



| Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi |

Value Orientations of School Principals and Teachers Working in Secondary Schools

Ortaokullarda Görev Yapan Okul Müdürleri ve Öğretmenlerin Değer Yönelimleri

Merve Çağlar Gönülaçık¹, Cüneyt Belenkuyu², Said Taş³

Keywords

- 1.Values
- 2.Value Orientations
- 3.Teachers

Anahtar Kelimeler

- 1.Değerler
- 2.Değer Yönelimleri
- 3.Öğretmenler

Received/Başvuru Tarihi

29.11.2021

Accepted / Kabul Tarihi

29.09.2022

Abstract

Purpose: Teachers have crucial influence on shaping students' values and behaviors either directly or indirectly besides implementing the curriculum. The current study examined the effects of gender, job position, seniority, marital status and educational status on principals and teachers' value orientations.

Design/Methodology/Approach: To understand teachers' values, we used survey research design. We conducted group comparison analyses (t-test and ANOVA) to determine whether gender, job position, seniority, marital status and educational status led to a difference in teachers' value preferences.

Findings: The values that are considered the most important by teachers were "hedonism" and the least mean score in "stimulation". Also, the variable of gender caused a statistically significant difference in the values of "achievement", "benevolence", "security" and "universalism" in favor of female teachers. Single teachers have higher level of "achievement", "benevolence", "security", "self-direction", "stimulation" and "universalism" values. With regard to educational status, no meaningful difference was found towards value orientations. Also, age and seniority variables didn't cause meaningful difference.

Highlights: It is important to reveal the values adopted by teachers and school principals to make sense of education systems. Especially today's changing structure makes it necessary to determine the values adopted in educational organizations by repeating them in different periods.

Öz

Çalışmanın amacı: Öğretmenler, müfredatın uygulanmasının yanı sıra, öğrencilerin değer ve davranışlarının şekillenmesinde doğrudan veya dolaylı olarak çok önemli etkiye sahiptir. Bu araştırma, öğretmenlerin ve okul müdürlerinin cinsiyet, iş pozisyonu, meslekte kıdem, medeni durum ve eğitim durumunun öğretmenlerin ve okul müdürlerinin değer yönelimlerine etkisini araştırmayı amaçlamıştır.

Materiyal ve Yöntem: Öğretmenlerin değer yönelimlerini ortaya çıkarmak için tarama araştırma deseni kullanılmıştır. Cinsiyet, iş pozisyonu, meslekte kıdem, medeni durum ve eğitim durumunun öğretmenlerin değer tercihlerinde farklılığa yol açmadığını belirlemek için grup karşılaştırma analizleri (t-testi ve ANOVA) yapılmıştır.

Bulgular: Öğretmenler tarafından en önemli olarak kabul edilen değerler "hazcılık" ve en az ortalama puan "uyarılma" olmuştur. Ayrıca cinsiyet değişkeni "başarı", "yardımseverlik", "güvenlik" ve "evrenselcilik" değerlerinde kadın öğretmenler lehine istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılığa neden olmuştur. Bekâr öğretmenlerin "başarı", "yardımseverlik", "güvenlik", "kendini yönlendirme", "uyarılma" ve "evrenselcilik" değerleri daha yüksek düzeydedir. Eğitim durumuna göre ise değer yönelimlerine yönelik anlamlı bir farklılık olmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Yaş ve kıdem değişkenleri öğretmenlerin ve okul müdürlerinin değer yönelimleri arasında anlamlı bir farklılığa neden olmamıştır.

Önemli Vurgular: Öğretmen ve okul müdürlerinin benimsedikleri değerlerin ortaya konulması eğitim sistemleri anlamlandırmak için önemlidir. Özellikle günümüzün hızlı değişen yapısı eğitim örgütlerinde de benimsenen değerlerin farklı dönemlerde tekrarlanarak belirlenmesini gerekli kılmaktadır.

¹ Süleyman Demirel University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Isparta, TURKEY; mervecaglar32@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5523-6588>

² **Corresponding Author**, Süleyman Demirel University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Isparta, TURKEY; cuneytbelenkuyu@sdu.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4861-5747>

³ Süleyman Demirel University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Isparta, TURKEY; saidtas@sdu.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3013-9084>

INTRODUCTION

Values are not the things attained in born, rather they are phenomena that are learned and adopted as a result of interaction with all components of the social structure, from the private to the general. In this respect, it can be stated that values are acquired and learned through experiences. Values involve the value judgments of the individual himself or his family; they also cover the value judgments of society. The individual has certain criteria through the values they have gained and through these criteria, he goes to the way of evaluating people, events or situations or reaches a decision. Therefore, the values adopted by individuals are the phenomena that determine the perspective of individuals on life, their understanding of life, their behaviors and their characters.

Value is a concept that is frequently encountered in the literature of many disciplines such as sociology, philosophy and psychology. Each discipline goes to the way of defining the concept of value by assigning meaning to it with different perspectives (Bacanlı, 2002). Therefore, it is difficult to give a clear definition of the concept of value. Schwartz (1999) states value as "a social actor that helps to choose behaviors, evaluate events and people, explain behaviors"; According to Ulusoy & Dilmaç (2016, p.7), value is "a set of beliefs that have the characteristics that make humans human and that contain the basic features that distinguish human beings from other living beings and that guide human behavior". From these two definitions, it can be seen that values are criteria. Situations, facts or people can be evaluated through these criteria. It is also possible to see the definitions that emphasize the role and importance of values in the social structure. As "the most important criteria that give meaning to the socio-cultural elements of society" (Özensel, 2003, p. 220), values influence people and societies in deciding how to live and what they find valuable (Ülken, 2016).

The phenomenon we express as a social structure can be expressed as a social integrity formed by individuals. Kiray (1964, p.19) expressed the social structure as follows:

"Every social structure, whether it is in the primitive, feudal, modern basic structure or in their variations in change, is a whole in which the social institutions that make up this structure, the human relations and the social values arising from their mutual interaction mutually affect each other".

Individuals are the smallest building blocks of society and the mental, spiritual, physical, intellectual and intellectual values of each individual affect and are influenced by society in different dimensions and areas. For this reason, just as individuals constitute society and social structure, the synthesis of value judgments that each individual in society has constitutes the set of values that society has, adopts and wants to transfer from generation to generation.

Schwartz Value Classification

Value list developed by Rokeach (1973) was open to show some kind of cross-cultural differences towards the meaning of the values, to show bias towards some cultures and not to have enough insight towards theoretical information of the value system. Based on these factors, Schwartz & Bilsky (1987) initiated some attempts to fulfil the gap in the existing value list. As a result of the efforts made, values are two-fold: individual values and cultural values. Cultural values provided notions related to norms and value systems of the cultures. And individual values are examined based on the level how people lead their lives (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000). The classification of the individual values is basically based on the motivational values that individuals have:

1. *Power*; "as attainment of social status and prestige, and control or dominance over people and resources (authority, wealth, social power, preserving my public image, social recognition)" (Kim, 2002, p.43)
2. *Achievement*; the defining goal of this value type is "personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards" (Komar, 2012, p.42)
3. *Hedonism*; the motivational goal of this type "more sharply as pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself (pleasure, enjoying life)" (Verdiesen et al., 2018, p. 27)
4. *Stimulation*; The motivational goals of this type of values are "excitement, novelty, and challenge in life (a varied life, an exciting life, daring)" (Kang et al.,1995, p.190)
5. *Self-direction*: Emphasizing "own independent thought and action and favoring change conflict with submissive self-restriction, preservation of traditional practices, and protection of stability" (Schwartz, 1992, p.15)
6. *Universalism*; The motivational goals of this type of values are "understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature." (Amormino et al., 2022).
7. *Benevolence*; "Emphasizing on preserving and enhancing the welfare of those with whom one is in frequent personal contact (the 'in-group')" (Kang et al.,1995, p.190)
8. *Tradition*; Emphasizing on "respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that one's culture or religion provides" (Schwartz, 1992, p.40)
9. *Conformity*; "The motivational goal of this value type of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms". (Schwartz, 1992, p.40).
10. *Security*; "The motivational goal of this value type is safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self" (Koepfler, 2014, p.85)

The Relationship Between Teacher and Value

Education is a crucial phenomenon which nourish human beings in many ways and differentiate them from other living things. Kant (2006) defends that a person as an existence who needs education. For him, there are differences between person and animal. While animals behave with their instincts, human beings behave with their mind. In this respect, human mind determines the directions of the actions and before draw the path of the way followed, he needs to make his own action plan (Yayla, 2005).

Schools are fundamental building blocks for education, by providing systematic and planned educational opportunity. Besides being a learning zone based on value systems, schools have a crucial role in value transmission, as well (Turan & Aktan, 2008). In this respect,

“The role of the school is two-fold: to build on and supplement the values children have already begun to develop by offering further exposure to a range of values that are current in society (such as equal opportunities and respect for diversity); and to help children to reflect on, make sense of and apply their own developing values” (Halstead & Taylor, 2000, p.169).

As the practitioners of the curriculum, teachers are one of the crucial components of the education process, in which they have various sphere of influence. Besides presenting the content of the curriculum, they have influence on cognitive, affective and social domains. Also, among these goals, teachers are expected to help children shape and evolve their values and behaviors to sustain their beings in a democratic and multicultural society. They can have either direct or indirect impact on helping students recognize what they value (Suh & Traiger, 1999). These claims match those with the ones stating that teachers perform a moral vocation in some way (Carr, 1993). Children’s values are influenced consciously or subconsciously as a result of their relationship with their trainees, attitudes and teaching styles (Jackson, 1992). In this respect, teachers may be expected to set a good example because they reflect their values to young people (Halstead & Taylor, 2000).

In this respect, the current study examined the value orientations of the teachers and school principals. It aimed to address these issues by reviewing gender, age, marital status, job position, seniority in profession and educational status of the participants.

METHOD

In order to understand teachers’ values, we used survey research design. Survey research models are the research approaches that aim to describe a situation that has existed in the past or currently exists as it exists. What is the subject of research, the individual or the object, is tried to be defined in its own conditions and as it is. No attempt is made to change or influence them in any way (Karasar, 1995). In addition to describing an incidence, giving details about the characteristics of a sample population, survey research can also be utilized in exploring a relationship between variables (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). We conducted group comparison analyses (t-test and ANOVA) to determine whether gender, job position, seniority in profession, marital status and educational status led to a difference in teachers' value preferences.

Sampling Strategy

The sample of the study is composed of 351 teachers working in a province of Turkey. 350 teachers are sufficient as sample size with a 95 % confidence level and a 5 % confidence interval (Cohen et al., 2018). Due to its simplicity to set up, cheapness and adequacy without a generalization effort, we used convenience sampling strategy to reach population of the study. Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the study sample.

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of participants

Characteristics	n	%
Gender		
Female	182	51.9
Male	169	48.1
Marital status		
Married	147	41.9
Single	175	49.9
Divorced	29	8.3
Job position		
Teacher	326	92.9
Administrator	25	7.1
Educational status		
Undergraduate	294	83.8
Masters' degree	49	14
Ph.D. Degree	8	2.3
Age		
21-30	149	42.5
31-40	103	29.3
41-50	75	21.4
50+	24	6.8
Seniority		

1-5	152	43.3
6-15	100	28.5
16-25	73	20.8
25+	26	7.4

Data Collection

We used Personal Information Form to gather data on demographic characteristics of teachers and Schwartz Value List to measure teachers' value preferences.

Personal Information Form

In order to collect data on the independent variables of the research, it consists of closed-ended questions about the gender, branch, age, marital status, professional seniority, duty and education status of the participants.

Schwartz Value List

The 55-item values list was developed by Schwartz (1992) and adopted to Turkish by Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı (2000). Each item in the list represents a value. Participants were asked to indicate the importance of the listed values in guiding their life with a scale of -1 (contrary to my principles) to 7 (most important). We conducted confirmatory factor analysis to validate the factor structure of the scale. Initial screening of the estimates showed an insignificant t-value with a high error variance for one item in universalism factor. After deleting the item, confirmatory factor analysis with 351 teachers confirmed the ten dimensional factor structure of the original list with acceptable fit values ($\chi^2/d:2.57$, $p:.000$, $RMSEA:.067$, $SRMR:.080$, $NFI:.86$, $NNFI:.90$, $CFI:.91$, $GFI:.73$, $AGFI:.70$) (Schumacker & Lomax, 2016; Kline, 2005). The internal consistency coefficient of the whole list was .92 while the internal consistency coefficient of the dimensions varied between .701 through .792.

Data Analysis Procedure

To determine whether demographic characteristics of teachers led to a difference in teachers' value preferences, we have conducted t-test and ANOVA. Before performing comparison analyzes, we run preliminary analysis with raw data. We used univariate outlier screening procedure. By using z-scores, we accepted cases with standardized scores exceeding 3.29 as potential outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). We also investigated the normality of the data to be able to run parametric tests. All skewness and kurtosis values was between acceptable range (- 3 and + 3 for skewness and - 10 to + 10 for kurtosis (Kline, 2011)) for all groups of demographic variables. A more stringent significance level was determined as $.05/10=.005$ by using Bonferroni correction to avoid a possible Type 1 error. We also interpreted eta squared values .01-.06 as small, .06 or higher as medium, and .14 or higher as high (Cohen, 1988) to assess effect size of independent variables on the variance explained in the dependent variable. While determining between which groups the difference was in ANOVA, Scheffe when equal variances assumed and Tamhane's T2 when equal variances not assumed were used as post-hoc tests.

FINDINGS

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for dimensions of Schwartz Value List. Findings show that teachers have the highest mean score in hedonism ($\bar{x}=4.19$, $SD=1.36$) and the least mean score in stimulation ($\bar{x}=3.12$, $SD=1.31$).

Table 2. Descriptive findings for the dimensions

Variables	Mean	SD
Hedonism	4.19	1.36
Universalism	4.17	1.16
Conformity	4.11	1.25
Self-Direction	3.92	1.23
Achievement	3.90	1.38
Tradition	3.88	1.23
Power	3.87	1.08
Benevolence	3.73	1.08
Security	3.61	1.26
Stimulation	3.12	1.31
Overall	3.85	.78

A *t-Test* was conducted to compare females and males on their value orientations. The results given in Table 3 revealed a statistically significant difference in the dimensions of achievement [$t_{(1, 351)}= 2.807$; $p=.005$; $\eta^2=.022$], benevolence [$t_{(1, 351)}= 3.903$; $p=.000$; $\eta^2=.041$], security [$t_{(1, 351)}= 2.819$; $p=.005$; $\eta^2=.022$], and universalism [$t_{(1, 351)}= 3.125$; $p=.002$; $\eta^2=.027$]. Even if it can be said that female teachers have higher scores in achievement, benevolence, security and universalism dimensions of value preferences in their life than male teachers, the variance on value orientations explained by gender is low with a small effect size.

Table 3. Results of t-test comparing females and males on value preferences

	Gender				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2	Difference
	Female (1)		Male (2)					
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Achievement	4.10	1.37	3.69	1.35	2.807	.005	.022	1>2
Benevolence	3.94	1.17	3.50	0.94	3.903	.000	.041	1>2
Conformity	4.23	1.28	3.98	1.20	1.899	.058	.010	
Hedonism	4.32	1.36	4.04	1.36	1.908	.057	.010	
Power	3.95	1.08	3.79	1.07	1.371	.171	.005	
Security	3.79	1.32	3.41	1.18	2.819	.005	.022	1>2
Self-Direction	4.02	1.24	3.82	1.23	1.498	.135	.006	
Stimulation	3.23	1.31	3.00	1.30	1.613	.108	.007	
Tradition	3.94	1.31	3.81	1.13	.966	.335	.003	
Universalism	4.35	1.18	3.97	1.12	3.125	.002	.027	1>2

Another t-Test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference according to job position. The results given in Table 4 showed no significant difference in any of the factors of value preferences.

Table 4. Results of t-Test comparing teachers and school administrators on value preferences

	Job Position				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
	Teacher		Administrator				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Achievement	3.91	1.40	3.82	1.07	.298	.766	.000
Benevolence	3.77	1.08	3.18	0.94	2.647	.008	.020
Conformity	4.14	1.26	3.72	1.07	1.630	.104	.008
Hedonism	4.21	1.37	3.94	1.24	.943	.346	.003
Power	3.88	1.07	3.80	1.19	.348	.728	.000
Security	3.64	1.27	3.25	1.13	1.469	.143	.006
Self-Direction	3.93	1.25	3.80	1.05	.511	.609	.001
Stimulation	3.13	1.33	3.00	1.09	.462	.644	.001
Tradition	3.89	1.23	3.73	1.14	.639	.523	.001
Universalism	4.18	1.17	4.04	1.09	.569	.569	.001

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that there is no statistically significant difference in the dimensions of teachers' value preferences according to their educational status ($p>.005$).

Table 5. Analysis of variance for value preferences according to educational status

	Educational Status						<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
	Undergraduate		Masters' degree		Doctoral degree				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Achievement	3.97	1.35	3.71	1.31	2.55	1.95	4.786	.009	.027
Benevolence	3.74	1.09	3.57	1.02	4.08	1.10	.982	.375	.006
Conformity	4.14	1.26	3.93	1.21	4.28	1.32	.662	.517	.004
Hedonism	4.24	1.35	3.87	1.44	4.25	1.39	1.578	.208	.009
Power	3.86	1.10	3.80	0.93	4.75	0.56	2.814	.061	.016
Security	3.61	1.28	3.55	1.09	3.80	1.73	.147	.863	.001
Self-Direction	3.97	1.22	3.62	1.34	4.08	0.87	1.796	.167	.010
Stimulation	3.13	1.30	3.10	1.41	2.88	1.25	.151	.860	.001
Tradition	3.89	1.22	3.85	1.14	3.48	1.87	.452	.637	.003
Universalism	4.21	1.15	3.88	1.20	4.23	1.14	1.815	.164	.010

In order to test the effect of seniority in profession on value orientations of teachers, we performed a one-way ANOVA. The results of the test given in Table 6 revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference in mean scores of value dimensions between groups ($p>.005$).

Table 6. Analysis of variance for value preferences according to seniority in profession

	Seniority in Profession								<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
	1-5		6-15		16-25		26+				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Achievement	4.02	1.38	3.86	1.26	3.92	1.38	3.34	1.70	1.871	.134	.016
Benevolence	3.84	1.08	3.66	1.11	3.68	1.07	3.41	0.98	1.449	.228	.012
Conformity	4.13	1.18	4.11	1.36	4.04	1.27	4.23	1.22	.162	.922	.001
Hedonism	4.35	1.37	4.14	1.37	4.15	1.25	3.56	1.51	2.619	.051	.022
Power	3.92	1.11	3.92	0.99	3.85	1.08	3.45	1.17	1.501	.214	.013
Security	3.74	1.32	3.52	1.20	3.51	1.24	3.46	1.22	.976	.404	.008
Self-Direction	4.11	1.18	3.86	1.27	3.71	1.28	3.62	1.16	2.535	.057	.021

Stimulation	3.27	1.32	3.01	1.30	2.98	1.27	3.00	1.40	1.300	.274	.011
Tradition	3.90	1.21	3.85	1.17	3.81	1.39	4.04	1.10	.262	.853	.002
Universalism	4.38	1.10	4.01	1.22	3.95	1.20	4.14	1.04	3.255	.022	.027

The results of one-way ANOVA presented in Table 7 to compare value orientations of teachers according to age show that there was no significant difference in teachers' value preferences due to age groups ($p > .005$).

Table 7. Analysis of variance for value preferences according to age

	Age Group								F	p	η^2
	21-30		31-40		41-50		51+				
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD			
Achievement	3.98	1.36	3.93	1.30	3.95	1.37	3.18	1.66	2.456	.063	.021
Benevolence	3.81	1.07	3.71	1.13	3.73	1.10	3.25	0.84	1.828	.142	.016
Conformity	4.10	1.17	4.17	1.38	4.08	1.28	4.07	1.13	.094	.963	.001
Hedonism	4.32	1.37	4.17	1.36	4.22	1.28	3.35	1.39	3.539	.015	.030
Power	3.92	1.11	3.92	1.00	3.87	1.07	3.38	1.18	1.883	.132	.016
Security	3.70	1.31	3.58	1.23	3.58	1.29	3.25	1.02	.945	.419	.008
Self-Direction	4.10	1.18	3.88	1.26	3.74	1.29	3.57	1.13	2.307	.076	.020
Stimulation	3.25	1.31	3.01	1.29	3.10	1.34	2.82	1.28	1.180	.317	.010
Tradition	3.93	1.19	3.81	1.20	3.84	1.39	3.98	1.08	.266	.850	.002
Universalism	4.35	1.09	4.05	1.23	4.01	1.23	4.02	0.99	2.216	.086	.019

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of marital status on the dimensions of value orientations. The test results given in Table 8 revealed that there was a statistically significant difference between at least two groups in the dimensions of achievement [$F_{(2, 350)} = 5.883$; $p = .003$; $\eta^2 = .033$], benevolence [$F_{(2, 350)} = 10.904$; $p = .000$; $\eta^2 = .059$], security [$F_{(2, 350)} = 9.159$; $p = .000$; $\eta^2 = .050$], self-direction [$F_{(2, 350)} = 9.680$; $p = .000$; $\eta^2 = .053$], stimulation [$F_{(2, 350)} = 6.719$; $p = .001$; $\eta^2 = .037$], and universalism [$F_{(2, 350)} = 10.813$; $p = .000$; $\eta^2 = .059$].

Table 8. Analysis of variance for value preferences according to marital status

	Marital Status						F	p	η^2	Difference
	Married (1)		Single (2)		Divorced (3)					
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD				
Achievement	4.13	1.25	3.66	1.43	4.26	1.47	5.883	.003	.033	1>2
Benevolence	3.83	1.12	3.52	0.99	4.44	1.10	10.904	.000	.059	1>2, 3>1, 3>2
Conformity	4.14	1.32	3.98	1.19	4.78	1.02	5.217	.006	.029	
Hedonism	4.22	1.32	4.10	1.39	4.55	1.45	1.441	.238	.008	
Power	3.94	1.05	3.75	1.07	4.27	1.15	3.393	.035	.019	
Security	3.72	1.34	3.39	1.16	4.39	1.12	9.159	.000	.050	3>1, 3>2
Self-Direction	4.00	1.20	3.72	1.23	4.75	1.09	9.680	.000	.053	3>1, 3>2
Stimulation	3.07	1.33	3.02	1.28	3.95	1.12	6.719	.001	.037	3>1, 3>2
Tradition	3.91	1.21	3.77	1.14	4.33	1.70	2.684	.070	.015	
Universalism	4.15	1.19	4.03	1.09	5.09	1.10	10.813	.000	.059	3>1, 3>2

DISCUSSION

In this section, firstly the aim of the study will be emphasized, the findings of the research are given and discussed with other researches and the results will be given. The purpose of the study was to identify the value orientations of school principals and teachers working in secondary schools based on various factors such as gender, marital status, educational status, age and seniority.

Results of the descriptive findings for the dimensions revealed that the values that are considered the most important by teachers were "hedonism" and the least mean score in "stimulation", which strengthens the claim that teachers who put great importance to students and their needs, who adopt a learner centered teaching style and interactive teaching methods and strategies are highly satisfied with their job and enjoy teaching (Bose, 2018). The relationship between the "hedonism" and teaching process were expected to give that satisfaction, caring behaviors towards students and giving feedback and praise would be expected to raise teachers' motivation and satisfaction level. Studies in the literature also show that teachers' professional satisfaction is higher than the average in the context of Turkey (Kumaş & Deniz, 2010). From this point of view, it can be stated that teachers prioritize the values of getting pleasure, that is, rewarding personal pleasure and feelings, in performing their profession.

The present study found that the variable of gender caused a statistically significant difference in the values of "achievement", "benevolence", "security" and "universalism". Regarding gender, female teachers have higher scores in "achievement", "benevolence", "security" and "universalism" in their life compared to male counterparts. A possible explanation for "achievement" value might be that teaching occupation is generally regarded as a traditional female occupation. Also, it is more likely to be easy for females to have social approval by fulfil the role of "being a mother" or "being a good wife" (Şahin Fırat & Açıkgöz, 2012). These results are in concordance with previous studies that have shown female teachers attribute more

importance to the values of "benevolence" than their male counterparts (Dönmez & Cömert, 2007). The fact that women were able to step into the teaching profession was also due to their tendency to show more compassion to children than men, and to open the way for men to choose more lucrative professions (Birey & Beyidođlu Önen, 2013). In this respect, the value that female teachers give to benevolence and success can be understood. Also, one of the findings of this study is that females give more importance to the value of "universalism" than males, which supports the previous findings of Memiş and Güney Gedik (2010). A possible explanation might be that female teachers attach more importance to equality than male teachers (Alptekin, 2019). Surprisingly, Aktay (2008) showed that male teachers placed a higher importance to "universalism" value. Additionally, there was no difference in "benevolence", "achievement" and "security" values based on gender factor, which differs from the findings presented here. Moving on from these research findings, it can be reached that there was a significant difference in some studies in favor of either female or male. Also, it is possible to see some studies, which support gender variable doesn't cause significant difference in terms of value orientations (Otrar & Öztürk, 2017; Tanit, 2007).

Another important finding is that marital status has an effect on value orientations. In this study, marital status was found to cause statistically significant difference in the dimensions of "achievement", "benevolence", "security", "self-direction", "stimulation" and "universalism". Regarding marital status, the current study found that divorced teachers have higher scores in "security", "self-direction", "stimulation" and "universalism". This result may be explained by the fact that divorced people are more tent to give importance to their creativity, freedom, independence and choosing their own goals because of their experiences in life. This result accords with another research by Yılmaz (2009), which showed that the marital status variable has a significant effect on all value variables except "power". However, Yılmaz (2009) showed that divorced teachers have significantly lower scores in "achievement", "universalism", "benevolence", "tradition", "stimulation" and "security" than both single and married counterparts. In this respect, it can be observed that there are some contradictory results in terms of value orientations based on marital status. Another important finding is that single teachers have higher scores in the values of "achievement" and "benevolence". These findings are consistent with previous study that has shown divorced teachers have lower scores in "conformity", "security", "tradition", "universalism", "achievement" and "benevolence". One another unanticipated result was that marital status didn't differ significantly among value dimensions except "universalism", "benevolence" and "tradition" (Yapıcıkardeşler, 2007). These contradictions may be partly explained by the relationship between the marriage and value orientations. It is considered that personality traits, nurturing environment and conditions, education level, occupations and value orientations are highly interrelated with each other, by which it affects the marriage and marital status (Kublay & Oktan, 2015).

When the quantitative data were examined with regard to "hedonism" value, surprisingly, while there is a study (Yılmaz, 2009) which supports that single teachers have higher scores than both married and divorced counterparts, Maya (2013) stated that school principals' self-values on the basis of marital status differ significantly in terms of "security", "conformity", and "hedonism" values. According to her findings, "hedonism" is one of the values regarded as more important by married principals, however our results did not show a significant difference in this value dimension.

With regard to educational status, it can be observed that educational status did not cause any statistically significant difference in any of the values. This accords with an earlier study Yapıcıkardeşler (2007), which showed that educational status didn't cause any significant difference in value orientations. This result may be explained by the fact that values are not things which develop and change in a short time. In contrast, even if the education has an effect to some extent they are nurtured mostly by environment, intelligence and personality.

In this study, age and seniority in profession did not cause a statistically significant difference in any of the groups. Although these results differ from some studies (Yılmaz, 2009; Balođlu & Balgalmış, 2005), they are consistent with those of Aktay (2008), Tanit (2007) and Yapıcıkardeşler (2007). Although the teaching profession is seen as a career profession, this result gives a clue that teachers' values and beliefs are realized through pre-professional indoctrination. Regarding the study of Yılmaz (2009), the value orientations of the teachers with 1-5 years seniority have higher scores than the teachers with 6-10 and 21+ years seniority teachers in terms of "hedonism", "benevolence", "security", "achievement", "stimulation" and "universalism". A possible explanation for this might be that as 1-5 years seniority teachers are at the beginning of their teaching profession, they hold idealistic educational views towards being successful and want to feel motivated and satisfied in their classroom settings. There is, however, another possible explanation. They are more open to search for new understandings challenging their entering beliefs (Wall, 2016).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

When the research and various research findings mentioned in this research are evaluated as a whole, it can be seen that the values that are considered the most important by teachers were "hedonism" and the least mean score in "stimulation". Also, the variable of gender caused a statistically significant difference in the values of "achievement", "benevolence", "security" and "universalism" in favor of female teachers, but some studies found meaningful differences in favor of either female or male teachers. In this research, the variable of marital status has an effect on higher level of "achievement", "benevolence", "security", "self-direction", "stimulation" and "universalism" value orientations of divorced teachers, but some studies have found significant differences in favor of single teachers, as in the current study. With regard to educational status, we found no meaningful difference in variances towards principals and teachers' value orientations, as in other studies. In the current study, also, age and

seniority variables did not create a meaningful variance on the value orientations. Considering the results obtained within the scope of the study and the relevant literature, the following suggestions can be made:

1. Considering the changing and transforming structure of education, studies can be carried out to increase teachers' awareness of the values they gain in teaching education and reflect on the teaching profession and their lives.
2. As the literature shows, studies can be conducted to inform teachers about the potential that the values adopted by teachers can affect classroom practices.
3. In-depth qualitative studies can be conducted to reveal why teachers choose or do not choose certain values.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Statements of Publication Ethics

We hereby declare that the study has not unethical issues and that research and publication ethics have been observed carefully.

Researchers' Contribution Rate

All authors contributed equally.

Ethics Committee Approval Information

The ethics committee approval for this study was obtained from Süleyman Demirel University Social and Human Sciences Publication Ethics Committee, dated 02.02.2021 and numbered 102/15.

REFERENCES

- Aktay, A. (2008). *Yönetici ve öğretmenlerin değer tercihleri ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Yeditepe Üniversitesi.
- Alptekin, B. (2019). *Öğretmen adaylarının toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri ile öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları (Pre-service teachers' attitudes towards gender roles and teaching profession)* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi.
- Amormino, P., Ploe, M., & Marsh, A. (2022). Moral foundations, values, and reasoning in extraordinary altruists, *Research Square*.
- Bacanlı, H. (2002). *Değer tercihleri: Psikolojik kavram analizleri*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Baloğlu, M. & Balgalmış, E. (2005). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim yöneticilerinin öz değerlerinin betimlenmesi: Tokat ili örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 3(10), 19-31.
- Birey, T., & Beyidoğlu Önen, M. (2013). *Toplumsal cinsiyet ve öğretmenlik: Öğretmenlerin bakış açısı*. POST.
- Bose, B. (2018). Teacher provocateur: Hedonism and the humanities. *Jindal Global Law Review*, 9, 279–285.
- Carr, D. (1993). Moral values and the teacher: Beyond the paternal and the permissive. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, (27), 193-207.
- Cohen, J.W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Dönmez, B. & Cömert, M. (2007). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin değer sistemleri. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 5 (14), 29-59.
- Halstead, J. M., & Taylor, M. J. (2000). Learning and teaching about values: A review of recent research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(2), 169–202.
- Kang, J. G., Kapoor, S., & Wolfe, A. S. (1995). The impact of television viewing on the values orientations of Indian students: An individualist-collectivist approach. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 6(3), 188–205.
- Kant, I. (2006). *Eğitim üzerine* (5th ed.). İz.
- Karasar, N. (1995). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kıray, M. B. (1964). *Ereğli: Ağır sanayiden önce bir sahil kasabası*. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı Yayını.
- Kim, Y. (2002). *The impact of personal value structures on consumer proenvironmental attitudes, behaviors, and consumerism: a cross-cultural study* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Michigan State University.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). Guilford Publications.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Methodology in the social sciences: Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. Guilford Press.
- Koepfler, J. (2014). *Values and self-presentation in online communication by stakeholders related to homelessness* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Maryland.
- Komar, S. (2012). *Implicit leadership: Exploring the role of leaders on the implicit activation of self-interest* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Waterloo.

- Kublay, D., & Oktan, V. (2015). Marital adjustment: The examination in terms of value preferences and subjective happiness. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 5 (44), 25-35.
- Kumaş, V., & Deniz, L. (2010). An investigation about job satisfaction of teachers. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 32(32), 123-139.
- Kuşdil, M. E., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz değer kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 45, 59-76
- Maya, İ. (2013). Self-values held by primary and secondary education school principals: A case in Canakkale. *Educational Research Review*, 8, 1094-1102.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Memiş, A. & Güney Gedik, E. (2010). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin değer yönelimleri. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 8 (20), 123-142.
- Otrar, M. & Öztürk, Z. G. (2017). The relationship between value preferences and life satisfaction of primary school teachers. *International Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences*, 1(1), 96-110.
- Özensel, E. (2003). Sosyolojik bir olgu olarak değer. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(3), 217-239.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *Nature of human values*. The Free Press.
- Schumacker, E., & Lomax, G. (2016). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modelling* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology*, 48(1), 23-47.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Towards a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 550-562.
- Suh, B. K., & Traiger, J. (1999). Teaching values through elementary social studies and literature curricula. *Education*, 119(4), 723-727.
- Şahin Firat, N., & Açıkgöz, K. (2012). Bazı değişkenler açısından öğretmenlerin değer sistemleri. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 43, 422-435.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.) Pearson.
- Tanıt, T. (2007). *Eğitim yöneticilerinin değer tercihleri ile yaratıcılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Yeditepe Üniversitesi.
- Turan, S., & Aktan D. (2008). Okul hayatında var olan ve olması düşünülen sosyal değerler. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 227-259.
- Ulusoy, K., & Dilmaç, B. (2016). *Değerler eğitimi* (4th ed.). Pegem Akademi.
- Ülken, H. Z. (2016). *Bilgi ve değer* (3rd ed.). Doğu Batı Yayınları.
- Verdiesen, I., Dignum, V., & Rahwan, I. (2018, September). *Design requirements for a moral machine for autonomous weapons* [Conference presentation]. International Conference on Computer Safety, Reliability, and Security.
- Wall, C. R. G. (2016). From student to teacher: Changes in preservice teacher educational beliefs throughout the learning-to-teach journey. *Teacher Development*, 20(3), 364-379.
- Yapıcıkardeşler, E. (2007). *Öğretmenlerin değer yönelimleri ile iş tatminleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Yeditepe Üniversitesi.
- Yayla, A. (2005). Kant's view on moral education. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences (JFES)*, 38 (1), 73-86.
- Yılmaz, E. (2009). Öğretmenlerin değer tercihlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 7 (17), 109-128.