	183	9.31	2.28	241	4.308	.015*	3>2
	Top	35	10.51	2.22				
	Total	242	9.54	2.34				

\*p<.05

According to the Tukey HSD analysis, a significance level of .05 emerged between the score averages of the second and third groups for the socioeconomic variable in the moral determination sub-dimension of the moral literacy scale of university students. In other words, the scores of the students in the third group in the moral determination sub-dimension are higher than the scores of the students in the second group.

Table 6. One-Way Variance (ANOVA) Results of University Students' Moral Literacy Levels According to the Faculty Variable

Dependent variable	Dimesions	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Faculty	Moral Reasoning	Between groups	67.571	5	13.514	1.847	.105
		Within groups	1727.175	236	7.319		
		Total	1794.746	241			
	Moral Awareness	Between groups	42.813	5	8.563	1.264	.280
		Within groups	1598.287	236	6.772		
		Total	1641.100	241			
	Moral Imagination	Between groups	126.581	5	25.136	2.361	0.41*
		Within groups	2530.641	236	10.723		
		Total	2657.221	241			
	Moral Sensitivity	Between groups	37.769	5	7.554	1.882	.098
		Within groups	947.146	236	4.013		
		Total	984.915	241			
	Moral Determination	Between groups	137.744	5	27.549	5.494	.000*
		Within groups	1183.493	236	5.015		
		Total	1321.238	241			
	Total	Between groups	1300.486	5	260.097	3.485	.005*
		Within groups	17614.717	236	74.639		
		Total	18915.203	241			

\*p<.05

According to Table 6, students' moral literacy scale included moral reasoning (F=1.847; p>0.05), moral awareness (F=1.1264; p>0.05) and moral determination (F=5.494; p>0.05), there was no significant difference between the groups according to the variable of the faculty they studied in their sub-dimensions. However, there was a significant difference in the moral imagination (F=2.361; p>0.05), moral determination (F=5.494; p>0.05) sub-dimensions and the overall scale (F=.485; p<0.05), depending on the socioeconomic status variable. A differentiation was found. To



determine the source of this difference, Tukey HSD test was performed and the results are given in Table 7 below.

Table 7. Tukey HSD Test Results

Dimensions	Groups	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	df	F	p	Tukey HSD
Moral Imagination	Education	45	19.03	3.22				
	Theology	31	19.45	2.96	241	2.361	.041*	3>4
	Fine Arts	50	20.80	3.24				
	Engineering	34	19.53	3.52				
	Sports Science	42	18.62	3.52				
	Science and Letters	40	19.61	3.10				
	Total	242	19.54	3.32				
Moral Determination	Education	45	11.46	1.64				
	Theology	31	11.70	2.05	241	5.494	.000*	1>6
	Fine Arts	50	11.86	1.94				
	Engineering	34	11.00	2.26				
	Sports Science	42	10.82	2.02				
	Science and Letters	40	11.76	2.13				
	Total	242	11.45	2.02				
Total	Education	45	70.41	8.43				
	Theology	31	73.16	8.05	241	3.485	.005*	4>2
	Fine Arts	50	73.57	7.75				
	Engineering	34	70.97	11.11				
	Sports Science	42	67.25	8.06				
	Science and Letters	40	73.61	8.55				
	Total	242	71.47	8.85				

\*p<.05

According to the Tukey HSD analysis, there was a significance level of .05 between the mean scores of university students in the third and fourth groups for the faculty variable they studied in the moral imagination sub-dimension of the moral literacy scale, in the first and sixth groups for the faculty variable they studied in the moral determination sub-dimension, and in the fourth and second groups of the overall scale. has come out. In other words, the third group has higher scores than the fourth group in the moral imagination sub-dimension, the first group has higher scores than the sixth group in the moral determination sub-dimension, and the fourth group has higher scores than the second group in the overall scale.

Table 8. One-Way Variance (ANOVA) Results of University Students' Moral Literacy Levels According to the Types of Art They Are Interested in

Dependent variable	Dimesions	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Types of Art	Moral Reasoning	Between groups	39.619	8	4.952	.676	.712
		Within groups	1508.445	206	7.323		
		Total	1548.064	214			
	Moral Awareness	Between groups	15.298	8	1.912	.260	.978
		Within groups	1516.510	206	7.362		
		Total	1531.807	214			
	Moral Imagination	Between groups	93.650	8	11.706	1.035	.411
		Within groups	2329.432	206	11.308		
		Total	2423.082	214			
	Moral Sensitivity	Between groups	34.350	8	4.294	1.063	.391
		Within groups	832.291	206	4.040		
		Total	866.641	214			
	Moral Determination	Between groups	56.066	8	7.008	1.292	.249
		Within groups	1117.513	206	5.425		
		Total	1173.579	214			
	Total	Between groups	202.116	8	25.265	.307	.963
		Within groups	16968.788	206	82.373		
		Total	17170.904	214			

\*p&lt;.05

According to Table 8, the moral literacy scale of the students included moral reasoning (F=.676; p>0.05), moral awareness (F=.260; p>0.05), moral imagination (F=1.035; p>0.05), moral sensitivity (F=1.063; p>0.05), moral determination (F=1.292; p>0.05) and the types of art they are interested in in the overall scale (F=.307; p>0.05). There was no significant difference between the groups according to the variable.

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics for the General and Sub-Dimensions of the University Students' Art Literacy Scale

Scale	Dimensions	Min	Max	n	$\bar{X}$	sd
Art Literacy	Using Artistic Knowledge	15	48	242	34.78	6.26
	Meeting the Need for Artistic Knowledge	6	25	242	17.73	3.44
	Transforming Theoretical Research into Performance	10	29	242	20.85	4.32
	Accessing Artistic Information	9	25	242	19.08	3.16
	Total	51	120	242	92.46	14.92

When the scores obtained from the art literacy scale and sub-dimensions of university students in Table 9 are examined, it is seen that the highest score average belongs to the sub-dimension of using artistic knowledge ( $X = 34.78$ ). In addition, the average of the scores obtained from the total of the scale is  $X = 92.46$ .

Table 10. T-Test Results of University Students' Art Literacy Levels by Gender

Dimensions	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	df	t	p
Using Artistic Knowledge	Female	157	34.86	5.52	240	.256	.798
	Male	85	34.64	7.46			
Meeting the Need for Artistic Knowledge	Female	157	17.84	3.10	240	.688	.492
	Male	85	17.52	4.01			
Transforming Theoretical Research into Performance	Female	157	21.02	4.00	240	.790	.430
	Male	85	20.56	4.86			
Reaching Information	Female	157	19.12	2.86	240	.234	.815
	Male	85	19.02	3.66			
Total	Female	157	92.85	13.14	240	.544	.587
	Male	85	91.75	17.82			

\*p<.05

Table 10 shows the t-test results regarding whether the art literacy levels of university students differ significantly according to the gender variable. Accordingly, it was determined that there was no significant difference on the basis of p>0.05 in the total and sub-dimensions of the scale according to the gender variable of the students.

Table 11. One-Way Variance (ANOVA) Results of University Students' Art Literacy Levels According to Socioeconomic Status Variable

Dependent variable	Dimesions	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Socioeconomics Level	Using Artistic Knowledge	Between groups	551.805	2	275.902	7.410	.001*
		Within groups	8898.505	239	37.232		
		Total	9450.310	241			
	Meeting the Need for Artistic Knowledge	Between groups	148.005	2	74.002	6.524	.002*
		Within groups	2710.935	239	11.343		
		Total	2858.940	241			
	Transforming Theoretical Research into Performance	Between groups	111.145	2	55.572	3.023	.051
		Within groups	4393.991	239	18.385		
		Total	4505.136	241			
	Reaching Information	Between groups	65.103	2	32.552	3.316	.038*
		Within groups	2345.822	239	9.815		
		Total	2410.925	241			
Total	Between groups	2931.792	2	1465.896	6.902	.001*	
	Within groups	50764.166	239	212.402			
	Total	53695.958	241				

\*p<.05

According to Table 11, the art literacy scale of the students is based on using artistic knowledge ( $F=7.410$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), meeting the need for artistic knowledge ( $F=6.524$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), and reaching artistic knowledge ( $F=3.316$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) and the overall scale ( $F=6.902$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), there was a significant difference between the groups according to the socioeconomic status variable. However, no significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of being able to transform theoretical research into performance ( $F=3.023$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) depending on the socioeconomic status variable. Tukey HSD test was performed to determine the source of the observed differences and the results are given in Table 12 below.

Table 12. Tukey HSD Test Results

Dimensions	Groups	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	F	p	Tukey HSD
Using Artistic Knowledge	Sub	24	32.78	5.14	7.410	.001*	
	Mid	183	34.38	6.45			3>2
	Top	35	38.27	4.53			
	Total	242	34.78	6.26			
Meeting the Need for Artistic Knowledge	Sub	24	16.88	2.91	6.524	.002*	
	Mid	183	17.49	3.55			3>1 3>2
	Top	35	19.58	2.52			
	Total	242	17.73	3.44			
Reaching Artistic Information	Sub	24	18.37	2.96	3.316	.038*	
	Mid	183	18.95	3.25			3>2
	Top	35	20.27	2.52			
	Total	242	19.08	3.16			
Total	Sub	24	88.31	12.32	6.902	.001*	
	Mid	183	91.45	15.49			3>1 3>2
	Top	35	100.62	10.26			
	Total	242	92.46	14.92			

\* $p<.05$ 

According to the Tukey HSD analysis in Table 12, a significance level of .05 emerged between the score averages of university students in the second and third groups in the sub-dimensions of using artistic information, meeting the need for artistic information, and accessing artistic information of the art literacy scale and the socioeconomic variable of the scale in general. This means that the scores of the third group students in this sub-dimension and the scale in general are higher than the scores of the second and first group students.

Table 13. One-Way Variance (ANOVA) Results of University Students' Art Literacy Levels According to the Faculty Variable

Dependent variable	Dimesions	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Faculty	Using Artistic Knowledge	Between groups	591.586	5	118.317	3.152	.009*
		Within groups	8858.724	236	37.537		
		Total	9450.310	241			
	Meeting the Need for Artistic Knowledge	Between groups	220.771	5	44.142	3.949	.002*
		Within groups	2638.229	236	11.179		
		Total	2858.940	241			
	Transforming Theoretical Research into Performance	Between groups	65.834	5	13.167	.700	.624
		Within groups	4439.302	236	18.811		
		Total	4505.136	241			
	Reaching Artistic Information	Between groups	68.647	5	13.729	1.383	.231
		Within groups	2342.278	236	9.925		
		Total	2410.925	241			
Total	Between groups	2683.045	5	536.609	2.483	.032*	
	Within groups	51012.914	236	216.156			
	Total	53695.958	241				

\*p&lt;.05

According to Table 13, students' art literacy scale has sub-dimensions of using artistic knowledge (F=3.152; p>0.05), meeting artistic knowledge needs (F=3.949; p>0.05), and the overall scale (F=2.483; p>0.05), a significant difference was observed between the groups according to the faculty levels variable. However, in the sub-dimensions of meeting the need for artistic information (F=3.949; p>0.05), being able to transform theoretical research into performance (F=.700; p>0.05) and accessing artistic information (F=1.383; p>0.05), No significant difference was found depending on the socioeconomic status variable. Tukey HSD test was performed to determine the source of the observed differences and the results are given in Table 14 below.

Table 14. Tukey HSD Test Results

Dimesions	Groups	n	$\bar{X}$	sd	df	F	p	Tukey HSD	
Using Knowledge	Artistic	Education	45	33.35	6.94				
		Theology	31	32.18	5.47	241	3.152	.009*	3>1 3>2
		Fine Arts	50	37.14	4.80				
		Engineering	34	34.76	7.50				
		Sports Science	42	34.92	5.84				
		Science and Letters	40	35.33	6.08				
		Total	242	34.78	6.26				
Meeting the Need for Artistic Knowledge	Artistic	Education	45	16.80	3.43				
		Theology	31	16.81	2.88	241	3.949	.002*	3>1 3>2
		Fine Arts	50	19.48	3.04				
		Engineering	34	17.48	4.05				
		Sports Science	42	17.68	3.24				
		Science and Letters	40	17.57	3.35				
		Total	242	17.73	3.44				
Total	Artistic	Education	45	89.57	15.35				
		Theology	31	87.18	12.38	241	2.483	.032*	3>2
		Fine Arts	50	97.73	12.27				
		Engineering	34	92.10	19.39				
		Sports Science	42	93.58	13.27				
		Science and Letters	40	92.37	15.21				
		Total	242	92.46	14.92				

\*p&lt;.05

According to the Tukey HSD analysis in Table 14, there was a significance level of .05 between the mean scores of university students in the first, second and third groups in the sub-dimensions of using artistic knowledge and meeting the need for artistic knowledge of the art literacy scale and the faculty variable in the overall scale. In other words, in this sub-dimension and scale, the scores of students studying at the Faculty of Fine Arts are higher than the scores of students studying at the Faculty of Education and Theology.



Table 15. One-Way Variance (ANOVA) Results of University Students' Art Literacy Levels According to the Art Types They Are Interested in

Dependent variable	Dimesions	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Types of Arts	Using Artistic Knowledge	Between groups	236.821	8	29.603	.818	.588
		Within groups	7455.186	206	36.190		
		Total	7692.008	214			
	Meeting the Need for Artistic Knowledge	Between groups	60.052	8	7.506	.723	.671
		Within groups	2139.580	206	10.386		
		Total	2199.632	214			
	Transforming Theoretical Research into Performance	Between groups	67.946	8	8.493	.467	.878
		Within groups	3742.486	206	18.167		
		Total	3810.432	214			
	Reaching Artistic Information	Between groups	77.300	8	9.663	1.067	.388
		Within groups	1866.103	206	9.059		
		Total	1943.403	214			
Total	Between groups	1208.316	8	151.040	.755	.643	
	Within groups	41211.316	206	200.055			
	Total	42419.632	214				

\*p&lt;.05

According to Table 15, the art literacy scale of the students is related to using artistic knowledge (F=.818; p>0.05), meeting the need for artistic knowledge (F=.723; p>0.05), transforming theoretical research into performance (F=.467; p>0.05) and reaching artistic information (F=1.067; p>0.05) and in the overall scale (F=.755; p>0.05), there was no significant difference between the groups according to the variable of the types of art they are interested in.

Table 16. Correlation between moral literacy and art literacy of university students

		Using Artistic Knowledge	Meeting the Need for Artistic Knowledge	Transforming Theoretical Research into Performance	Reaching Artistic Information	Art Literacy Total
Moral Reasoning	<i>r</i>	.115	.097	.061	.115	.113
	<i>p</i>	.073	.133	.348	.073	.080
	<i>n</i>	242	242	242	242	242
Moral Awareness	<i>r</i>	.271**	.249**	.261**	.174**	.284**
	<i>p</i>	.000	.000	.000	.007	.000
	<i>n</i>	242	242	242	242	242
Moral Imagination	<i>r</i>	.292**	.337**	.238**	.195**	.311**
	<i>p</i>	.000	.000	.000	.002	.000
	<i>n</i>	242	242	242	242	242
Moral Sensitivity	<i>r</i>	.353**	.382**	.324**	.305**	.395**
	<i>p</i>	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	<i>n</i>	242	242	242	242	242
Moral Determination	<i>r</i>	.305**	.262**	.228**	.215**	.300**
	<i>p</i>	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000
	<i>n</i>	242	242	242	242	242
Moral Literacy Total	<i>r</i>	.386**	.386**	.319**	.286**	.504**
	<i>p</i>	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	<i>n</i>	242	242	242	242	242

\*\* $p < .01$ 

The last sub-problem of the research is to determine the level of relationship between moral literacy and art literacy of university students. The ranges in evaluating the Pearson correlation coefficient which reveals the relationship between two variables was determined as  $r = .00-.25$  very weak,  $r = .26-.49$  weak,  $r = .50-.69$  medium  $r = .70-.89$  high,  $r = .90-1.00$  very high (Sungur, 2006). As seen in Table 16, as a result of the Pearson Correlation analysis conducted to reveal the relationship between moral literacy and art literacy of university students, the correlation coefficient was found to be ' $r = .504$ '. According to the findings, there is a significant and positive moderate relationship between the moral literacy and art literacy of university students.

## CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

This research aims to examine the relationship between moral literacy and art literacy of university students according to some determined variables. When we look at the descriptive statistics results for the moral literacy levels of university students, it can be said that the mean scores in both the sub-dimensions and the entire scale are close to high scores, in other words, their moral literacy is at a medium developed level. When the moral literacy levels of university students are examined according to the gender variable, it is seen that there is no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the scale and the overall scale. In other words, it can be said that the moral literacy levels of male and female students are similar. This result may be due to the lack of differences in moral consciousness and behavior between men and women in society, or it may be due to similar experiences in the education and training process. Because the ever-increasing level of education and learning opportunities may have brought the moral literacy levels of both genders closer to each other. From this perspective, this result can be considered a positive finding.

When the moral literacy levels of university students are examined according to their socioeconomic status variable; It was determined that there was a significant difference in the moral determination dimension, one of the sub-dimensions of the scale, in favor of students with high socioeconomic status. In this case, it can be interpreted that students with favorable socioeconomic conditions are more effective in determining their own moral decisions. Therefore, socioeconomic status does not only affect individuals' ability to sustain their lives. Studies show that socioeconomic level affects an important area such as individuals' education (Kazu, 2019) as well as their psychological state and behavior (Öncü et al., 2007). Based on this, it can be concluded that socioeconomic level is actually quite a factor in both material and spiritual dimensions.

When the moral literacy levels of university students were examined according to the faculty variable, it was observed that there was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of moral reasoning, moral awareness and moral sensitivity. However, a significant difference was found in the moral imagination, moral determination sub-dimensions and the overall scale. As a result of the Tukey HSD test conducted to determine the source of this difference, university students' scores in the moral imagination sub-dimension at the Faculty of Fine Arts; It was concluded that the moral determination sub-dimension was in favor of those studying at the Faculty of Education and the overall scale was in favor of those studying at the Faculty of Engineering. This suggests that different educational content and disciplines between faculties may have affected students' moral thought and decision processes differently. In addition, it can be interpreted as the students of the Faculty of Fine Arts, who are more involved in visual arts compared to students studying in other faculties, understand morality by imagining it. In other words, Fine Arts education is a field where artistic creativity and expression are at the forefront. Art is frequently associated with the attempt to represent human experience and the inner world. In this respect, this result can be read as a natural result of the imagination and imagination skills of the students of the faculty of fine arts. According to the views of Uçar, Canbolat and İlhan (2019; 395), which is in line with this idea, mental image, which is a way of seeing and thinking based on creating awareness of the perceptions of individuals receiving art education, paves the way for new approaches between concept and meaning. Moral literacy of university students When the levels are examined according to the variable of the types of art they are interested in, no significant relationship was found in the sub-dimensions and the overall scale.

When we look at the descriptive statistics results for the art literacy levels of university students, it can be said that the average scores in both the sub-dimensions and the entire scale are at a medium developed level. In other words, it suggests that the students have a moderate level of understanding on art-related issues. From this perspective, it comes to mind that more efforts should be made to increase students' understanding of art. When the art literacy levels of university students were examined according to the gender variable, no significant difference was

observed in the sub-dimensions of the scale and the overall scale. In other words, it can be said that the art literacy levels of male and female students are similar.

When the art literacy levels of university students are examined according to their socioeconomic status variable; No significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of being able to transform theoretical research into performance. However, it was determined that there was a significant difference in favor of students with high socioeconomic status in the scale's sub-dimensions of using artistic knowledge, meeting the need for artistic knowledge, and accessing artistic knowledge, and in general. This finding may suggest that university students with high socioeconomic levels are more competent in identifying and meeting their needs and efforts towards art and understanding art. This may be associated with the fact that students with high socioeconomic levels have more advantages in accessing artistic knowledge and participating in artistic experiences than other groups.

When the art literacy levels of university students are examined according to the variable of the faculty they study at; A significant difference was found in the scale's use of artistic knowledge, meeting the need for artistic knowledge and overall. These significant differences were generally in favor of students studying at the Faculty of Fine Arts. In fact, it is somewhat inevitable for the students of the Faculty of Fine Arts, who deal with a piece of art every day, to use and process the knowledge they have acquired about art. On the other hand, when the art literacy levels of university students are examined according to the variable of the types of art they are interested in, no significant relationship was found in the sub-dimensions and the overall scale.

As a result of the analyzes carried out to examine the relationship between moral literacy and art literacy of university students studying in different faculties and with different socioeconomic levels, a 'weak' and 'medium' level of relationship was observed between most of the sub-dimensions of both scales, but when the general scales are taken into consideration, the relationship between the two scales is positive. It appears to be at a 'medium' level.

The fact that the relationship between the two scales applied on university students is positive reveals that the relationship between morality and art is actually two thought structures that predict each other. As a matter of fact, as emphasized in the conceptual section, morality and art are two systems that feed each other. The words attributed to Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe, the world-famous man of letters, politician, painter and naturalist, are as follows: "*A person should listen to some music, read some poetry, and see a beautiful painting every day, so that worldly concerns can erase and destroy the beautiful feelings that the Creator has instilled in the human soul.*" (Azquotes, 2023) supports the connection between these two systems. Similarly, Aristotle argues that the duty of art is not to arouse aesthetic pleasure in people, but to create ethical pleasure (Tunali, 2016). Making a unique definition of morality and art and achieving aesthetic pleasure in the dynamic and young minds of university age is important to open new doors of the future. Morality is a starting point for determining the inner world of an individual, and art is a starting point for reflecting these to the outside.

Another important result of the research is that students' moral and artistic literacy varies depending on their socioeconomic status. With this result, if the socioeconomic status of the students is high, they will be able to solve their own problems, help others' problems, etc. It is thought that they make moral decisions more easily. In addition, students with high socioeconomic status do not have difficulty in accessing financial resources, which is very effective in their ability to access artistic knowledge and use it without hesitation. After all, morality and art are directly related to the ability to think freely.

One of the results obtained from the research is that, in general, university students studying at the Faculty of Fine Arts are more competent than other students in using artistic knowledge and developing an original and positive perspective on morality. This suggests that students studying at the Faculty of Fine Arts may be able to think more original than other students and to be able to convey these thoughts to the outside world through the art they engage in. As a matter of fact, Tuana (2007) defines moral imagination as helping the individual to overcome difficulties and to

think critically about options and original perspectives that help him to realize the moral dimensions of people, events, indicators and meanings related to a situation. On the other hand, Özer's (2018) study concluded that as the grade levels of students studying at the Faculty of Fine Arts increase, their art literacy levels also increase. In this context, it can be said that art education can positively contribute to the development of original thought and moral perspective. In addition, this should be noted as an important finding as it shows that art is not only an aesthetic experience, but also an important tool in shaping the ethical and moral aspects of the individual.

This positive relationship, which emerged as a result of the research, can be interpreted as meaning that university students' moral thoughts are effective in their artistic actions, and their artistic ideas are also effective in their moral decisions. In parallel with this issue, Ahmedov (2010) states that art that reflects life in its entirety also constitutes the integrity of individuals' moral and aesthetic upbringing. So much so that our famous poet Mehmet Akif Ersoy is one of those who drew a unique path by blending art and morality. According to Yüce (2022), this mindset is seen to be reflected in Ersoy's own development process into the world of mentality from a holistic perspective of 'science, art and religion'. As a result of the research, university students are more likely to engage in artistic activities intertwined with moral learning. It is thought to be important. Moreover, these activities must be at a level that does not affect the socioeconomic status of the students and must appeal to each student equally. In this way, students who freely determine their own areas of interest will be able to freely reveal their own systems of thought. They will also be able to prevent hopeless thoughts about the future, which is one of the results obtained from the research. University students are the adults of the future. Therefore, their ability to have competent, creative and critical skills will also affect the future. Establishing, understanding, assimilating and evaluating the connection between morality and art; It is valuable for future teachers, engineers, athletes and artists.

In light of the findings from this research; It may be recommended to organize activities to develop both thought and behavior structures at the higher education level, to conduct similar studies with different working groups, and to implement additional studies for university students in line with the results obtained.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmedov, A. İ. (2010). Sanatta Estetik Ve Ahlaki Cihetlerin Karşılıklı İlişkisi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (10).
- AKYOL, A.D. (2002). Etik ve Hemşirelik. *Ege Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksek Okulu Dergisi*, 18(1-3), 105-118.
- Alp, K. Ö. (2013). Sanatın Temsili ve Postmodern Sanatta Temsil. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Fakültesi Hakemli Dergisi, Art-E 6 (12)*, 40-61.
- Azquotes. "Johann Wolfgang von Goethe Quotes". Access Date :16.08.2023. Available from: <https://www.azquotes.com/quote/352249>
- Brown, A. L. (2017). *Metacognitive development and reading*. In Theoretical issues in reading comprehension (pp. 453-482). Routledge.
- ÇAKIR, Z. & YALÇIN, S. A. (2021). Montessori Yaklaşımı Temelli STEM Etkinliklerinin Öğretmen Adaylarının Fene ve Fen Öğretimine Yönelik Tutumlarına Etkisi. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 17(35), 1895-1924.
- ÇELİK, B. (2017). Üniversite 1. Sınıf Öğrencileri İle Ortaokul 6. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Ahlak Gelişimlerinin Karşılaştırılması.(Yayınlanmış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Available from: <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi>.
- Davutoğlu, A. (2017). *Duruş Gençlerle Yüz Yüze*. İstanbul: Küre Yayınları.
- EFİL, Ş. (2020). TOLSTOY'DA SANATIN DİN VE AHLAKLA İLİŞKİSİ. *Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (FLSF)*, (30).
- Elkatmış, M. (2021). Peygamberimiz ve Çocuk. Fatih Kurt (Ed.) *Uluslar arası Mevlid-i Nebi Sempozyumu*. (s.665-665). Çağlayan Basım Yayın Dağıtım Ambalaj San. ve Tic. A.Ş., İzmir.
- Fraenkel, Jack R., veWallen, Norman E. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (Seventh ed.). NewYork: McGraw-Hill.
- Gülhan, F. & Şahin, F. (2018). STEAM (STEM+Sanat) etkinliklerinin 7. sınıf öğrencilerinin akademik başarı, STEAM tutum ve bilimsel yaratıcılıklarına etkisi. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 15(3), 1675-1699. doi:10.14687/jhs.v15i3.5430

- Hussey, I., Alsalti, T., Bosco, F., Elson, M. & Arslan, R. C. (2023). An aberrant abundance of Cronbach's alpha values at. 70. *PsyArXiv*.
- Kazu, İ. Y. (2019). Sosyo-ekonomik aıdan dezavantajlı kiřilerin eđitimi sırasında karřılařtıkları sorunlar. *Dicle niversitesi Ziya Gkalp Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, (34), 38-47.
- Milli Eđitim Bakanlıđı (2018). *İnsan Hakları, Yurttařlık ve Demokrasi Dersi đretim Programı*. Ankara: MEB.
- Tuana, N. (2007) "Conceptualizing Moral Literacy", *Journal of Educational Administration*, ed. Paul Begley 45/4, 364-378.
- nc, F., Sercan, M., Ger, C., Bilici, R., Ural, C., & Uygur, N. (2007). Sosyoekonomik etmenlerin ve sosyodemografik zelliklerin psikotik olguların su iřlemesinde etkisi. *Trk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, (18), 4-12.
- zer, B. (2018). Gzel sanatlar fakltelerindeki đrencilerin sanat okuryazarlık dzeyleri zerine bir arařtırma. *Ekev Akademi Dergisi Yıl: 22 Sayı: 73*.
- zkse, K. (2011). Ahilikte Ahlak ve Meslek Eđitimi. *Cumhuriyet niversitesi İlahiyat Fakltesi Dergisi*, 15(2), 5-19.
- Schiller, F. R. (2020). *İnsanın Estetik Eđitimi zerine*. (G. Ayta, ev.). Ankara: Folkitap.
- Sivrikaya, ., Sadık, R., Efek, E. (2018). Spor Bilimleri Alanında Okuyan niversite đrencilerinin Ahlaki Geliřim Dzeyleriyle Spor Tutumları Arasındaki İliřkinin İncelenmesi Investigation Of The Students Relations Between Moral Levels And Sports Attitudes in University Of Sports Science. *Journal of Social And Humanities Sciences Research (JSHSR)*, 5(29), 3895-3903.
- Sungur, O. (2006). *Korelasyon analizi*, ř. Kalaycı (Ed.) SPSS uygulamalı ok deđiřkenli istatistik teknikleri. (113-127) iinde, Ankara, Asil Yayın Dađıtım.
- řahin, N. (2011). Gazl'i'de Etik-Estetik İliřkisi. *Diyanet İlmî Dergi*, 47(3), 93-114.
- Tekin, İ. (2022). Ahlak Okuryazarlıđı leđinin Geliřtirilmesi: Geerlik ve Gvenirlik alıřması. *Marife Dini Arařtırmalar Dergisi*, 22(1), 43-67.
- Tunalı İ. (2016). *GreK Estetik'i*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi
- Tunalı, İ., (1996). "Sanat ve Ahlak zerine Rportaj", *İzlenim Dergisi*, 32, [30-32]. Available from: <https://katalog.idp.org.tr/yazilar/1348438/prof-dr-ismail-tunali-sanat-toplumdan-ve-ahlaktan-soyutlanamaz> (15.10.2022)
- Uar, M., Canbolat, C. & İlhan, S. (2019). Gzel Sanatlar ve Tasarım Fakltesi đrencilerinin "Sanat" Kavramına İliřkin Zihinsel İmgeleri. *Sanat ve Tasarım Dergisi*, (23), 393-411.
- Uan, A. (1996). *İnsan ve Mzik, İnsan ve Sanat Eđitimi*. Mzik Ansiklopedisi Yayınları, 2. Basım, Ankara.
- Yce, S. (2022). Mehmet kif'in Sanat Ve Estetik Anlayıřı. *Ankara niversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Cođrafya Fakltesi Trkoloji Dergisi* (26)-1, 218-233
- Ycetoker, İ. (2014). Sanat Okuryazarlıđı leđinin Hazırlanması ve Geliřtirilmesi. *Sanat Eđitimi Dergisi* 2 (1), 112-126.