

Factors Affecting Teacher Candidates' Value Preferences

Aylin Mentiş K ksoyⁱ
Ege University

İskender Daşdemirⁱⁱ
Ege University

Abstract

Since the beginning, humankind accumulated knowledge and experiences by passing them to new generations. This accumulation within societies emerged as these societies' values. We acquire these values from our societies and we hold them up as examples in our lives. To ensure the country's future, educational institutions and teachers have to teach these values.

The study purpose is to determine whether teacher candidates' value preferences differ or not. Relational survey model was employed in the study. The sex of the candidates, education level of the parents, income level of the family, where they live and the program they are in make up the independent variables. Human value dimensions (power, achievement, hedonism, self-direction, stimulation, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security) of the candidates make up the dependent variables of the study. The study universe consists of seniors attending Omer Halisdemir University's Faculty of Education during the 2016-2017 academic year. Selected by random sampling method among this universe, 380 senior teacher candidates make up the study group.

The study results put forth that values education has effect on female candidates' universalism, benevolence and security value tendencies, and their value tendencies are high. Also, the higher the mother's education level, the higher the candidates' universalism, hedonism, benevolence and security value tendencies. Yet, father's education level does not have any effect on candidates' value tendencies. The study, also, reveals that teacher candidates' family income and where they live have no effect on value tendencies. Furthermore, the programs the candidates are in have effect on their universalism, hedonism, benevolence and security value tendencies.

Keywords: Teacher Candidates, Values Education, Schwartz Value Survey

DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2019.215.7

ⁱ Aylin Mentiş K ksoy, Assoc. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Education, Ege University, ORCID: 0000-0003-4158-2388

Correspondence: aylin.mentis.koksoy@ege.edu.tr

ⁱⁱ İskender Daşdemir, Lecturer Dr., Social Sciences and Turkish Education, Social Studies Teacher Education, Education Sciences, Ege University

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning, humankind accumulated knowledge and experiences by passing them to new generations, and this accumulation within the societies emerged as the societies' values. Value as a concept is defined as something that is wanted and needed but at the same time something that is necessary. Moreover, values are not entirely objective; they form completeness with emotions when they come to the fore. In other words, values are not ideas devoid of emotions. Values are effective in the behaviors of individuals while they are trying to achieve their goals (Cetin, 2004). Values are patterns of social behaviors ensuring individuals' place in society and making their lives easier (Ozkan, 2010, p.1128). Values become a whole with its information, emotion and behavior dimensions. Although societies and individuals have different values, values share common characteristics in terms of structure, logic and function (Yesil & Aydin, 2007, p. 80; Gomleksiz & Curo, 2011, p. 97).

We acquire these values from our societies and we hold them up as examples in our lives. Therefore, values are gained from the family, surroundings, and written and visual materials through imitation, modeling or reading (Sen, 2008, p. 764-765). For this reason, individuals become aware of certain values, create new ones, adopt them and show them with their behaviors through education. This education is called values education (Yesil & Aydin, 2007, p. 71). Today, values education is given in a systematic order within a program in educational institutions (Sen, 2008, p. 764-765). Preparing individuals for life and teaching citizenship skills and values are done through curricula. This function is realized by certain subjects in every course and courses like Life Sciences, Social Studies, Citizenship and Human Rights (Akengin, Saglam & Dilek, 2002, p. 3). A person whose values are not matured or developed enough can hurt people around himself (Doganay, 2006, p. 257). For this reason, values education has an important place in the education system. The fundamental purpose of families, societies and schools is to raise individuals who adopted basic human values. In this respect, the general purpose of schools is to raise individuals who are academically successful and who adopted basic values (Eksi, 2003, p. 79). Moreover, values education has an important part in protecting and development of national identity. People grow mature by the development of values and attitudes that they have to have through values education. The most important characteristics of values education are these (Kale, 2007, p. 319), to make people aware of universal and cultural values and their importance, to associate democratic attitudes with tolerance, to evaluate all values with human existence and developing opportunities, and to transform information to reality or reality to information through concrete problems related to ethical problems (Gomleksiz & Curo, 2011, p. 99-100).

Values are general principles reflecting on people's way of life. In social life, everything is perceived according to values, and people use values' different approaches and applications as criteria (Kincal, 2002; Genc & Eryaman, 2008). In sociology, common thoughts of healthy adults, their habits and conditioned emotional reactions are universal. What individuals understand from universal is not the universalism of good and bad separately but good and bad as a whole. For example, we can call love, war and death universal or we can make explanations about the situations created by these words. In this way, what we understand from universalism will reveal itself (Koc, 2007). When universal values are considered in terms of benefit to humankind, acting in a way that would be beneficial to people or acting in a way that would not be harmful to them is possible with ethical values, love respect trust, tolerance, etc. Universal processes are expression of social rules that do not need to be defined other than general understanding. A society does not necessarily go through its phases because they should be universal but they go through them as principles of understanding offered by experiences. Being a part of experiences that are shared from past to present, actions that are believed to be universal are products of the social system representing people's general understandings. Nobody has the initiative to create the framework for universal rules. Social accumulations that have universal characteristics are identified by comparing different cultures and finding common aspects. When Rousseau (1992) stated that people have natural rights before the state and above its laws, he meant that these values are above the law. If there are no values addressing all human beings, there will be a world full of wars and anarchy (Somuncu, 2008, s. 25-27).

In his Kohlberg Moral principles, German developmental psychologist Kohlberg states that people have tendencies for universal moral principles during their moral development stages. Universal moral principles are Kohlberg's sixth stage. In this stage, right and wrong is defined by people's own conscious. These principles are universal moral principles like justice, human rights and respect for others (Yapici & Yapici, 2005). Universal moral principles make up people's moral judgments in this stage. Gander calls these moral principles universal justice principles and ranks them as equality of human rights and respect for people's honor as individual beings. Finally, characteristics of universal moral values can be ranked as follows: "Universal moral values are put forth and recommended by a superhuman entity-God. They are the values that emerge in the actions of people making sure they live with dignity, listen to their conscious and enables them not to be alienated to themselves. They are in the interest of humankind and help the society. In order for personal integrity to have meaning, universal values should live in the society's culture. Creating the future is only possible with living with the values and keeping them alive because power coming from values does not oppress people, lower human dignity and instead rise human dignity (Cuceloglu, 1999). In order to bring peace and justice to world and protect it, people should develop a common consensus and cooperate. This is possible with universal values being taught in schools. According to Plato, education is to bring out the truths hidden in the student. According to rationalists, education is to educate the mind on mental problems and past solutions with applications and intellectual habits. According to Russell, education is formation of certain mental habits through training and is a certain outlook to life and world.

According to Dewey, education is an attempt to fulfill the conditions that make people grow regardless of age. According to Rousseau, education's purpose is to make the child happy and good. Since everything in nature is corrupted by people, education should be in harmony with nature. Children should not learn from books, but from nature and experience. Education should be versatile and comprehensive to bring out the child's hidden potential (Inal, 1998; Eryaman & Riedler 2009). According to Montaigne, education not corrupting people is not enough; it should change people for the better (Montaigne, 1580; Somuncu, 2008). Having a society with good values is greatly important for the future of a country. Educational institutions and teachers that will give these values are needed to create this society. School education is vital in giving these values. Today, values education is given great importance, and there are studies on how to transmit these values to children. In schools, a social environment, values are developed with the reactions and interpretations children receive from their environment for their behaviors and attitudes. The social fabric formed in the classroom provides a ground for the development of their values. Teachers help the development of children's value systems with positive and negative feedback by giving them responsibilities. Today's events led many parents and educators to believe that academic achievement alone is not enough for children and information is not enough for achievement. What is more important is for children to make good life choices, to be self-confident to express themselves, to be honest, to never stray away from what is right. These values, today, became priceless, and researchers began to work on these issues (Aydin, 2010). Values include individuals' experiences, and have a great effect on organizing relationships with other people. Therefore, in values education stress the importance of evaluating individuals' lives and experiences with ethical values like love, respect, honesty, trust, independence and truth (Kale, 2007: 319; Gomleksiz & Curo, 2011, p. 101).

When considered individually, values emerge as a criterion in an individual's thoughts, attitudes, behaviors and structures, and indissolubly constitute a part of social holism (Durmus, 1996). Values are also a part of the culture of the organizations where the individuals work because organization culture is defined as values that are shared and obeyed by the individuals and groups in an institution (Sabuncuoglu & Tuz, 2003). At the same time, values are considered as one of the most important keys to understand workers' behaviors in an organization (Demir, 2005). Workers' human values create a powerful organization culture and workplace. Also, in an organization where human values are dominant, workers' psychology is better understood. This helps workers to reach their potential and be more successful. Finally, in an organization with human values, people give more importance to each other's emotions (Stallard & Pankau, 2008). Individuals live in environments made up of their and environments' values (Turan & Aktan, 2008). Individuals can change their values with

interaction. During this process, individuals' school life is very important because values are mostly learned in schools. School is a learning place built on values (Turan & Turan, 2008). School curricula have objectives regarding values. Especially in the new curricula, objectives regarding values and how to teach them are given great importance (MEB, 2004; Yilmaz, 2009).

The main purpose of education programs is to raise effective citizens and individuals who know their responsibilities. In addition to this, affective characteristics including individual's emotions are also very important in education. In education, attaining positive or negative emotions towards certain objects or events and transmitting values and attitudes wanted by the society are related to affective objectives. The education done to reach these objectives is affective education. Affective education is also called moral education, character education and value education (Bacanli, 2006, p. 13-14). Great responsibility falls on teachers for socialization of children and for them to live in society appreciating democratic values (Gomleksiz & Curo, 2011, p. 1001-1002). Teachers play an important role in values education, planned or unplanned. In addition to teaching the subject matter, teachers influence children's cognitive, affective and social development (Akbas, 2009, p. 404). Teachers' own value judgements have a significant impact on students. Thus, values education should not be only theoretical but also should be practical (Tozlu & Topsakal, 2007, p. 181; Gomleksiz & Curo, 2011, p. 100).

In training teachers who will teach values education, great responsibility falls on the shoulders of faculty members in education faculties. Teacher candidates should be taught values along with subject matter because teachers play significant part in realizing educational objectives and bringing natural talents into the open (Jackson, Boostrom & Hansen, 1998; Riedler & Eryaman, 2016). Teachers' values are especially important because of their position. Their roles are not just related to teaching they do in classroom. Their role encompasses the entire school. For this, teachers should see students as individuals and should value them. Teachers should strive for the highest level of learning and development by taking students' social and cultural differences and their interests into consideration. They also should have the personal characteristics they want their students to have in themselves because there are many study findings showing how teachers' values affect student behaviors (Brophy & Good, 1986; Dickinson, 1990). Because of their position, teachers have an important role in the process of teaching values to the students (Suh & Traiger, 1999; Yilmaz, 2009). Taking all these assumptions into consideration, determining and explaining values of teacher candidates who will become the future teachers is quite important.

The purpose of the present study is to determine whether teacher candidates' value preferences differ or not according to sex of the candidates, education level of the parents, income level of the family, where they live and the program they are in.

METHOD

The study purpose, model, universe and sample, data collection tools and statistical methods used to analyze the data collected are presented in this section.

Study Purpose

The purpose of this study is to put forth the value tendencies of 380 seniors attending Nigde Omer Halisdemir University's Faculty of Education during the 2016-2017 academic year in terms of certain variables (sex, education levels of their parents, income levels of their family, where they live and programs they are in).

Study Model

The study employed relational survey model, a subtype of general survey model. Relational survey model aims to determine the co-changing between two or more variables and establish the

degree of change (Karasar, 2009). The sex of the teacher candidates, education level of the parents, income level of the family, where they live and the program they are in make up the independent variables. Human value dimensions of the teacher candidates make up the dependent variables of the study. In the study, human values of the teacher candidates were examined to determine whether they differed or not according to their sex, education levels of their parents, income levels of their family, where they live and programs they are in.

Study Group

The sample universe of the study is made up of seniors attending Nigde Omer Halisdemir University's Faculty of Education. Since the teacher candidates in the Faculty of Education have similar characteristics, random sampling method was used. Selected by random sampling method among this universe, 380 senior teacher candidates from the programs of Social Studies, Turkish, Math, Science, Primary, Guidance and Psychological Counseling, Painting and Music make up the study group.

| Value | | Frequency | Percent |
|------------|---------------------|-----------|---------|
| Sex | Female | 254 | 66,8 |
| | Male | 126 | 33,2 |
| Department | Math | 49 | 12,9 |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 14,7 |
| | Science | 39 | 10,3 |
| | Turkish | 53 | 13,9 |
| | Primary | 50 | 13,2 |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 12,1 |
| | Painting | 42 | 11,1 |
| | Music | 45 | 11,8 |

Data Collection Tools

In the study, a personal information form was used to collect teacher candidates' demographic information. Schwartz Value Survey was administered to measure teacher candidates' value preferences in their lives. The survey was adapted to Turkish by Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı in 2000, and their version was administered to teacher candidates in the present study. This survey was administered during the fall semester of 2015-2016 academic year.

Schwartz Value Survey

Schwartz Value Survey consists of 57 value items. Respondents rate the importance of each of these 57 items "as a guiding principle in my life" on a scale varying from 1 (opposed to my values) to 7 (of supreme importance). The 57 value were grouped under 10 sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are power, achievement, hedonism, self-direction, stimulation, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security. Reliability coefficients of value dimensions was calculated by Ercan (2009) and Kusdil and Kagitcibasi (2000). The reliability coefficients for value dimensions range from 0.51 to 0.77.

The value dimensions and values used in the study are power (having social power, controlling others, dominance), universalism (equality, internal harmony, wanted a peaceful world, harmony with nature, being), achievement (being ambitious, being influential, being intelligent, being successful), hedonism (taking pleasure from life, gratification), stimulation (being brave, living ever-changing life, having an exciting life), self-direction (being creative, being independent, choosing your own goals, being free, being respectful to yourself), benevolence (spiritual life, being forgiving, being honest, being benevolent, being loyal, being responsible, meaningful life, real friendship, mature love), tradition (accepting what life gives, being genial, being religious, beings respectful of

traditions), conformity (being obedient, cherishing parents and elders, being polite, controlling yourself) and security (loyalty, social justice, family security, wanting the social order to continue, national security, being clean, being healthy)

Data Analysis

Before data analysis, assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance were tested to check whether the assumptions were met or not. To determine whether the assumption of normality was met, skewness and kurtosis coefficients regarding the distribution of scores from each sub-dimension were examined, and these coefficients were determined to be between -1 and +1 limits. According to these results, the scores did not show any significant deviation from the normal deviation (Buyukozturk, 2009; Kalayci, 2010). Puanlara ilişkin çarpıklık ve basıklık katsayıları Tablo... Da verilmiştir.

Table... Descriptive Statistics Regarding Scores

| Values | Mean | Std. Deviation | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|-----------------|-------|----------------|----------|----------|
| Power | 22,96 | 7,15 | -,448 | -,068 |
| Universalism | 51,31 | 8,76 | ,921 | ,615 |
| Achievement | 20,69 | 5,57 | -,774 | ,602 |
| Hhedonism | 10,53 | 2,77 | -,644 | -,142 |
| Stimulation | 13,08 | 5,09 | -,349 | -,534 |
| Öself-direction | 35,03 | 6,17 | -,683 | ,817 |
| Benevolence | 51,65 | 8,69 | -,974 | ,950 |
| Tradition | 22,50 | 6,28 | -,429 | -,015 |
| Confirmity | 19,97 | 5,01 | -,810 | ,968 |
| Security | 41,07 | 6,59 | -,854 | ,975 |

Then, assumptions of homogeneity of variance were tested. Levene F test was used to test the assumption of homogeneity of variance. According to Levene F test, variances of scores from each sub-dimension were not equal for each group (Buyukozturk, 2009). Since these assumptions were met, Independent Samples t Test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference according to the sex variable, and ANOVA was used to determine whether there were significant difference according to mother's education level, place to live and program variables. Since teacher candidate numbers in some groups were small, Kruskal Wallis test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between the education level of father variable and income level of family variable. The eta-square value, also called effect size, is a measure of the magnitude of the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). η^2 , which shows the independent variable's explanation amount of the total variance in the dependent variable, varies between 0.00 and 1.00, and η^2 values at .01, .06 and .14 levels are interpreted as "small", "medium" and "large" effect sizes in the same order (Büyüköztürk, 2009). The data was analyzed using SPSS 18.0 statistical package program. In the analysis of data, significance level (p) was accepted as 0.05.

FINDINGS

This section of the study includes findings obtained from the statistical analysis done based on the study purposes and interpretations of these findings. Whether the difference between the value dimensions score averages was significant according to teacher candidates' sex variables was test with Independent Samples t Test, and the results are presented in the following table 1.

Table 1. Independent Samples t Test Results According to Sex Variable

| Value | Sex | N | \bar{x} | Sx | t | Df | p | η^2 |
|----------------|--------|-----|-----------|-------|--------|-----|-------|----------|
| Power | female | 254 | 23.38 | 6.91 | 1.629 | 378 | .104 | |
| | male | 126 | 22.11 | 7.55 | | | | |
| Universalism | female | 254 | 52.11 | 7.79 | 2.525 | 378 | .012* | 0.017 |
| | male | 126 | 49.71 | 10.27 | | | | |
| Achievement | Female | 254 | 20.77 | 5.46 | .343 | 378 | .732 | |
| | male | 126 | 20.56 | 5.80 | | | | |
| Hedonism | female | 254 | 10.66 | 2.61 | 1.314 | 378 | .190 | |
| | male | 126 | 10.26 | 3.04 | | | | |
| Stimulation | female | 254 | 12.88 | 5.09 | -1.086 | 378 | .278 | |
| | male | 126 | 13.48 | 5.07 | | | | |
| Self-direction | female | 254 | 35.43 | 5.26 | 1.801 | 378 | .072 | |
| | male | 126 | 34.22 | 7.62 | | | | |
| Benevolence | female | 254 | 52.74 | 7.77 | 3.532 | 378 | .000* | 0.032 |
| | male | 126 | 49.44 | 9.96 | | | | |
| Tradition | female | 254 | 22.73 | 6.18 | 1.023 | 378 | .307 | |
| | male | 126 | 22.03 | 6.47 | | | | |
| Conformity | female | 254 | 20.28 | 4.56 | 1.738 | 378 | .083 | |
| | male | 126 | 19.33 | 5.76 | | | | |
| Security | female | 254 | 41.55 | 5.58 | 2.008 | 378 | .045* | 0.011 |
| | male | 126 | 40.11 | 8.19 | | | | |

*p<0.05

When Table 1 is examined, it is found that there are no significant differences between power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, tradition and conformity according to the sex ($p>0,05$). This finding shows that sex does not have effect on teacher candidates' power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, tradition and conformity value tendencies.

According to Table 1, there are significant differences in favor of female teacher candidates between universalism, benevolence and security value types ($p<0,05$). These findings indicate that sex has effect on teacher candidates' universalism, benevolence and security value tendencies, and these value tendencies of female teacher candidates' are higher than the males. The eta-square effect size value was between 0.011 and 0.032. This finding shows that sex has a "low level" effect on universalism, benevolence and security scores.

Whether there is a significant difference between value dimensions score averages according to teacher candidates' mother's education level or not is tested with ANOVA and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. ANOVA Results According to Mother's Education Level

| Value | Mother's Education | N | \bar{x} | Sx | F | Df | p | Significant Difference | η^2 |
|--------------|--------------------|-----|-----------|-------|-------|-----|-------|---|----------|
| Power | Illiterate | 43 | 21.95 | 6.87 | .436 | 379 | .783 | | |
| | Primary school | 208 | 22.91 | 7.18 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 57 | 23.47 | 6.81 | | | | | |
| | High school | 50 | 22.92 | 7.02 | | | | | |
| | University | 22 | 24.14 | 8.73 | | | | | |
| Universalism | Illiterate | 43 | 48.58 | 10.32 | 2.625 | 379 | .034* | illiterate-middle school illiterate-university high school-university | 0.027 |
| | Primary school | 208 | 51.31 | 8.58 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 57 | 53.02 | 6.96 | | | | | |
| | High school | 50 | 50.26 | 9.73 | | | | | |
| | University | 22 | 54.68 | 7.46 | | | | | |
| Achievement | Illiterate | 43 | 20.56 | 5.31 | .278 | 379 | .892 | | |
| | Primary school | 208 | 20.60 | 5.69 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 57 | 20.75 | 5.20 | | | | | |
| | High school | 50 | 21.40 | 6.13 | | | | | |
| | University | 22 | 20.14 | 4.76 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|--|-------|
| Hedonism | Illiterate | 43 | 9.98 | 2.93 | 3.260 | 379 | .012* | illiterate-university primary school- university middle school-university high school-university | 0.008 |
| | Primary school | 208 | 10.44 | 2.79 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 57 | 10.86 | 2.59 | | | | | |
| | High school | 50 | 10.18 | 2.78 | | | | | |
| | University | 22 | 12.32 | 1.80 | | | | | |
| Stimulation | Illiterate | 43 | 12.77 | 4.30 | 1.661 | 379 | .158 | | |
| | Primary school | 208 | 12.74 | 5.08 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 57 | 13.95 | 4.71 | | | | | |
| | High school | 50 | 12.88 | 5.84 | | | | | |
| | University | 22 | 15.18 | 5.29 | | | | | |
| Self-Direction | Illiterate | 43 | 34.07 | 6.82 | 1.153 | 379 | .331 | | |
| | Primary school | 208 | 34.97 | 6.20 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 57 | 35.46 | 5.74 | | | | | |
| | High school | 50 | 34.60 | 6.62 | | | | | |
| | University | 22 | 37.32 | 3.84 | | | | | |
| Benevolence | Illiterate | 43 | 49.21 | 10.41 | 2.645 | 379 | .033* | illiterate-primary school illiterate-middle school primary school-high school middle school- high school | 0.027 |
| | Primary school | 208 | 52.21 | 8.26 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 57 | 52.91 | 7.05 | | | | | |
| | High school | 50 | 49.18 | 9.97 | | | | | |
| | University | 22 | 53.41 | 8.44 | | | | | |
| Tradition | Illiterate | 43 | 20.91 | 6.60 | 1.181 | 379 | .319 | | |
| | Primary school | 208 | 22.92 | 6.36 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 57 | 22.81 | 5.13 | | | | | |
| | High school | 50 | 21.68 | 6.79 | | | | | |
| | University | 22 | 22.68 | 6.23 | | | | | |
| Confirmity | Illiterate | 43 | 18.14 | 5.82 | 1.642 | 379 | .163 | | |
| | Primary school | 208 | 20.17 | 5.08 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 57 | 20.35 | 4.54 | | | | | |
| | High school | 50 | 20.12 | 4.45 | | | | | |
| | University | 22 | 20.27 | 4.60 | | | | | |
| Security | Illiterate | 43 | 38.14 | 8.97 | 2.754 | 379 | .028* | Illiterate-primary school Illiterate-middle school Illiterate-university | 0.029 |
| | Primary school | 208 | 41.53 | 6.22 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 57 | 41.26 | 5.42 | | | | | |
| | High school | 50 | 40.80 | 6.97 | | | | | |
| | University | 22 | 42.59 | 5.16 | | | | | |

*p<0.05

When Table 2 is examined, it is found that there are no significant differences between power, achievement, stimulation, self-direction, tradition and conformity according to mother's education level ($p>0,05$). This finding shows that mother's education level does not have effect on teacher candidates' power, achievement, stimulation, self-direction, tradition and conformity value tendencies.

Table 2 shows that universalism value tendencies of teacher candidates significantly differ in favor of female teacher candidates ($p<0,05$). According to the results of LSD test, one of the multiple comparison tests, universalism value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers graduated from university are significantly higher than universalism value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers are illiterate or graduated from high school. Furthermore, universalism value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers graduated from middle school are significantly higher compared to teacher candidates whose mothers are illiterate. Eta-square effect size value was found to be 0.027. This finding shows that mother's education level has a "low level" effect on universalism scores.

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that hedonism value tendencies of teacher candidates significantly differ according to mother's education level ($p<0,05$). When average scores are examined, it is found that as the education level of the family increases, the teacher candidates' hedonism value tendency scores increase. According to the results of LSD test, hedonism value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers graduated from university are significantly higher compared to mothers who are illiterate or who graduated from primary school, middle school and high school. Eta-square effect size value was found to be 0.008. This finding shows that mother's education level has a "low level" effect on hedonism scores.

Teacher candidates significantly differ according to mother's education level ($p < 0,05$). According to the results of LSD test, benevolence value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers graduated from primary school and middle school are significantly higher compared to mothers who are illiterate or who graduated from high school. Eta-square effect size value was found to be 0.027. This finding shows that mother's education level has a "low level" effect on benevolence scores.

Table 2 also shows that security value tendencies of teacher candidates significantly differ according to mother's education level ($p < 0,05$). When average scores are examined, it is found that as the education level of the family increases, the teacher candidates' security value tendency scores increase. According to the results of LSD test, security value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers graduated from primary school, middle school and university are significantly higher compared to mothers who are illiterate. Eta-square effect size value was found to be 0.029. This finding shows that mother's education level has a "low level" effect on security scores.

Since teacher candidate numbers in some groups were small, Kruskal Wallis test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between value dimensions score averages according to the education level of teacher candidates' father, and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Kruskal Wallis Test Results According to Father's Education Level

| Value | Father's Education | N | \bar{x} | Sx | χ^2 | Df | P |
|----------------|--------------------|-----|-----------|------|----------|----|------|
| Power | Illiterate | 12 | 22.33 | 8.18 | .480 | 5 | .993 |
| | Primary school | 154 | 22.80 | 7.08 | | | |
| | Middle school | 63 | 22.92 | 7.06 | | | |
| | High school | 84 | 23.14 | 6.90 | | | |
| | University | 64 | 23.06 | 7.78 | | | |
| | graduate school | 2 | 26.00 | 7.07 | | | |
| Universalism | Illiterate | 12 | 51.83 | 8.98 | 3.409 | 5 | .637 |
| | Primary school | 154 | 50.67 | 9.14 | | | |
| | Middle school | 63 | 51.60 | 9.48 | | | |
| | High school | 84 | 52.30 | 8.20 | | | |
| | University | 64 | 52.64 | 7.87 | | | |
| | graduate school | 2 | 57.00 | 2.82 | | | |
| Achievement | Illiterate | 12 | 20.00 | 6.09 | 1.886 | 5 | .865 |
| | Primary school | 154 | 20.69 | 5.68 | | | |
| | Middle school | 63 | 20.71 | 5.76 | | | |
| | High school | 84 | 20.96 | 5.72 | | | |
| | University | 64 | 20.34 | 4.98 | | | |
| | graduate school | 2 | 24.00 | 4.24 | | | |
| Hedonism | Illiterate | 12 | 9.92 | 3.34 | 2.775 | 5 | .742 |
| | Primary school | 154 | 10.40 | 2.75 | | | |
| | Middle school | 63 | 10.41 | 3.11 | | | |
| | High school | 84 | 10.61 | 2.56 | | | |
| | University | 64 | 10.91 | 2.62 | | | |
| | graduate school | 2 | 12.50 | .70 | | | |
| Stimulation | Illiterate | 12 | 13.67 | 5.19 | 5.042 | 5 | .414 |
| | Primary school | 154 | 12.71 | 4.98 | | | |
| | Middle school | 63 | 12.98 | 5.00 | | | |
| | High school | 84 | 13.11 | 5.35 | | | |
| | University | 64 | 13.73 | 5.15 | | | |
| | graduate school | 2 | 18.50 | .70 | | | |
| Self-Direction | Illiterate | 12 | 36.17 | 4.26 | 1.360 | 5 | .929 |
| | Primary school | 154 | 34.84 | 6.26 | | | |
| | Middle school | 63 | 35.24 | 6.81 | | | |
| | High school | 84 | 35.04 | 6.20 | | | |
| | University | 64 | 34.95 | 5.76 | | | |
| | graduate school | 2 | 38.50 | 2.12 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|---|------|
| Benevolence | Illiterate | 12 | 49.83 | 6.97 | 4.350 | 5 | .500 |
| | Primary school | 154 | 51.80 | 8.48 | | | |
| | Middle school | 63 | 52.24 | 10.28 | | | |
| | High school | 84 | 50.93 | 8.58 | | | |
| | University | 64 | 51.92 | 8.16 | | | |
| | graduate school | 2 | 57.00 | 1.41 | | | |
| Tradition | Illiterate | 12 | 24.83 | 5.32 | 2.310 | 5 | .805 |
| | Primary school | 154 | 22.60 | 5.87 | | | |
| | Middle school | 63 | 22.27 | 6.92 | | | |
| | High school | 84 | 22.08 | 6.92 | | | |
| | University | 64 | 22.73 | 6.05 | | | |
| | graduate school | 2 | 20.00 | 2.82 | | | |
| Confirmity | Illiterate | 12 | 19.67 | 5.71 | 1.872 | 5 | .867 |
| | Primary school | 154 | 19.79 | 5.53 | | | |
| | Middle school | 63 | 20.35 | 4.96 | | | |
| | High school | 84 | 20.08 | 4.60 | | | |
| | University | 64 | 19.84 | 4.24 | | | |
| | graduate school | 2 | 23.00 | 1.41 | | | |

When Table 3 is examined, it is found that there are no significant differences between power, universalism, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security according to father's education level of teacher candidates ($p>0,05$). This finding shows that father's education level does not have effect on teacher candidates' value tendencies.

Since teacher candidate numbers in some groups were small, Kruskal Wallis test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between value dimensions score averages according to the family income level of teacher candidates, and the results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Krukul Wallis Test Results According to Family Income Level

| Value | Family Income | N | \bar{x} | Sx | χ^2 | Df | P |
|----------------|---------------|-----|-----------|-------|----------|----|------|
| Power | 0-1500 | 153 | 23,16 | 6,63 | 3.128 | 4 | .537 |
| | 1501-3000 | 151 | 23,40 | 7,04 | | | |
| | 3001-4500 | 57 | 21,37 | 8,13 | | | |
| | 4501-6000 | 10 | 23,00 | 6,49 | | | |
| | 6000 above | 9 | 22,22 | 11,11 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Universalism | 0-1500 | 153 | 50,33 | 9,06 | 4.457 | 4 | .348 |
| | 1501-3000 | 151 | 52,36 | 7,90 | | | |
| | 3001-4500 | 57 | 51,47 | 9,97 | | | |
| | 4501-6000 | 10 | 49,10 | 8,84 | | | |
| | 6000 above | 9 | 51,78 | 8,28 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| achievement | 0-1500 | 153 | 20,95 | 5,38 | 1.361 | 4 | .851 |
| | 1501-3000 | 151 | 20,66 | 5,63 | | | |
| | 3001-4500 | 57 | 20,26 | 6,13 | | | |
| | 4501-6000 | 10 | 19,20 | 5,47 | | | |
| | 6000 above | 9 | 21,22 | 4,68 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Hedonism | 0-1500 | 153 | 10,66 | 2,75 | 2.736 | 4 | .603 |
| | 1501-3000 | 151 | 10,44 | 2,68 | | | |
| | 3001-4500 | 57 | 10,60 | 3,02 | | | |
| | 4501-6000 | 10 | 9,40 | 2,87 | | | |
| | 6000 above | 9 | 10,56 | 2,78 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Stimulation | 0-1500 | 153 | 12,83 | 4,53 | 2.374 | 4 | .667 |
| | 1501-3000 | 151 | 13,39 | 5,38 | | | |
| | 3001-4500 | 57 | 12,97 | 5,61 | | | |
| | 4501-6000 | 10 | 12,10 | 5,36 | | | |
| | 6000 above | 9 | 14,00 | 5,85 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Self-direction | 0-1500 | 153 | 34,95 | 6,17 | 5.935 | 4 | .204 |
| | 1501-3000 | 151 | 35,36 | 5,66 | | | |
| | 3001-4500 | 57 | 34,58 | 7,28 | | | |
| | 4501-6000 | 10 | 31,20 | 7,42 | | | |
| | 6000 above | 9 | 37,89 | 3,51 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|------|
| Benevolence | 0-1500 | 153 | 52.05 | 8.86 | 4.109 | .392 |
| | 1501-3000 | 151 | 51.89 | 7.53 | | |
| | 3001-4500 | 57 | 50.48 | 10.94 | | |
| | 4501-6000 | 10 | 47.80 | 8.85 | | |
| | 6000 above | 9 | 52.56 | 7.68 | | |
| Tradition | 0-1500 | 153 | 22.92 | 5.82 | 2.008 | .734 |
| | 1501-3000 | 151 | 22.60 | 6.44 | | |
| | 3001-4500 | 57 | 21.30 | 7.09 | | |
| | 4501-6000 | 10 | 21.90 | 6.91 | | |
| | 6000 above | 9 | 22.00 | 4.97 | | |
| Conformity | 0-1500 | 153 | 20.12 | 5.40 | 2.220 | .695 |
| | 1501-3000 | 151 | 20.04 | 4.63 | | |
| | 3001-4500 | 57 | 19.53 | 5.17 | | |
| | 4501-6000 | 10 | 18.70 | 4.80 | | |
| | 6000 above | 9 | 20.33 | 3.53 | | |
| Security | 0-1500 | 153 | 41.30 | 6.67 | 2.021 | .732 |
| | 1501-3000 | 151 | 41.09 | 5.91 | | |
| | 3001-4500 | 57 | 40.77 | 7.75 | | |
| | 4501-6000 | 10 | 38.00 | 9.40 | | |
| | 6000 above | 9 | 42.22 | 4.40 | | |

When Table 4 is examined, it is found that there are no significant differences between power, universalism, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security according to family income level of teacher candidates ($p > 0,05$). This finding shows that family's income level does not have effect on teacher candidates' value tendencies.

ANOVA was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between value dimensions score averages according to where the teacher candidates live, and the results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA Results According to Where the Teacher Candidates Live

| Value | Where They Live | N | \bar{x} | Sx | F | Df | P |
|----------------|-----------------|-----|-----------|------|-------|-----|------|
| Power | City | 196 | 23.15 | 7.37 | .115 | 379 | .952 |
| | District | 92 | 22.86 | 7.58 | | | |
| | Town | 32 | 22.69 | 5.76 | | | |
| | Village | 60 | 22.62 | 6.50 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Universalism | City | 196 | 52.24 | 8.42 | 1.793 | 379 | .148 |
| | District | 92 | 50.87 | 8.89 | | | |
| | Town | 32 | 49.28 | 9.46 | | | |
| | Village | 60 | 50.07 | 9.04 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Achievement | City | 196 | 20.82 | 5.45 | .135 | 379 | .939 |
| | District | 92 | 20.38 | 6.24 | | | |
| | Town | 32 | 20.66 | 4.59 | | | |
| | Village | 60 | 20.80 | 5.43 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Hedonism | City | 196 | 10.68 | 2.79 | 1.084 | 379 | .356 |
| | District | 92 | 10.43 | 2.58 | | | |
| | Town | 32 | 10.81 | 2.76 | | | |
| | Village | 60 | 10.00 | 2.93 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Stimulation | City | 196 | 13.33 | 5.28 | .637 | 379 | .592 |
| | District | 92 | 12.75 | 4.89 | | | |
| | Town | 32 | 12.19 | 5.59 | | | |
| | Village | 60 | 13.25 | 4.44 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Self-direction | City | 196 | 35.49 | 5.72 | .928 | 379 | .427 |
| | District | 92 | 34.45 | 6.52 | | | |
| | Town | 32 | 35.28 | 6.17 | | | |
| | Village | 60 | 34.30 | 6.96 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Benevolence | City | 196 | 52.13 | 8.73 | .551 | 379 | .648 |
| | District | 92 | 50.91 | 8.77 | | | |
| | Town | 32 | 50.69 | 8.36 | | | |
| | Village | 60 | 51.70 | 8.67 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----|------|
| Tradition | City | 196 | 21.91 | 6.70 | 1.287 | 379 | .278 |
| | District | 92 | 23.36 | 5.93 | | | |
| | Town | 32 | 22.78 | 5.37 | | | |
| | Village | 60 | 22.97 | 5.73 | | | |
| Conformity | City | 196 | 20.16 | 4.71 | .238 | 379 | .870 |
| | District | 92 | 19.65 | 5.34 | | | |
| | Town | 32 | 20.00 | 5.63 | | | |
| | Village | 60 | 19.80 | 5.14 | | | |
| Security | City | 196 | 41.36 | 6.98 | .301 | 379 | .824 |
| | District | 92 | 40.64 | 5.71 | | | |
| | Town | 32 | 40.63 | 5.92 | | | |
| | Village | 60 | 41.03 | 6.94 | | | |

When Table 5 is examined, it is found that there are no significant differences between power, universalism, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security according to where the teacher candidates live ($p>0,05$). This finding shows that the place where the teacher candidates live does not have effect on teacher candidates' value tendencies.

ANOVA was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between value dimensions score averages according to the programs the teacher candidates are in, and the results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. ANOVA Results According to the Programs

| Value | Program | N | \bar{x} | Sx | F | Df | p | Significant Difference | η^2 |
|--------------|---------------------|----|-----------|-------|-------|-----|-------|--|----------|
| Power | Math | 49 | 23.18 | 6.98 | .741 | 379 | .638 | | |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 23.00 | 6.53 | | | | | |
| | Science | 39 | 22.05 | 9.35 | | | | | |
| | Turkish | 53 | 24.11 | 6.19 | | | | | |
| | Primary | 50 | 22.44 | 6.66 | | | | | |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 21.87 | 6.30 | | | | | |
| | Painting | 42 | 24.36 | 7.19 | | | | | |
| | Music | 45 | 22.47 | 8.28 | | | | | |
| Universalism | Math | 49 | 50.78 | 9.81 | .720 | 379 | .655 | | |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 49.84 | 11.82 | | | | | |
| | Science | 39 | 50.21 | 9.88 | | | | | |
| | Turkish | 53 | 52.40 | 6.91 | | | | | |
| | Primary | 50 | 51.02 | 5.50 | | | | | |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 51.44 | 6.33 | | | | | |
| | Painting | 42 | 52.10 | 8.56 | | | | | |
| | Music | 45 | 52.89 | 9.39 | | | | | |
| Achievement | Math | 49 | 19.47 | 5.52 | 2.728 | 379 | .009* | Math-Turkish Math-Primary Social-Painting Turkish-Painting Primary-Painting | 0.020 |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 20.98 | 5.08 | | | | | |
| | Science | 39 | 20.44 | 6.07 | | | | | |
| | Turkish | 53 | 22.45 | 4.68 | | | | | |
| | Primary | 50 | 22.10 | 4.33 | | | | | |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 20.61 | 5.21 | | | | | |
| | Painting | 42 | 18.36 | 6.25 | | | | | |
| | Music | 45 | 20.53 | 6.76 | | | | | |
| Hedonism | Math | 49 | 10.35 | 2.83 | 2.136 | 379 | .039* | Social-Science Science-Turkish Science-Primary Turkish-Counseling Primary-Counseling Turkish-Music Primary-Music | 0.039 |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 10.23 | 3.16 | | | | | |
| | Science | 39 | 11.46 | 2.41 | | | | | |
| | Turkish | 53 | 9.89 | 2.57 | | | | | |
| | Primary | 50 | 9.92 | 2.98 | | | | | |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 11.04 | 2.05 | | | | | |
| | Painting | 42 | 10.52 | 2.66 | | | | | |
| | Music | 45 | 11.18 | 2.89 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|----|-------|-------|-------|-----|------|
| Stimulation | Math | 49 | 13.08 | 4.82 | 1.160 | 379 | .325 |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 13.13 | 4.72 | | | |
| | Science | 39 | 12.13 | 6.46 | | | |
| | Turkish | 53 | 13.66 | 5.25 | | | |
| | Primary | 50 | 13.30 | 3.83 | | | |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 12.26 | 5.33 | | | |
| | Painting | 42 | 12.26 | 5.41 | | | |
| | Music | 45 | 14.53 | 4.85 | | | |
| Self-direction | Math | 49 | 33.88 | 7.65 | 1.309 | 379 | .245 |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 34.09 | 7.15 | | | |
| | Science | 39 | 35.69 | 5.54 | | | |
| | Turkish | 53 | 37.00 | 2.72 | | | |
| | Primary | 50 | 34.96 | 4.01 | | | |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 35.20 | 5.99 | | | |
| | Painting | 42 | 34.71 | 6.64 | | | |
| | Music | 45 | 34.76 | 7.79 | | | |
| Benevolence | Math | 49 | 49.96 | 11.67 | .617 | 379 | .742 |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 51.61 | 10.82 | | | |
| | Science | 39 | 50.44 | 8.35 | | | |
| | Turkish | 53 | 52.13 | 5.00 | | | |
| | Primary | 50 | 51.44 | 6.94 | | | |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 52.74 | 6.59 | | | |
| | Painting | 42 | 52.05 | 8.45 | | | |
| | Music | 45 | 52.76 | 9.66 | | | |
| Tradition | Math | 49 | 22.55 | 7.07 | 1.181 | 379 | .312 |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 22.07 | 7.16 | | | |
| | Science | 39 | 20.15 | 5.98 | | | |
| | Turkish | 53 | 22.25 | 7.28 | | | |
| | Primary | 50 | 23.46 | 4.17 | | | |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 23.30 | 4.43 | | | |
| | Painting | 42 | 23.10 | 6.53 | | | |
| | Music | 45 | 22.87 | 6.38 | | | |
| Conformity | Math | 49 | 19.43 | 5.75 | .503 | 379 | .833 |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 19.32 | 5.99 | | | |
| | Science | 39 | 19.80 | 4.45 | | | |
| | Turkish | 53 | 20.40 | 4.31 | | | |
| | Primary | 50 | 20.30 | 4.59 | | | |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 19.70 | 5.12 | | | |
| | Painting | 42 | 20.07 | 4.78 | | | |
| | Music | 45 | 20.80 | 4.72 | | | |
| Security | Math | 49 | 40.43 | 8.33 | .695 | 379 | .676 |
| | Social Studies | 56 | 40.79 | 8.62 | | | |
| | Science | 39 | 42.05 | 5.68 | | | |
| | Turkish | 53 | 42.38 | 4.68 | | | |
| | Primary | 50 | 40.34 | 5.87 | | | |
| | Guidance Counseling | 46 | 41.13 | 4.39 | | | |
| | Painting | 42 | 40.21 | 5.47 | | | |
| | Music | 45 | 41.29 | 7.77 | | | |

*p<0.05

When Table 6 is examined, it is found that there are no significant differences between power, universalism, stimulation, self-direction, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security according to the programs the teacher candidates are in ($p>0,05$). This finding shows that the program the teacher candidates are in does not have effect on teacher candidates' power, universalism, stimulation, self-direction, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security value tendencies.

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that achievement value tendencies of teacher candidates significantly differ according to the program they are in ($p < 0,05$). According to the results of LSD test, achievement value tendencies of teacher candidates in Math Education are significantly lower compared to teacher candidates in Primary Education and Turkish Education. Also, achievement value tendencies of teacher candidates in Painting Education are found significantly lower compared to teacher candidates in Primary Education, Social Studies Education and Turkish Education. Eta-square effect size value was found to be 0.020. This finding shows that department has a “low level” effect on achievement scores.

According to Table 6, hedonism value tendencies of teacher candidates significantly differ according to the programs they are in ($p < 0,05$). The results of LSD test show that hedonism value tendencies of teacher candidates in Science Education are significantly higher compared to teacher candidates in Primary Education, Social Studies Education and Turkish Education. Furthermore, hedonism value tendencies of teacher candidates in Guidance and Psychological Counseling and Music Education are found significantly higher compared to teacher candidates in Primary Education and Turkish Education. Eta-square effect size value was found to be 0.039. This finding shows that department has a “low level” effect on hedonism scores.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

Conducted with 4th grade teacher candidates, this study put forth that sex does not have effect on teacher candidates’ power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, tradition and conformity value tendencies. This finding shows that sex has an effect on teacher candidates’ universalism, benevolence and security value tendencies, and these values are higher in female teacher candidates. In a similar study, Yilmaz (2009) stated that score averages of female teacher candidates’ universalism, benevolence, conformity and security dimensions are significantly higher than score averages of male teachers. Also, in the study conducted by Mehmedoglu (2006), score averages of universalism and security dimensions of females were found higher than the males. Similarly, Coskun and Yildirim (2009) found that female university students’ value levels are higher than the male students. These studies support the present study’s findings. In Turkish culture, characteristics related to women are expressed more in interpersonal relationships. The basic tasks expected from women are for them to be emotional, to cooperate and to show care and interest. On the contrary, men are expected to be independent, to represent the family and to be competitive (Temel & Aksoy, 2001). The way women are raised and what is expected from them by the society can make them to prefer universalism, benevolence, conformity and security values more than the men. Women look at their surroundings with compassion, mercy and love (Yapici & Zengin, 2003). According to Oguz’s (2012) study findings, there is a positive relationship between self-direction, universalism and security value types and sex. Female teacher candidates stated positive opinions on all these value types. A similar result was put forth by Altunay and Yalcinkaya (2011). When teacher candidates’ values are compared according to sex, it is seen that females give more importance to all the values compared to male teacher candidates. Also, both females and males adopt the tradition value the highest (Altunay & Yalcinkaya, 2011). According to Basciftci, Gulec, Akdogan and Koc (2011), while teacher candidates’ value preferences do not show any difference in power, achievement, stimulation, self-direction, tradition and security sub-dimensions based on sex, they show difference in hedonism, universalism, benevolence, conformity, ability and effort sub-dimensions (Oguz, 2012). Female characteristics like being peaceful, virtuous, forgiving, loyal, obedient, kind, clean and respectful to elders can make them prefer values like universalism, benevolence, conformity and security more than the males. Different results were found in some studies conducted on teachers’ value levels. For example, in Dilmac, Bozgeyikli and Cikili’s (2008) study on teacher candidates, males’ score averages are higher than females in the universalism dimension. In studies done by Sari (2005) and Cileli and Tezer (1998), males’ value scores are higher than female in all value dimensions (Yilmaz, 2009).

The study results show that mother’s education level has no effect on the power, achievement, stimulation, self-direction, tradition and conformity value tendencies. In multiple comparison tests, universalism value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers graduated from university are

found significantly higher than universalism value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers are illiterate or graduated from high school. Furthermore, universalism value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers graduated from middle school are found to significantly higher compared to teacher candidates whose mothers are illiterate. The results, also, show that hedonism value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers graduated from university are significantly higher compared to mothers who are illiterate or who graduated from primary school, middle school and high school. Benevolence value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers graduated from primary school and middle school are found significantly higher compared to mothers who are illiterate or who graduated from high school. In addition, security value tendencies of teacher candidates whose mothers graduated from primary school, middle school and university are found significantly higher compared to mothers who are illiterate. However, father's education level has no effect on teacher candidates' value tendencies. The society gives more roles to the mothers in raising their children. Mothers have great effect on their children's value judgments because in our society, fathers take on the roles outside the house and mothers become the main actors in the development of children. When the Kruskal Wallis test results according to father's education level in Table 3 is examined, it is found that there are no significant differences between power, universalism, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security value types according to father's education level of teacher candidates. This finding shows that father's education level does not have effect on teacher candidates' value tendencies. Traditionally, tasks and responsibilities are shared in the family according to gender. In a traditional family, while men do tasks like repairs and garden work, women do tasks like cooking, washing and cleaning (Safak, Copur, Ozkan, 2006; Gunay ve Bener, 2011). According to Jan R. M. Gerris et al (1997), family values and goals shape what is precious and wanted for a child's future and beliefs whether these values and goals come from social structure or from socio-cultural interaction. These beliefs and cultural values can be considered as mental formations given by the parents and through these families are considered to play important roles in their children's lives. Based on this, it can be accepted that families' effect on individuals' value structuring is quite high (Coskun & Yildirim, 2009).

The present study determined that family income level has no effect on teacher candidates' value tendencies. This indicates that the society has certain value judgements and income level does not affect these.

According to another result of the study, the places teacher candidates live has no effect on their value tendencies. It can be concluded that the social structure has a certain value structure and where they live has no effect on teacher candidates' value judgements. While value judgments changed according to education level of the parents, it did not change according to where they live. The value judgements of teacher candidates from the cities and from rural areas show no difference, indicating the importance of traditions, language and religious unity over the places they live in. Coskun and Yildirim (2009) found no significant difference in value levels according to where the participants lived, and stated that there is no difference between village and city because the society shows a homogeneous structure in terms of values. This result is similar to the present study. However, this can be limited to the values stated in the study.

The present study, also, reveals that the programs the teacher candidates are in have no effect on their power, universalism, stimulation, self-direction, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security value tendencies. However, there is a difference between the programs in terms of power, universalism, stimulation, self-direction, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security values. For example, while science education program got the highest value in the power value tendency, social studies program got the highest value in the universalism value. According to the study findings, achievement value tendencies of teacher candidates in Math Education are found significantly lower compared to teacher candidates in Primary Education and Turkish Education. Also, achievement value tendencies of teacher candidates in Painting Education are found significantly lower compared to teacher candidates in Primary Education, Social Studies Education and Turkish Education. Since candidates in Painting Education give more importance to artistic tendencies, they value art more than achievement.

According to the LSD test result, one of the multiple comparison tests, hedonism value tendencies of teacher candidates in Science Education are found significantly higher compared to teacher candidates in Primary Education, Social Studies Education and Turkish Education. Furthermore, hedonism value tendencies of teacher candidates in Guidance and Psychological Counseling and Music Education are found significantly higher compared to teacher candidates in Primary Education and Turkish Education. The Life Sciences course taught in primary schools becomes Social Studies in middle school. While values education is given under the heading of personal qualities in the primary curriculum, it is seen as values in the 2015 curriculum. As a result of this, it can be said that values education is included in Social Studies. To be able to teach values education, the teachers should improve themselves in this area. On the other hand, since primary teachers have to teach social studies as life sciences in primary schools, they have to have the same attitude as the social studies teachers. When Turkish teachers are taken into consideration, Turkish courses are about language teaching but also about cultural values. Since the Turkish teachers are aware of this, they have high scores in values compared to other teaching programs. The reason why science teacher candidates' scores are higher is because science related courses are taught in Life Science course in primary schools but taught as a separate course in middle schools just like Social Studies.

The reason why hedonism value scores of teacher candidates in Guidance and Psychological Counseling are higher than candidates in Primary Education and Turkish Education can be attributed to the importance they give on human psychology. Even listening to a person is part of values education. Teacher candidates in Guidance and Psychological Counseling have a different outlook on life and focus on human lives. These are the reasons why their hedonism values are higher. The reason why teacher candidates in Music Education got higher hedonism scores than the candidates in other programs can be attributed to music's transference from the past to present, its cultural functionality and its secret communication between people. Hedonism is part of music culture, and teacher candidates studying in Music Education have more hedonistic values and prefer this program in line with their abilities. According to Oguz (2012), there is a positive relationship between the programs the teacher candidates are in and their power, stimulation, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security value types. Compared to teacher candidates in other programs, teacher candidates in Science Education gave more positive statements in all the value types. According to study findings, there is a negative relationship between the stimulation, universalism and conformity value types and the grades the candidates are in (Oguz, 2012). Although the study done by Oguz (2012) does not show similar results with the present study, they are similar in the sense that teacher candidates in different programs have different statements on values education.

SUGGESTIONS

In this study, different values were put forth through the survey conducted in different programs of Omer Halisdemir University's Faculty of Education. This shows that different values will be put forth in different universities' programs.

Therefore, education programs should be reorganized in a way that values are really taught. Values can be given with different activities in Service Learning courses. In education faculties, there should be courses on affective domain in general and values education in specific. The meaning and teaching of values should be taught to the prospective teachers.

From the high benevolence and security scores of female candidates, it can be concluded that they are generally more emotional than the male candidates.

While mother's education level has an effect on teacher candidates' value tendencies, father's education level does not. Mother's education affects child rearing but father's education does not affect . Therefore, more emphasis should be given to mothers' education and women's education in general as a country. There are not enough courses on values in the programs of education faculties. For example, while values education is included in Social Studies, it is only given in culture and major

area courses. In Primary Teaching values education is given in history, Turkish and geography courses. However, there are no courses that include values education in Math, Science, Music and Painting. For all teacher candidates to be equipped in this area, education faculties should offer courses on values education.

Values education can best be given through the family members and educational institutions. Values education starts within the family when the child is born, and it helps the development of child's character in every aspect. Thus, children should be taught about what is right and what is wrong, and a solid foundation be given to them. It is necessary to raise children with good morals and children who have positive attitudes about the future.

Rather than giving importance to value classifications in values education, large-scale studies should be conducted to determine the needs of the society, country and individuals, and values education should be given more importance. Values classifications should be reorganized according to our own social structure and present conditions. The works related to this can be done by setting up a special research commission with the Ministry of National Education. Today, no matter how excellent an educational institution is and no matter how well teachers know their subjects, this is not enough. Teachers need to have human values. They should be able to teach values in addition to their subjects.

REFERENCES

- Akbas, O. (2009). İlkogretim Okullarında Gorevli Brans Ogretmenlerinin Deger Ogretimi Yaparken Kullandıkları Etkinlikler: 2004 ve 2007 Yillarına Iliskin Bir Karsilastirma [Activities Used by Subject Teachers in Elementary Schools during Values: Comparison between the Years 2004-2007]. *Kastamonu Egitim Dergisi*, 17(2), 403-414.
- Akengin, H. Saglam, D. ve Arzu Dilek, A. (2002). İlkogretim 4. ve 5. Sinif Ogrencilerinin Sosyal Bilgiler Dersi Ile Ilgili Gorusleri [Views of Fourth and Fifth Grade Pupils about Social Studies Course]. *Marmara Universitesi Ataturk Egitim Fakultesi Egitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 16, 1-12.
- Altunay, E. ve Yalcinkaya, M. (2011). Ogretmen adaylarinin bilgi toplumunda degerlere Iliskin goruslerinin bazi degiskenler acisindan Incelenmesi [Examining Teacher Candidates' Views about Values in Knowledge Society by Some Variables]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi*, 17 (1), 5-28.
- Aydin, M.Z. (2010). Okulda Degerler Egitimi [Values Education in School], *Egitime Bakis*, 6(18), S.16-19.
- Bacanli, H. (2006). *Duyusal Davranis Egitimi [Affective Behavior Training]*. Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim.
- Basciftci, F., Gulec, N., Akdogan, T. ve Koc, Z. (2011, April). Ogretmen adaylarinin deger tercihleri Ile epistemolojik inanclarinin Incelenmesi [Examination of Teacher Candidates' Value Preferences and their Epistemological Beliefs]. Paper presented at the *2nd International Conference on New Trends in Education and their Implications*, Antalya.
- Brophy, H. W. & Good, T. L. (1986). *Third handbook of research on teaching*. Chicago: McNally.
- Buyukozturk, S. (2009). *Sosyal Bilimler Icin veri analizi el kitabi [Data analysis handbook for Social Sciences]*. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Cileli, M. & Tezer, E. (1998). Life and value orientations of Turkish university students. *Adolescence*, 33(129), 219-224.

- Cuceloglu, D. (1999). *Anlamli ve Coskulu Bir Yasam Icin "Savasci"*, Sistem Yayıncılık, İstanbul, s. 134, 150
- Cetin, S. (2004). Degisen Degerler ve Egitim [Changing Values and Education]. *Milli Egitim Dergisi*, Sayi: 161, 26-32.
- Coskun, M. Yildirim, A. (2009). Universite Ogrencilerinin Deger Duzeylelerinin Bazi degiskenler Acisinden Incelenmesi [Examining the Value Levels of University Students' In Terms of Some Variables]. *Yuzuncu Yil Universitesi, Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, Cilt:XI, Sayi: 1, 311-328.
- Demir, N. (2005). Orgut kulturu-is tatmini iliskisi, plastik sektörde bir arastirma [Relationship between Organization Culture and Job Satisfaction: A Study on Plastic Sector]. Unpublished doctoral thesis. İstanbul University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Dickinson, D. J. (1990). The relation between ratings of teacher performance and student learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 15, 142-152.
- Dilmac, B. Bozgeyikli, H. & Cikili, Y. (2008). Ogretmen adaylarının deger algılarının farkli degiskenler acisinden Incelenmesi [The Investigation of Teacher Candidates' Value Perceptions in Terms of Various Variables]. *Degerler Egitimi Dergisi*, 6(16), 65-92.
- Doganay, A. (2006). Degerler Egitimi. Hayat Bilgisi ve Sosyal Bilgiler Ogretimi [Values Education. Life Science and Social Studies Teaching] (Ed. Cemil Ozturk) (pp.255–286). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Durmus, C. (1996). Degerlerin meslek grupları acisinden Incelenmesi [Examination of values in terms of occupational groups]. Unpublished Master's thesis. Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Eksi, H. (2003). Temel İnsani Degerlerin Kazandırılmasında Bir Yaklaşım: Karakter Egitimi Programları [An Approach to Teach Basic Human Values: Character Education Programs]. *Degerler Egitimi Dergisi*, (1)1, 79–96.
- Eryaman, M. Y. & Riedler, M. (2009). From interpretive progressivism to radical progressivism in teacher education: Teaching as praxis. In M. Y. Eryaman (Ed.). *Peter McLaren, education, and the struggle for liberation*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Gander, M. J. Gardiner, H. W. (1998). *Cocuk ve Ergen Gelisimi*, (Cev: A. Donmez, N. Celen, B. Onur), İmge Yayınları, Ankara, s. 335.
- Genc, S. Z., & Eryaman, M. Y. (2008). Changing values and new education paradigm. *Journal of Social Sciences of the Afyon Kocatepe University*, 9(1), 89-102.
- Gerris, J.R.M. Dekovic, M., Janssens, J. M.A.M. (1997). The relationship between social and childrearing behaviors: Parents' perspective taking and value orientations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 59 (4), 834-847.
- Gomleksiz, M.N. Curo: E. (2011). Sosyal Bilgiler dersi ogretim programında yer alan degerlere İlişkin ogrenci tutumlarının degerlendirilmesi [An Assessment of students' attitudes towards values in Social Studies curriculum]. *Uluslari İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, Cilt: 8 Sayi: 1 Yil:2011, 95-134.
- Gunay, G. ve Bener, O. (2011). Kadınların Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rollerini Cercevesinde Aile İçi Yasamı Algılamaları. *Türkiye Sosyal Arastirmalar Dergisi*, 15 (3), 157-171.

- İnal, K. (1998). *Türkiye’de Ders Kitaplarında Demokratik ve Milliyetçi Değerler -27 Mayıs ve 12 Eylül Askeri Müdahale Dönemlerine İlişkin Bir İnceleme*, (Doktora Tezi), Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Jackson, P. W. Boostrom, R. E. & Hansen, D. T. (1998). *The moral life of schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kale, N. (2007). *Nasıl Bir Değerler Eğitimi? [What Type of a Value Education?] Değerler ve Eğitimi Uluslararası Sempozyumu* (26–28 Kasım 2004), 313–322, İstanbul: Değerler Eğitimi Merkezi Yayınları.
- Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri [Scientific Research Methods]*. (19th Edition) Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- Kalaycı S. (2009). *SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri [Multi-Variable Statistical Techniques Using SPSS Application]* (4th Edition). Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kıncal, R. Y. (2002) *Vatandaşlık Bilgisi*, Mikro Yayınları, Ankara, s. 24.
- Koc K, (2007). *İlköğretim 7. Sınıfta Okutulan Vatandaşlık ve İnsan Hakları Eğitimi Dersinde Öğrenciye Kazandırılması Amaçlanan Evrensel Değerlere İlişkin Tutumlar Üzerinde Öğretim Sisteminin Etkisi*, (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Fırat Üniversitesi, Elazığ,
- Kusdil, M. E. & Kagitçibasi, C. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz değer kuramı [Value orientations of Turkish teachers and Schwartz's theory of values running head: Values]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(45), 59-76.
- Mehmedoğlu, U. (2006). *Gençlik, değerler ve din. Küreselleşme, ahlak ve değerler* [Youth, values and religion: Globalisation, morals and values] (Ed. U. Mehmedoğlu & Y. Mehmedoğlu). İstanbul: Litera Yayıncılık.
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2005). *Advanced and Multivariate Statistical Methods Practical Application and Interpretation*. California : Pyrczak Publishing.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (2004). *İlköğretim Hayat Bilgisi dersi programı* [The program of Primary Life Science lesson] Ankara: MEB Yayınları.
- Montaigne, M. D.(1580). *Denemeler*, (Cev: S. Eyuboğlu), Cem Yayınevi, İstanbul, 1999, s. 58.
- Oğuz, E. (2012). Views of Pre-service Teachers on Values and Value Education, *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice – 12* (2) [Supplementary Special Issue] • Spring • 1320-1325 ©2012 Educational Consultancy and Research Center www.edam.com.tr/estp
- Ozkan, R. (2010). Türk Eğitim Sisteminde Himayeci Değerler: İlköğretim Ders Kitapları Örneği [Protectionist values in Turkish education system: sample primary education course book]. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(1), 1124–1141.
- Riedler, M. & Eryaman M.Y. (2016). Complexity, Diversity and Ambiguity in Teaching and Teacher Education: Practical Wisdom, Pedagogical Fitness and Tact of Teaching. *International Journal of Progressive Education*. 12(3): 172-186
- Rousseau, J. J. (1992). *Toplum Anlaşması*, (Cev: V. Günüoğlu), Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, İstanbul, s. 25.
- Sabancıoğlu, Z. & Tuz, M. (2003). *Organizasyonel psikoloji* [Organizational psychology]. Bursa: Furkan Ofset

- Sari, E. (2005). Öğretmen adaylarının değer tercihleri: Giresun Eğitim Fakültesi Örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 3(10), 73-88.
- Safak, S. Copur, Z. ve Ozkan, M. (2006). Çocukların evle ilgili faaliyetlere Harcadıkları Zamanının İncelenmesi. www.sdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/sszcmao.pdf. (erişim tarihi:09.03.2011).
- Stallard, M.L. & Pankau, J. (2008). Strengthening human value in organizational cultures [Strengthening human value in organizational cultures]. *Leader to Leader*, Winter, 18-23.
- Sen, U. (2008). Altıncı Sınıf Türkçe Ders Kitaplarındaki Metinlerin İlettiği Değerler Açısından İncelenmesi [Examination of 6th Grade Turkish Textbook Passages in Terms of Values they convey]. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 1(5), 763-779. Retrieved from http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt1/sayi5/sayi5pdf/sen_ulker.pdf.
- Somuncu, S. (2008). İlköğretim 7. Sınıf Türkçe Ders Kitabındaki Edebi Metinlerin Temel Evrensel Değerleri İçermesi Bakımından İncelenmesi Yayınlanmamış yüksek Lisans Tezi, Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Mayıs 2008 p. 25-29.
- Suh, B. K. & Traiger, J. (1999). Teaching values through elementary social studies and literature curricula. *Education*, 119(4), 723-727
- Temel, Z. F. & Aksoy A. B. (2001). *Ergen ve gelişimi: yetiskinlige ilk adım [Adolescence and development: the first step in adulthood]*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Tozlu, N. & Topsakal, C. (2007). “Avrupa Birliği’ne Uyum Çerçevesinde Değerler Eğitimi. Değerler ve Eğitimi Uluslararası Sempozyumu, İstanbul. Değerler ve Eğitimi, İstanbul: DEM Yayınları, 177-202.
- Turan, S. & Aktan D. (2008). Okul hayatında var olan ve olması düşünülen sosyal değerler [Existing and İdeal Social Values of School Life ss Perceived by Teachers and Students]. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 227-259.
- Yapıcı, S. & Yapıcı, M. (2005). *Gelişim ve Öğrenme Psikolojisi*, Ani Yayıncılık, Ankara, s. 130.
- Yapıcı, A. & Zengin, S. Z. (2003). İlahiyat fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer tercih sıralamaları üzerine psikolojik bir araştırma: Cukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi örneği [A psychological study on Theology Faculty students’ value preference rankings: Cukurova University Faculty of Theology sample]. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(4), 173-206.
- Yesil, R. ve Aydın, D. (2007). Demokratik Değerlerin Eğitiminde Yöntem ve Zamanlama [Method and Timing in Democratic Values Education]. *TSA / Yıl: 11, 2, 65-84*.
- Yılmaz, E. (2009). Öğretmenlerin Değer Tercihlerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi [The Study into Teachers’ Value Perceptions in Terms of Various Variables]. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi* Cilt 7, No. 17, 109-128.