

Full Length Research Paper

The pre-service teachers' value orientations

Mehmet Ali Akin

Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Letters, Mardin Artuklu University, Mardin, Turkey.

Received 16 October, 2017; Accepted 15 January, 2018

It is important to note that social scientists have recently concentrated on the issue of values. People's thoughts, decisions, behaviors etc. values that have an important place in the explanations constitute the subject of this research. The main purpose of the research is to analyze whether the value orientations of the pre-service teacher' differ according to gender and branch variables. In the context with this research, the value orientations of the pre-service teachers attending the Pedagogical Formation Training Certificate Program which was held at Mardin Artuklu University in 2015 to 2016 academic year were revealed according to gender and branch variables. A mixed-methods approach incorporating both quantitative and qualitative methods was implemented in this research. The quantitative data were collected through the Portrait Values Questionnaire with the 40 questions developed by Schwartz and Bilsky, and the qualitative data were obtained by the means of semi-structured interview technique. A significant difference occurred in favor of the female participants with regard to gender variable. The pre-service teachers' value orientations also differed significantly taking into account their subject area variables.

Key words: Pre-service teachers, value orientations, portrait values questionnaire.

INTRODUCTION

Humans need to base their decisions, preferences, behaviors and so forth in all phases of life on strong justification references. The references serve as a function for inner and outer justifications and beliefs, values and their derivations shape these references.

In spite of individual and social differences, some people can make similar decisions and choices, and exhibit similar behaviors. On the other hand, two siblings, friends and two colleagues etc. can readily differ in their decisions and preferences, behave in different manners despite their common similar characteristics. The most reliable way to understand these similarities and differences is to know peoples' value orientations. Value orientations have a decisive impact on these processes.

Therefore, societies endeavor to enable next generations to acquire some values.

One of the expectations from an education system is to train new generations that society dreams of. Education system determines the characteristics and values of the target human model as its general objectives. The general objectives of the education system of Turkey can be thought of as a summary of the envisaged values for the human model the system wants to train. These values, briefly, can be enumerated as national, spiritual, ethical, cultural and familial ones (Fundamental Provision of National Education 1739, Article 2/1) (Basic Law of National Education, 1973). The fact that individuals are trained with these values can be fulfilled with the teachers

E-mail: akina7215@hotmail.com.

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

who have these values and can transfer the values into attitude and behavior. These values may be acquired through social learning in the process of culturalization which is one of the functions of education.

According to Bandura, human learning occurs in a social environment, and the most important learning experiences of children come into play by observing the behavior of others. This learning method is called Bandura observation learning Cücelloğlu (2006). According to Bandura's approach, the concept of learning is defined as a set of knowledge gained in a cognitive process. At the same time, it is the foundational social origin of a significant part of human thoughts and behaviors, in other words, information derived from the social environment at the basis of thoughts and behaviors (Stadjkovic and Luthan, 1998). Principal actors of social learning in school; are the teachers and administrators who run the educational process where a significant part of the students' days pass.

People want others to have similar preferences like theirs and to act the way they do. In this way, their self-confidence increases. The people who considerably value preferring similar things, want to transmit these values to their children and want them to make similar preferences like their own ones (Bacanlı, 2011). The expectation for the transmission of the values starts at family and intensifies at school. Teachers have a vital role in meeting this expectation. If teachers can initiate and sustain this process according to the expectations of families and societies, the confidence and support of the families and societies towards teachers and schools increasingly continue. In the opposite case, school can become a conflict zone and students can experience a value confusion.

There are a number of definitions for values concept. Values are rules related with personal harmony and identity, and deep-rooted concepts or life standards which guide behaviors, form a basis for decision making, and become a criteria to evaluate beliefs and behaviors (Halstead and Taylor, 1996). Values are sensitivity which individuals reveal with regard to any person, entity, event or case etc. This sensitivity can be in human, ethical, cultural, spiritual, social and universal dimensions (Ertuğrul, 2012). Value is concerned with the belief indicating something can or cannot be asked for (Güngör, 2010).

Values, which are shared by communities in a serious consensus, are considered to be the criteria that add value to the culture and collectivity (Zevalsiz (2014). Values are beliefs and rules which lead and guide our behaviors. They are principles and standards contributing to determining the appropriateness, effectiveness, beauty and morality of our behaviors. We decide an objective, aim or behavior superior to other ones through the values we have accepted (Hökelekli, 2011).

In this context, the moral sense is good; in sociological sense, the quality of societal significance of objects and

events; the truth in logic; In the aesthetic language, it is seen that the concept of value which expresses the beautiful is defined as "abstract measure" and "a response to something" that determines the importance of something in the dictionary (Hançerlioğlu, 1976; Turkish Language Society, 2005; Püsküllüoğlu, 2003). Although value is expressed by some researchers and values by others, the intended thing is similar. This similarity is that values are beliefs, principles and rules influencing our behaviors.

Organizations use a number of organizational-managerial tools influencing and leading their employees' thoughts, attitudes, decisions and behaviors and so forth to realize their objectives. Values are one of the organizational-managerial tools organizations utilize. Values may be regarded the strongest tools managers make use of. Organizational-managerial tools are phenomenon an organization conducts to achieve its objectives. Values are consulted to qualify, evaluate and justify its employees' behaviors.

In this regard, values are taken as a reference to qualify, evaluate and justify the behaviors. Besides, values provide acceptable solutions to overcome organizational matters. They also shed light on an organization's general objectives, ideals and standards. They are expressed in variety of ways in organizational life. Achievement, industriousness, equality, responsibility, confidence, independence, autonomy, loyalty, honesty, courage, passion, respect, compassion, tolerance, truth, benevolence, self-confidence, obedience, devotion and so forth can be included among these values. Shared common values connect an organization's members to each other and provide a basis for organizational integrity, continuity and stability. Being deprived of the common values causes different values to dominate at organization and organizational conflicts (Şişman, 2002).

The function of education to transmit social values to the next generations is a crucial social consensus. Teachers play an indisputable role in the transmission of the values. In addition to having which values or values system, it is important how they are conveyed. In this process, teachers should address the following questions:

- (1) Which values should I have as an educator?
- (2) How should I convey these values?
- (3) What occupational ethical principles should I have for the transmission of these values? (Akbaba and Altun, 2003).

A number of scientific studies have proven that positive and moral human characteristics make significant contributions to students' cognitive, academic development and achievement. A society's future depends on well trained and outstanding characterized people. A good character includes understanding moral

values, internalization and behaving according to them.

For that reason, children and youths need to be exposed to be learning, guidance, counseling and appropriate role models. Schools, namely administrators and teachers are responsible for helping each individual in schooling age make appropriate and moral decisions, and put the values they learnt into practice. The fact that children and youths are trained as good people and citizens, being at peace with themselves and environment, compatible and characterized individuals is, at least, as important as academic achievement. Therefore, schools have to be a place where moral and human values which enable good and strong characteristics to be constructed in students, are reinforced, modeled and implemented (Hökelekli, 2011).

The fact that the duty to transmit social and universal values to new generations at formal institutions, namely schools through acculturation is expected from school administrators and particularly teachers to be fulfilled, keeps its relevance and importance. It is important to know how pre-service teachers, who will be teaching at schools in future, are involved in the acculturation and socialization process, that is, their value systems (Sarı, 2005). Because teachers and pre-service teachers' value orientations significantly influence what value orientations new generations will have. The fact that teachers and pre-service teachers have national, spiritual, moral, cultural and familial values and so forth increase the possibility that their students will acquire these values. In the opposite case, it will be difficult for the students to have the values. In this research, an answer for the question "what are the pre-service teachers' value orientations?" was sought.

Purpose

The general purpose of the research is to identify pre-service teachers' value orientations and reveal whether the value orientations significantly differ with regard to gender and subject area variables.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A mixed-methods approach incorporating both quantitative and qualitative methods was implemented in this research. A mixed-method approach is a mixture of either quantitative and qualitative methods or paradigms (Balci, 2009). A researcher in mixed-methods approach collects and analyzes quantitative and qualitative data capiously and eloquently based on research questions. At the same time, he/she integrates or combines these two types of data by placing one type of data into other one or building one type of data into other one respectively. He/she gives priority to one type of data or both types of data according to the emphasized priority in the research of Creswell and Plano Clark (2015).

The portrait values questionnaire with the 40 questions developed by Schwartz and Bilsky (1994) was used to collect the quantitative data. The questionnaire consists of 40 items which are

given two sentences. A fictional individual is described taking into account the aims or desires with regard to the ten values types in each item in the questionnaire. The value types and the related item numbers are presented below (Demirutku, 2004).

A sample expression is given for each dimension in the questionnaire 1-Power: It is important for him to be rich; 2-Achievement: It is very important for him to show his talents; 3-Hedonism: Every opportunity to have fun arms; 4-Stimulation: Every time I try new things to try; 5-Self-direction: He likes doing things in his own, original way; 6-Universalism: Believes that everyone in life must have equal opportunities; 7-Benevolence: It is very important for him to help people around him; 8-Tradition: He thinks it is best to do things in the traditional way; 9-Conformity: people believe that they have to do what is said to them; 10-Security: Avoid everything that could put your safety in jeopardy.

The data related to the validity and reliability of the questionnaire used in this study were used as the data in the Turkish version of the questionnaire. Validity and reliability studies on the Porte values questionnaire (Demirutku and Sümer, 2010) were conducted within the context of the Turkish version of the questionnaire. According to this, it can be said that the empirical work in the study does not show significant deviations from the theoretical model and that the observed deviations are in fact consistent with the deviations from the previous studies.

Both Cronbach alpha and test-retest reliability coefficients were calculated for the value-type scales that personal digital assistant (PDA) items brought to the market. According to the calculations made, the lowest coefficient was 0.56 and the highest coefficient was 0.82. In addition, test-retest reliability for each value type was also calculated, with the lowest reliability coefficient being .65 (Self-referential value type) and the highest reliability coefficient being 0.82 (Traditionality value type).

Semi-structured interview form was used in the collection of qualitative data. An interview form consisting of an open-ended question was prepared by the researcher. In the interview form, it is desirable to rank the values in the Porte Values Questionnaire according to the order of importance from top to bottom and to write the reasons. The following question was asked in the interview form. "As a candidate for a teacher, rank the values of" Success ", " Power ", " Provision ", " Adaptation ", " Self ", " Universality ", " Charity ", " Traditionality ", " Adaptation " .

In order to ensure validity, a single questionnaire form prepared for seven competent field specialists in the field of educational sciences was given and the final form was given in the form of an interview form in the light of the opinions and recommendations of field experts. The interview form was applied to ten teacher candidates outside the study group, The data were gathered from volunteer participants from the teacher candidates trained in the pedagogical formation training certificate program. After making the necessary explanation for the researcher interview, the teacher candidates should write the interview form and the researcher was handed over to the investigator (Table 1).

The population of the research consists of 1000 students attending the Pedagogical Formation Training Certificate Program which was held at Mardin Artuklu University in 2015 to 2016 academic year. The quantitative data were collected from 435 pre-service teachers who were randomly selected. The qualitative data were obtained from 50 voluntary pre-service teachers who did not fill out the questionnaire before. These variables were chosen because of the possibility of changing value orientations according to gender and branch variables. The data for the sample are given in Table 1.

Data analysis

The study was designed as a screening model and mix (quantitative and qualitative). The study attempted to describe the

Table 1. Distribution of teacher candidates in the sample.

Variable	Gender		Branch				
	Woman	Man	Turkish language ve Edebiyatı	History	Teologi	Philosophy	Health
Quantitative veriler							
N	241	194	111	46	110	82	86
%	55.4	43.6	25.5	10.5	25.5	18.8	19.7
Qualitative veriler							
N	25	25	10	10	10	10	10
%	50	50	20	20	20	20	20

Table 2. The results of pre-service teachers' value orientations.

Pre-service teachers' value orientations	N	\bar{X}	S
Universalism	435	1,52	0.50
Benevolence	435	1.79	0.70
Self-direction	435	1,83	0.66
Security	435	1,97	0.71
Conformity	435	1,99	0.77
Tradition	435	2.37	0.85
Stimulation	435	2.42	0.95
Achievement	435	2.62	0.96
Hedonism	435	2.76	1.13
Power	435	3.27	1.09

value orientations according to the perceptions of the prospective of the pre-servis teachers. If the group size is greater than 50, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test scores can be used to assess normality. As a result of this test, when $p > 0.05$, the data showed normal distribution; When $p < 0.05$, it is understood that the data do not show normal distribution (Büyüköztürk, 2013). In the study, data were analyzed based on these criteria. Mean and standard deviation were used to evaluate the quantitative data in the research. Correlation was conducted to identify the relationships among the dimensions. Besides, t-test for gender variable and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for subject area variable were utilized. Tukey HSD test, which is one of post-hoc tests, was used to find out the significant differences for F values. Frequency values were used for the qualitative data. Besides, the codes were given to the participants and it was quoted from their remarks. To illustrate, pre-service teachers' subject areas such as Theology PRE-THE, history PRE-HIS, Turkish and Literature PRE-TUR, Health PRE-HEA, and Philosophy PRE-PHI were coded.

FINDINGS AND COMMENT

The analysis of the findings of the research started with the quantitative data and continued with the qualitative ones.

Analysis of the quantitative data

In the analysis of the quantitative data of the research,

the pre-service teachers' value orientations were firstly dealt with and then correlations among the sub-dimensions were examined and lastly the independent variables were analyzed (Table 2). When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that the expressions in the values "universalism", "benevolence", "self-direction", "security", and "conformity" more appealed to the pre-service teachers, whereas the expressions in the values "tradition", "stimulation", "achievement", "hedonism", and "power" less appealed to them.

When Table 3 is considered, the strongest correlation value (0.495) occurred between "stimulation" and "hedonism" sub-dimensions and the lowest correlation value (0.021) between "power" and "benevolence" ones. Based on these values, there is a significant relationship between "stimulation" and "hedonism" sub-dimensions, whereas there is not a significant relationship between "power" and "benevolence" sub-dimensions.

According to the data in Table 4, the general arithmetic average for the participants' responses is $=2.16$. The average for the female participants' response is $=2.10$, while the average for the male participants' responses is $=2.24$. As t-test result is 3.255 with $p < 0.05$, there is a significant difference between the female and male participants' responses. It was found that this difference is in favor the female participants. According to these results, the score of the female participants' responses is

Table 3. The results of the correlation for pre-service teachers' value orientations.

Factors	Power	Achievement	Hedonism	Stimulation	Self-direction	Universalism	Benevolence	Tradition	Conformity	Security
Power	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Achievement	0.469**	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hedonism	0.317**	0.316**	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stimulation	0.251**	0.310**	0.495**	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Self-direction	0.184**	0.297**	0.288**	0.335**	1	-	-	-	-	-
Universalism	-0.024	0.080	0.060	0.112*	0.354**	1	-	-	-	-
Benevolence	0.021	0.091	0.102*	0.054	0.253**	0.419**	1	-	-	-
Tradition	0.056	0.128**	0.110*	0.058	0.105*	0.230**	0.293**	1	-	-
Conformity	0.109*	0.167**	0.091	0.048	0.132**	0.226**	0.290**	0.443**	1	-
Security	0.190**	0.295**	0.220**	0.116*	0.242**	0.328**	0.276**	0.389**	0.410**	1

**p<.01, *p<.05.

Table 4. T-test results for the value orientations with regard to gender variable.

Gender	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	T	P
Female	241	2.10	0.400	433	-3.255	0.001
Male	194	2.24	0.467			

* p<.05.

lower than the score of the male participants' ones. The female participants think that the expressions in the values are more associated with them as opposed to the male ones. In this research, low score means high association, whereas high score means low association.

When Table 5 is examined, it was found that there is a significant difference in the pre-service teachers' value orientations with regard to "gender" variable. The difference happened in favor of the female teachers (p<0.05). With respect to the value sub-dimensions, a significant difference occurred in "achievement", "hedonism", "stimulation", "conformity", and "security" values (p<0.05). However, there was not any significant

difference in "Power", "Self-direction", "Universalism", "Benevolence" and "Tradition" values (p>0.05). It is seen that the significant differences in the value sub-dimensions are in favor of the female teachers. They think that the expressions in the value sub-dimensions more appeal to them compared with the male teachers. A significant difference was found in ANOVA test with regard to the subject areas variable (p<0.05). The subject areas where the significant differences occurred are displayed in Table 6. When Table 7 is considered, a significant difference occurred in the pre-service teachers' value preferences with regard to "study area" variable (p<.05). When the results for the values

sub-dimensions are taken into account, it is seen that there were significant differences in "achievement", "hedonism", "stimulation", "self-direction", "benevolence", "tradition", "conformity" and "security" values sub-dimensions (p<0.05). On the other hand, there were not significant differences in "Power" and "Universalism" sub-dimensions (p>0.05). The subject areas where the significant differences occurred are displayed in Table 7.

Analysis of the qualitative data

"Gender" and "Subject Areas" variables were

Table 5. T-test results for the value sub-dimensions with regard to gender variable.

Sub-dimensions	Gender	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	T	P
Power	Female	241	3.36	1.04	433	1.569	0.117
	Male	194	3.19	1.14			
Achievement	Female	241	2.52	0.96	433	-2.308	0.021*
	Male	194	2.73	0.97			
Hedonism	Female	241	2.49	1.08	433	-4.993	0.000*
	Male	194	3.03	1.19			
Stimulation	Female	241	2.33	0.93	433	-2.022	0.044*
	Male	194	2.52	0.98			
Self-direction	Female	241	1.77	0.60	433	1.797	0.073
	Male	194	1.89	0.72			
Universalism	Female	241	1.49	0.46	433	1.248	0.213
	Male	194	1.55	0.54			
Benevolence	Female	241	1.74	0.67	433	1.587	0.113
	Male	194	1.84	0.74			
Tradition	Female	241	2.39	0.86	433	.521	0.603
	Male	194	2.35	0.83			
Conformity	Female	241	1.91	0.70	433	2.212	0.028*
	Male	194	2.08	0.85			
Security	Female	241	1.86	0.66	433	3.206	0.001*
	Male	194	2.08	0.75			

* p<.05.

Table 6. ANOVA results for the pre-service teachers' value orientations with regard to the subject areas variable.

Source for variation	Sum of Squares	Sd	Mean Squares	F	P	Significant difference
Between groups	5.38	4	1.35	7.51	0.000	Health-theology
Within groups	77.09	430	0.179			Health-philosophy group
						Literature-theology
Total	82.47	434	-			Literature-philosophy group History-philosophy History-theology group

analyzed one by one in the analysis of the qualitative data. Frequency values were used in the analysis. The universe in which the research was conducted consists of 1000 pre-services teachers participating in the Pedagogical Formation Education Certificate Program conducted by Mardin Artuklu University in 2015 to 2016 school year.

Quantitative data were collected from 435 pre-services teachers randomly selected from the research population. Qualitative data were collected from 50 volunteer pre-services teachers who did not complete the quantitative data collection questionnaire before the research universe. As seen in Table 8, according to "Gender" variable, 36% of the female participants preferred

Table 7. ANOVA results for the pre-service teachers' subject area sub-dimensions.

Source for variation		Sum of squares	Sd	Mean Squares	F	P	Significant difference
Power	Between groups	3.131	4	0.783	0.662	0.619	-
	Within groups	508.633	430	1.183			
	Total	511.764	434	-			
Achievement	Between groups	18.508	4	4.627	5.155	0.000	Health-theology Literature-theology History-theology Philosophy group-theology
	Within groups	385.953	430	.898			
	Total	404.461	434	-			
Hedonism	Between groups	23.679	4	5.920	4.552	0.001	Health-theology Literature-theology History-theology
	Within groups	559.166	430	1.300			
	Total	582.844	434	-			
Stimulation	Between groups	9.435	4	2.359	2.605	0.035	Health-theology Literature-theology
	Within groups	389.299	430	0.905			
	Total	398.735	434	-			
Self-direction	Between groups	4.876	4	1.219	2.851	0.024	Health-theology Literature-theology
	Within groups	183.895	430	0.428			
	Total	188.771	434	-			
Universalism	Between groups	2.157	4	0.539	2.206	-0.068	-
	Within groups	105.129	430	0.244			
	Total	107.287	434	-			
Benevolence	Between groups	6.763	4	1.691	3.506	0.008	Literature-philosophy group
	Within groups	207.379	430	0.482			
	Total	214.142	434	-			
Tradition	Between groups	20.183	4	5.046	7.437	0.000	Health-literature Literature-philosophy group History-philosophy group
	Within groups	291.739	430	0.678			
	Total	311.922	434	-			
Conformity	Between groups	8.544	4	2.136	3.646	0.006	Literature-philosophy group History-philosophy
	Within groups	251.929	430	0.586			
	Total	260.473	434	-			
Security	Between groups	7.736	4	1.934	3.911	0.004	Literature-philosophy group
	Within groups	212.616	430	0.494			
	Total	220.352	434	-			

*p<0.05.

"achievement" value, whereas the percentage value for the male ones was 64%. PRE-PHI42 coded female participant stated her reason for "achievement" as "the way to be useful to an individual himself/herself and society depends on achievement" and PRE-TUR16 coded male participant explained his reason for "achievement" as "a teacher, firstly, should be successful. A pre-service teacher should pursue being successful."

It is seen in Table 8 that the male participants preferred "Hedonism" value, while the percentage value for the female ones 64%. PRE-PHI45 coded male participant indicated his preference for "hedonism" as "an individual who does not enjoy life, misses the meaning of life from the very beginning." Besides, PRE-PHI44 coded female participant accounted for her reason for the value as "the first value a pre-service teacher should possess is to

Table 8. Pre-service teachers' perceptions for "gender" variable.

Gender	Value Order 1st Order	F	Gender	Value Order 10th Order	F
Female 25	Achievement	9	Female 25	Tradition	9
Male 25	Achievement	6	Male 25	Tradition	9
Female 25	Hedonism	5	Female 25	Self-direction	4
Male 25	Hedonism	8	Male 25	Stimulation	1
Female 25	Security	5	Female 25	Power	3
Male 25	Security	2	Male 25	Power	4
Female 25	Universalism	2	Female 25	Stimulation	3
Male 25	Universalism	1	Male 25	Stimulation	1
Female 25	Self-direction	2	Female 25	Universalism	2
Male 25	Self-direction	1	Male 25	Universalism	2
Female 25	Benevolence	1	Female 25	Achievement	2
Male 25	Benevolence	4	Male 25	Achievement	3
Female 25	Tradition	1	Female 25	Benevolence	2
Male 25	Power	3	Male 25	Hedonism	3
-	-	-	Male 25	Power	2
Total	-	25	Total	-	25
	-	25		-	25

enjoy life. A teacher enjoying life is peaceful with himself/herself and provides more help to his/her environment.

As seen in Table 8, the female participants preferred "security" value as opposed to the male participants preferring this value. PRE-PHI50 coded female participant revealed that "first of all, a secure setting should be enabled for achievement and power. Otherwise, it will be impossible to enjoy achievement, power and life. The other values can develop or be developed depending on security factor." On the other hand, PRE-TUR17 coded male participant justified his reason for "security" value as "firstly, I would like to feel myself secure. The others come after this value". The branch of the Turkish and Literature pre-service teachers' value orientations is shown in Table 9. The Turkish and Literature pre-service teachers preferred "achievement", "benevolence", "security", and "self-direction" in the first rank, respectively. Based on these data, these teachers favored "achievement" value to the others. For instance, PRE-TUR14 coded teacher accounted for the reason for "achievement" value as "It is very difficult to realize the other values without achievement. Therefore, if achievement is succeeded, the others are accomplished as well." Furthermore, PRE-TUR16 coded teacher stated

the reason to choose "achievement" value as "A teacher, firstly, should be successful. A pre-service teacher should constantly pursue being successful."

The branch of the philosophy pre-service teachers' value orientations is shown in Table 9. The philosophy pre-service teachers preferred "achievement", "security", "hedonism" and "benevolence", in the first rank, respectively. It is understood that these teachers firstly and equally favored "achievement", "security", and "hedonism" values. To illustrate, PRE-PHI42 coded teacher accounted for the reason to prefer "achievement" value as "the way to be useful to an individual himself/herself and society depends on achievement". On the other hand, PRE-PHI50 coded teacher explained the reason to favor "Security" value as "First of all, a secure setting should be enabled for achievement and power. Otherwise, it will be impossible to enjoy achievement, power and life. The other values can develop or be developed depending on security factor." Another PRE-PHI44 coded teacher explained the reason to choose "Hedonism" value as "The first value a pre-service teacher should possess is to enjoy life. A teacher enjoying life is peaceful with himself/herself and provides more help to his/her environment."

The branch of the Theology pre-service teachers' value

Table 9. Pre-service teachers' perceptions for "subject area" variable.

Variable	Value order	1st value order	F	Value order	10th value order	F
Literature		Achievement	5	Hedonism		3
		Benevolence	2	Power		2
		Security	2	Tradition		2
		Self-direction	1	Self-direction		2
		-	-	Universalism		1
Total		-	10		-	10
Philosophy group		Achievement	3	Tradition		3
		Hedonism	3	Achievement		2
		Security	3	Security		1
		-	-	Self-direction		1
		-	-	Stimulation		1
		Benevolence	1	Universalism		1
Total		-	10		-	10
Theology		Achievement	2	Achievement		3
		Universalism	2	Power		3
		Security	2	Security		1
		Hedonism	2	Universalism		1
		Power	1	Stimulation		1
		Tradition	1	Tradition		1
Total		-	10		-	10
Health		Power	3	Tradition		6
		Hedonism	3	Stimulation		1
		Self-direction	2	Self-direction		1
		Universalism	1	Universalism		1
		Benevolence	1	Power		1
Total		-	10		-	10
History		Hedonism	6	Tradition		6
		Achievement	2	Power		1
		-	2	Conformity		1
		Power	2	Security		1
		-	-	Stimulation		1
Total		-	10		-	10

orientations is shown in Table 9. The theology pre-service teachers favored "achievement", "universalism", "security", "hedonism", "power" and "tradition", in the first rank consecutively. Based on these findings, these teachers evenly attach importance to "achievement", "universalism", "security" and "hedonism" values. PRE-THE5 coded pre-service teacher indicated the reason for "achievement" value as "achievement should be the most important value." PRE-THE4 coded teacher stated the reason to favor "Universalism" value as "As I live in this way, I have ordered the values like this." PRE-THE6

coded pre-service teacher explained the reason to prefer "Security" value as "An individual's life needs determine security as the top of the value hierarchy." PRE-THE1 coded pre-service teacher revealed the reason for "Hedonism" value as "People should enjoy life to conduct other steps in life. The fact that they are at peace with the world, think universally are possible to embrace such a world view. These steps should be passed to realize achievement."

The branch of the Health pre-service teachers' value orientations is shown in Table 9. The health pre-service

teachers preferred "achievement", "hedonism", "self-direction", "universalism" and "benevolence" in the first rank, respectively. The teachers regard "achievement", "hedonism" and "self-direction" more important compared with the other values. PRE-HEA33 coded pre-service teacher stated the reason for "achievement" value as "first and foremost of everything is to be successful." On the other hand, PRE-HEA35 coded pre-service teacher accounted for the reason for "Hedonism" as "I believe that enjoying life should be at the top of the values ranking to be more compatible."

The branch of the History pre-service teachers' value orientations is shown in Table 9. The history pre-service teachers preferred "hedonism", "achievement", and "benevolence" in the first rank, respectively. These teachers consider "hedonism", "achievement" and "power" more important compared with the other values. It is noteworthy that "hedonism" value has such a high percentage value. PRE-HIS24 coded pre-service teacher explained the reason for "hedonism" value as "the most important thing determining an individual's value orientations is to enjoy life, which is a point concerned with his/her future and life. The others follow this." PRE-HIS26 coded pre-service teacher indicated the reason for "achievement" value as "achievement herewith ensures happiness, enjoying life and increasing self-confidence. The reason for "stimulation" value in the last rank is that people do not act with their emotions and go one step further through the decisions they make with their reasons and logics". And lastly, PRE-HIS26 coded pre-service teacher demonstrated the reason for "power" value as "power is always a positive privilege". According to the subject area variable, teachers' preferences for the values in the last rank are seen in detailed in Table 8.

DISCUSSION

One of the social expectations is to educate next generations to have the idealized values. Even though their education process starts at home, systematic and programmed education continues at school. The fact that schools fulfill this education meeting the social expectations is possible with the teachers who have these values because students learn a number of things from their teachers by seeing and practicing in the context with the social learning.

In this section, firstly findings obtained in this research are given, these findings are discussed with other research results and the result is explained in several sentences one by one. Participants (teacher/pre-service teachers) according to the findings obtained in the research were mainly in the research "universality", "benevolence" and "self-direction"; and later in other researches, for example, by Özcan and Erol (2017); "benevolence", "self-direction" and "security". In the work done by Acar et al. (2016) "self-direction", "benevolence"

and "security"; In the research conducted by the Kızılgeçit et al. (2015); "benevolence", "universality" and "security"; In the work done by Emre and Yapıcı (2015); "traditionality", "benevolence" and "compliance"; In the survey conducted by Dündar (2013); "goodness", "security" and "universality"; In the work done by Arslan and Tunç (2013); "benevolence", "universality" and "security"; In the research carried out by Oğuz (2012); "universalism", "benevolence" and "security"; In the survey conducted by Dilmaç et al. (2009); "benevolence", "universality" and "security"; In the research done by Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı (2000); "universalism", "universality" and "security" are more important values of "universalism", "security" and "benevolence".

In addition, according to the results obtained in the research, the participants (teacher pre-services teachers) were surveyed by "achievement", "hedonism" and "power" in this research, and then in other researches such as Özcan and Erol (2017). "power", "stimulation" and "hedonism"; In the work done by Acar et al, (2016) "power", "alignment" and "preparing"; In the research conducted by the Kızılgeçit et al, (2015), "power", "hedonism" and "stimulation"; In the work done by Emre and Yapıcı [2015]; "hedonism", "power" and "stimulation"; In the survey conducted by Dündar (2013); "success", "tradition" and "power"; In the work done by Arslan and Tunç (2013); "adaptation", "adaptation" and "power"; In the research conducted by Oğuz (2012), "warning" and "hedonism"; In the research carried out by Dilmaç et al, (2009); the data on which the values of "stimulation", "hedonism" and "power" are least important are revealed.

When these different research results are evaluated as a whole, it can be seen that teacher and the pre-services teachers are more concerned with the values of "benevolence", "universality" and "security" within the aforementioned 10 values; the values of "hedonism", "stimulation" and "power" are reached as less important consequences. These results can be interpreted as the fact that the values of "benevolence", "universality" and "security" should be given more importance to the teachers and the pre-service teachers, and the values of "hedonism", "stimulation" and "power" should be less emphasized. If values are adopted in this way, they can be educated in a balanced manner in terms of mind, emotion and body health, with a well-balanced and balanced personality in the knowledge of their responsibilities. It can also be assessed that students can contribute to building a livable social environment as a good person and a good citizen. When the results are examined with regard to the value dimensions, it is seen that there were significant differences in the quantitative and qualitative data in respect to the variables. The dimensions were analyzed one by one.

In the context with "achievement" dimension, there was a significant difference in the quantitative data according to gender variable, whereas there were differences of opinion in the qualitative data. Besides, this difference is

in favor of the female pre-service teachers. It was revealed in the research by Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012) that a significant difference occurs in favor of the female teachers in terms of gender variable. However, it was not found in the research by Oğuz (2012), Bulut (2012), Dilmaç et al. (2009) and Dilmaç et al. (2008) that a significant difference does not happen in the teachers' "achievement" value with regard to gender variable. Moving on from these unique research findings, the following conclusion can be reached. While there was a significant difference in some studies in favor of female teacher and pre-service teachers' according to the gender variable, there was no significant difference in some studies according to the gender variable.

The reasons for the significant difference in favor of the female pre-service teachers can be accounted for the fact that they prefer "Achievement" value at a higher rate compared with the male teachers, need to prove themselves ontologically, want to acquire social status or need to meet the social expectations as a result of the changing social expectations. Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012) put forward two reasons for these differences. The first reason is teaching occupation being perceived as a traditional female occupation. The second reason is that it will be easy for females to get social approval by fulfilling their traditional woman roles (a good mother, a good wife) by teaching.

When the findings concerned with "hedonism" dimension is regarded, it is seen that there was a significant difference in the quantitative data with regard to gender variable, while there were differences of opinion in the qualitative data. In the quantitative data, the difference is in favor of the female teachers. That is, they prefer this value at a higher rate. On the other hand, the difference of opinion in the qualitative data is in favor of the male teachers. In other words, the male pre-service teachers prefer hedonism value at a higher rate. A similar result turns out to be in favor of the male pre-service teachers in the research by Dilmaç et al. (2008). Nevertheless, significant differences do not occur in the research by Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012), Oğuz (2012), Bulut (2012) and Dilmaç et al. (2008) in terms of gender variable.

Moving from the findings of these different researches, it has been reached that the preferences of teacher and pre-service teachers' regarding the hedonism value are different according to gender variable. The contrary differences in the quantitative and qualitative data and the different results of the research can be justified with the different natures of the qualitative and quantitative data collection instruments, the participants' psychological states at the moment filling out the data collection instruments or the target populations' being different in the data collection instruments.

Besides, the fact that "hedonism" value is more preferred by the pre-service teachers compared with "benevolence", "universalism", and "security" values

and hedonism recalls running after zest and it is used more closely with this recalling in the questionnaire need to be seriously thought. The issue how a teacher or a pre-service teacher preferring hedonism value in the first rank enables his/her students to acquire national, spiritual, moral, cultural and familial values in their teaching practices, should be primarily dealt with. At the same time, this value preference confronts us the reality for the value erosions in pre-service teachers as well. If hedonism is understood as taking pleasure from one's work, enjoying working, dedicating himself/herself to that particular work or making effort to do one's best in work, a positive meaning, then, can be attributed to hedonism values.

When the findings concerning "stimulation" dimension are examined, there was a significant difference in the quantitative data with regard to gender variable, whereas there was not a difference for opinion in the qualitative data. This difference in the quantitative data is in favor of the female pre-service teachers. That is, the female pre-service teachers associate stimulation value with themselves at a higher rate. This finding is also supported with the research conducted by Bulut (2012). However, a significant difference is not found in the research by Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012), Oğuz (2012), Dilmaç et al. (2009) and Dilmaç et al. (2008). These findings support the qualitative dimension of the current research. In response to the findings of the research, it has been achieved that the preferences of the teacher and pre-services teachers' regarding the value of the stimulation differ according to the gender variable. The contrary differences in the quantitative and qualitative data and the different results of the research can be accounted for the different natures of the qualitative and quantitative data collection instruments, the participants' psychological states at the moment filling out the data collection instruments or the target populations' being different in the data collection instruments.

When the findings concerned with "security" dimension is considered, a significant difference was found in the quantitative data with regard to gender variable. A difference for opinion was observed in the qualitative data as well. This significant difference is in favor of the female pre-service teachers. This finding is in parallel with the ones in the research conducted by Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012), Oğuz (2012), Bulut (2012), and Dilmaç et al. (2009). On the other hand, a significant difference does not occur in the research conducted by Dilmaç et al. (2008). In all research data except for one of the aforementioned researches, a meaningful result has emerged in favor of female teacher and the pre-services teachers' in terms of gender change related to security value preference. The reason why this value is high for the female teachers can be explained with their motherhood notion "Women make homes", protective and affectionate psychology. However, Bulut (2012)

attributes this difference in favor of the female pre-service teachers to the behavior tendencies societies expect with regard to gender roles. He accounted for the female students' benevolence, security and conformity values at a higher rate compared with the male students indicating that these values have already been expected from women by societies.

When the results concerned with "conformity" dimension are taken into account, a significant difference was found in the quantitative data with regard to gender variable, whereas a difference for opinion was not observed in the qualitative data. This finding is supported with the research by Bulut (2012), Oğuz (2012), Dilmaç et al. (2009). On the other hand, a significant difference between the female and male pre-service teachers is not found in the research by Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012) and Dilmaç et al. (2008). Moving from the research findings given above, it has been achieved that the preferences of teacher and pre-services teachers' regarding the obedience value orientations differ according to gender variables.. The contrary differences in the quantitative and qualitative data and the different results of the research can be accounted for the different natures of the qualitative and quantitative data collection instruments, the participants' psychological states at the moment filling out the data collection instruments or the women's being more inclined to conformity as a requisite of their psychology.

There was not a significant difference between the female and male pre-service teachers in "Power", "self-direction", "universalism", "benevolence" and "tradition" dimensions in the quantitative and qualitative data with regard to gender variable. Besides, the quantitative and qualitative findings support each other. A significant difference is not found between the female and male pre-service teachers in "power", "self-direction", "universalism", "benevolence" and "tradition" dimensions in the research by Bulut (2012). Dilmaç et al. (2009) found a significant difference in favor of the female pre-service teachers in "power" and "universalism" value orientations and a difference in favor of the female ones in "self-direction" value orientation based on their research results. There is not a significant difference between the female and male pre-service teachers with regard to "benevolence" and "tradition" value orientations.

A significant difference occurs in favor of the male pre-service teachers in "Self-direction" and "Benevolence" value orientations, whereas a significant difference occurs in favor of the female pre-service teachers in "Power" value orientation. A significant difference is not observed in "Universalism" and "Tradition" (Dilmaç et al. (???). It was revealed in the research by Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012) that there is a significant difference in favor of the female pre-service teachers in "Universalism" and "Tradition" value orientations, whereas there is not a significant difference among the teachers in "Power", "Self-direction" and "Benevolence" dimensions.

On the basis of the research findings, there was no

significant difference in terms of gender change among the teachers 'and pre-services teachers' values in terms of power, self-interest, universality, benevolence and tradition; there is a significant difference between some research findings. This result can be interpreted as the fact that the participants of the study may have been socio-economically-cultural differences and the difference in the psychological conditions when they filled the data collection vehicle.

When the quantitative data are evaluated with regard to subject area variable, a significant difference was not found among Health, Theology, History, Turkish and Literature and Philosophy Group pre-service teachers in "Power" value orientation. When the qualitative data are considered, "Power" is not preferred among Turkish and Literature, Philosophy Group, Theology and Health pre-service teachers in the first rank. It is seen that this value was favored by only two history pre-service teachers.

According to these results, there is a consistency between the quantitative and qualitative data. It was revealed in the research by Yapıcı et al. (2012) that the subject area factor makes a significant difference in preferring "power" value. However, Oğuz (2012) and Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012) found that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas do not make a significant difference with regard to power variable. When these research findings were evaluated as a whole, there was no significant difference between the power value preferences of teacher and pre-services teachers' in the overall researches; it is only the result of a significant difference in research findings. This result in the research can be explained by the fact that the branches are different but the teacher competencies are generally overlapped and the difference may be caused by differences in the purpose, achievement and / or activities of the branches.

When "achievement" value are evaluated with regard to the quantitative data, a significant difference was found among Turkish and Literature-Theology, History-Theology and Philosophy Group-Theology pre-service teachers in the value orientation. As far as the qualitative data are concerned, there was also a significant difference among Turkish Literature-Theology and Philosophy Group-Theology pre-service teachers in power value orientation. In this regard, the quantitative and qualitative data considerably support each other. These findings show parallelisms with the research by Yapıcı et al. (2012) and Dönmez and Cömert (2007).

However, Oğuz (2012) and Özcan and Erol (2017) found that the subject area variable does not make a significant difference in power value orientations among the pre-service teachers. When the research findings given above are evaluated as a whole, it is seen that there is a significant difference between the achievement value orientations of teacher and pre-services teachers' in the overall researches; only a finding of research did not reveal any significant difference. This result emerged in the research can be sought in terms of meaning

differences that teacher and pre-services teachers' have succeeded, depending on branch differences, although teacher qualifications are generally similar.

When "hedonism" value was examined with regard to the quantitative data, a significant difference was found in the value orientation among Health-Theology, Turkish Literature-Theology and History-Theology pre-service teachers. There was a significant difference in the value orientation among Health-Theology, Turkish Literature-Theology and History-Theology in the qualitative data. In this case, the quantitative and qualitative data support each other. Studies conducted by Emre and Yapıcı (2015) on studies involving a large number of individuals belonging to different nationalities by Hofmann-Towfigh (2007) reveal that the relationship between hedonism and religiosity is negative.

Moreover, Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012), Yapıcı et al. (2012) and Dönmez and Cömert (2007) found in their research that the pre-service and teachers' subject areas differentiate value orientations. However, Oğuz (2012) and Özcan and Erol (2017) indicated that the pre-service teachers' subject areas do not make significant differences in the related value orientation. When we look at the findings of the research as a whole, it is seen that there is a significant difference between the hedonism value confirmity of teacher and pre-services teachers' in the overall researches; only a finding of research did not reveal any significant difference. This result in the research can be explained as the fact that although teacher qualifications are generally similar, teacher and per-servis teachers' stemming from branch differences originated from evaluating the knowledge, skills, understanding, hedonic value derived from the difference in understanding and meaning of life.

When the results concerning "stimulation" value was evaluated in the quantitative data, a significant difference was found in the value orientations among Health-Theology and Turkish Literature pre-service teachers. A significant difference was also found in the value orientations among Health-Theology and Turkish Literature-Theology pre-service teachers in the qualitative data. These findings are supported with the research by Oğuz (2012), Yapıcı et al. (2012), Dönmez and Cömert (2007) and Özcan and Erol (2017). The findings of the research reveal that teacher and pre-services teachers differ significantly in the stimulation value orientation. This result can be predicted from the fact that although the characteristics of the teacher and pre-services teachers are generally similar, the teacher and teacher candidates from different branches can evaluate the knowledge, skills, understanding, the value of arousal in understanding and understanding life differently.

When the quantitative data was examined with regard to "self-direction" value, a significant difference turned out to be in the value orientations among Health-Theology and Turkish Literature-Health pre-service teachers. As far as the qualitative data were concerned, a significant

difference was found among Health-Theology and Turkish Literature-Health pre-service teachers in the value orientations. In this regard, the quantitative data completely overlap with the qualitative data. This finding is parallel with the research by Oğuz (2012) and Dönmez and Cömert (2007).

However, Yapıcı et al. (2012) and Özcan and Erol (2017) indicated that the different subject areas do not make a significant difference in the pre-service teachers' value orientations. When the research findings were evaluated as a whole, it was found that there was a significant difference between self-directed value orientations of teacher and pre-services teachers' in the overall researches; it was only the result that there was no significant difference in research findings. This result emerging from the research can be interpreted as the fact that teacher and pre-services teachers' arising from branch differences differently evaluate knowledge, skill, understanding, self-worth derived from the difference in understanding and meaning of life, although teacher qualifications are generally similar.

When both quantitative and qualitative data were evaluated with regard to "universalism" value, a significant difference was not found in the value orientations among Health, Theology, Turkish Literature, History and Philosophy Group pre-service teachers. In this regard, the quantitative data completely overlap with the qualitative data. On the other hand, Oğuz (2012), Yapıcı et al. (2012), Dönmez and Cömert (2007) and Özcan and Erol (2017) indicated that the pre-service and teachers' subject areas differentiate the value systems. According to the findings of this research, the result that teacher and pre-services teachers' differentiated in terms of universalism value orientations emerged. While this result should be a value that universality value should be taken as a center for all teacher and pre-services teachers', socio-cultural etc. can be predicted to have different value preferences for this value derived from variables.

When both quantitative and qualitative data were examined with regard to "Benevolence" value, a significant difference was found in the value orientations among Turkish Literature-Philosophy Group pre-service teachers. In this regard, the quantitative and qualitative data support each other. These findings are supported with the research by Oğuz (2012), Yapıcı et al. (2012), Dönmez and Cömert (2007) and Özcan and Erol (2017). When the research findings were evaluated, it was concluded that there was a significant difference between the benevolence value orientations of teacher and pre-services teachers in all of the researches. Although this result suggests that the qualifications of teacher and pre-services teachers are generally similar and that there is no significant difference between teachers and prospective teachers in terms of the value of benevolence value, it is observed that teacher and pre-services teachers stemming from branch differences

have a higher level of knowledge, skill, understanding, value differently.

When the quantitative data was taken into account with regard to "Tradition" value, a significant difference occurred in the value orientations among Health-Turkish Literature, Turkish Literature-Philosophy Group and History-Philosophy Group pre-service teachers. As far as the qualitative data were concerned, a significant difference did not take place in the value orientations among Health-Turkish Literature, Turkish Literature - Philosophy Group and History-Philosophy Group pre-service teachers. On the other hand, it was found by Oğuz (2012), Yapıcı et al. (2012), Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012), Dönmez and Cömert (2007) and Özcan and Erol (2017) that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas differentiate their value systems. According to these findings, the results of teacher and pre-services teachers perceptions differ in terms of tradition and value orientations. Although the general characteristics of the teacher and pre-services teachers are similar to each other, this faculty originates from the differences of purpose, achievement, content and efficiency of the courses, as well as socio-economic- can be attributed to variables.

When the quantitative data were examined with regard to "conformity" value, a significant difference was found in the value orientations among Turkish-Philosophy Group and History-Philosophy Group pre-service teachers, whereas a significant difference was not found in the value orientations among Turkish Literature-Philosophy Group and History-Philosophy pre-service teachers in the qualitative data. Oğuz (2012), Yapıcı et al. (2012) and Dönmez and Cömert (2007) revealed that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas make difference in the value systems. According to research findings, it is concluded that there is a difference between the observance values of teacher and pre-services teachers. Although the general characteristics of the teacher and teacher candidates similar to each other, this branch-content, and activity, as well as socio-cultural-economic, etc. can be attributed to variables.

When both quantitative and qualitative data were examined with regard to "security" value, a significant difference was found in the value orientations among Turkish Literature-Philosophy Group pre-service teachers. In this regard, the quantitative and qualitative data completely support each other. These findings show parallelisms with those research by Oğuz (2012), Yapıcı et al. (2012) and Dönmez and Cömert (2007). When the findings are evaluated, it is concluded that in all the above studies, there is a significant difference between the security value orientations of teacher and pre-services teachers. Despite the fact that the qualifications of teacher and pre-services teachers are generally expected to be similar, this branch-based difference is due to differences in knowledge, skills, understanding, understanding of meaning and meaning of life and

differences in purpose, achievement, content and effectiveness of the courses as well as socio-cultural- can be attributed to variables. The results of the research can be briefly summarized as follows:

- 1) When the research and similar research findings included in this research are evaluated as a whole, it can be seen that teacher and pre-services teachers are more concerned with the values of "benevolence", "universality" and "security" within the aforementioned 10 values; In addition, in some researches, female teacher and female pre-services teachers related to "achievement", "stimulation", "security" and "confirmity" value orientation a significant difference emerged in favor of teacher and pre-services teachers; there is no significant difference in some studies; According to the gender variable, there is generally no meaningful difference between teacher and pre-services teachers in "Power", "Self-direction", "universality", "benevolence" and "traditionality" but some studies have found significant differences.
- 2) When the research and similar research findings included in this study were evaluated as a whole, it was found that there was no meaningful difference between "power" value orientations of teacher and pre-services teachers in the whole of the researches; there is a meaningful difference between "achievement", "hedonism" and "self-direction" value orientations which have a meaningful difference only in a research findings; it was found that there was a meaningful difference between the values of "stimulation", "universality", "benevolence", "tradition", "conformity" and "security"

SUGGESTIONS

- (1) More pre-service and in-service training should be conducted to enable teachers and pre-service teachers to acquire the values such as universalism, benevolence, achievement and so forth.
- (2) Studies could be conducted to investigate the reasons why the teachers and pre-service teachers prefer universalism, benevolence and security values in the first rank and favor less power, hedonism and achievement values in the quantitative studies which aims to determine teachers and pre-service teachers' value orientations.
- (3) Studies could be conducted to enable academicians, administrators, teachers and pre-service teachers to see achievement value as a prior value.
- (4) Studies could be conducted to investigate the reasons why hedonism value is embraced at a higher rate in some subject areas and to come up with the solutions to handle this issue.
- (5) Studies could be conducted to investigate the reasons why pre-service teachers' subject areas show differences in achievement, hedonism, stimulation, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security values.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Acar H, Akar M, Acar B (2016). Value orientations of social workers. *Kastamonu Educ. J.* 24(1):97-118.
- Akbaba D, Altun S (2003). Education Management and Values, *Values Educ. J.* 1(1):7-18.
- Arslan M, Tunç E (2013). The Differences in Value Orientation of Students of Theology, *Value Educ. J.* 11(26):7-39.
- Bacanlı H (2011). Value, Value?, *Educ. Overview J. Yr.* 7(19):20-21.
- Balci A (2009). Research Methods, Techniques and Principles in Social Sciences, 7th. Edition, Pegem Akademi, Ankara.
- Basic Law of National Education, Article 1/2. 14/6/1973.
- Bulut SB (2012). International Turkish Literature Culture and Literature *J.* 1(3):212-238, Turkey,
- Büyükoztürk Ş (2013). Manual of Data Analysis for Social Sciences, 18th. Edition, Pegem Akademi, Ankara.
- Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL (2015). Design and Execution of Mixed Method Investigations (trans. Y. Dede, S.Y Demir), Anı Publishing, Ankara,
- Cüceloğlu D (2006). Human and Behavior. Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore.
- Demirutku K (2004). Turkish Adaptation of the Portrait Values Questionnaire, Unpublished Manuscript, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Demirutku K, Sümer N (2010). Turkish Psychology Articles, June 13(25):17-25.
- Dilmaç B, Bozgeyikli H, Çakıllı Y (2008). Examination of Teacher Candidates' Value Perceptions in Terms of Different Variables, *Value Educ. J.* 16:69-91.
- Dilmaç B, Deniz M, Deniz ME (2009). Investigation of Value Preference and Valuation Preferences of University Students, *Values Education J.* 7(18):9-24.
- Dönmez B, Cömert M (2007). Value systems of primary school teachers. *J. Values Educ. Turkey* 5(14):29-59.
- Dündar H (2013). The relationship between the values of teacher candidates and their democratic attitudes. *J. Acad. Soc. Sci.* 6(2):367-381.
- Oğuz E (2012). Teacher Candidates' Views on Values and Values Education, Theory and Practice in Educational Science, *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice [Ad. Special / Supplementary Special Issue]*, Spring, 12(2):1309-1325.
- Emre Y, Yapıcı A (2015). Value Orientations of Turkish Cypriot Citizens", *Turkish Studies International Periodical for Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* Ankara 10(2):1308-2140.
- Ertuğrul Y (2012). Values Education New Horizons in Education, 2nd. Edition, Akçağ, Ankara.
- Güngör E (2010). Values on Psychology Research, 4th Edition, Ötüken Neşriyat, İstanbul.
- Halstead JM, Taylor MJ (1996). Values in Education and Education in Values, The Flamer Press. London-Washington, DC.
- Hançerlioğlu O (1976). "Value", *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 1st Edition, İstanbul: Remzi Bookstore.
- Hofmann-Towfigh N (2007). Do students' values change in different types of schools? *J. Moral Educ.* 36(4):453-473.
- Hökelekli H (2011). Family, School, Values in Society Psychology and Education, 1st Edition, Timaş Publications, İstanbul.
- Kızılgöç M, Acuner HY, Toklu G (2015). Value Orientations and Religiosity-Value Relationship of the Students of the Faculty of Theology", *Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University J. Theol.* 8:43-84.
- Kuşdil ME, Kağıtçıbaşı Ç (2000). Value Orientations of Turkish Teachers and Schwartz Value Theory, *J. Turk. Psychol.* 15(45):59-76.
- Özcan Z, Erol HK (2017). Value Orientations and Religiosity-Value Relationship of University Students (Karabük Example). *J. History Culture Art Res.* 6:4.
- Püsküllüoğlu A (2003). Turkish Dictionary, Ankara: Friends-Angora Publications.
- Şahin-Fırat Ş, Açıkgöz K (2012). Teachers' Value Systems in terms of Some Variables H.U. *J. Educ.* 43:422-435.
- Sarı E (2005). Value Preference of Teacher Candidates: Giresun Education Faculty Sample, *Values Educ. J.* 3(10):73-88,
- Schwartz SH, Bilsky W (1994). Values and personality. *Eur. J. Personality* 8:163-181.
- Şişman M (2002). Organizations and Cultures, Pegem A Publishing, Ankara.
- Stadjkovic AD, Luthans F (1998). Social Cognitive Theory and Self-Efficacy: Going Beyond Traditionally, Motivational and Behavioral Approaches. *Organ. Dynamics* 26(4):62-75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(98\)90006-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(98)90006-7)
- Turkish Language Society (2005). Turkish dictionary. Ankara: Turkish Language Association Publication.
- Yapıcı A, Kutlu MO, Bilican FI (2012). Teacher Candidates value orientations. *Electronic J. Soc. Sci.* 11(42):9-151.
- Zevalsiz S (2014). Value Perception of University Students (Karabük University Example), *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 9(2):1739-1762.