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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to investigate the values of elementary teachers in terms of gender, marital status, seniority and level of education variables. The study was conducted in accordance with the relational screening model. The sample of the study consists of 400 elementary teachers, 182 male and 218 female teachers working in public schools in Rize City, located in the north-east part of Turkey. The data were collected between March-May 2015. The "Schwartz Values Scale" (PBL) developed by Schwartz and adapted to Turkish by Demirutku was used in the study to reveal the values of elementary teachers. The participants were asked to mark a single option from 6 options ranging from "Much Like Me" to "Never Say It to Me" about the scale information and participants' brief portrayal of how similar they were to themselves. SPSS package program was used for statistical analysis of the data. Independent groups t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and correlation analyzes were performed in comparison with the items made in terms of personal characteristics.
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INTRODUCTION

The concept of "value" based on a hypothetical philosophy has become a mission in the functioning of social institutions by becoming an indispensable guide to the field of education in the 21st century. In this context, "value" is an interdisciplinary concept because of its importance. Value has different definitions in sociology, psychology and philosophy. According to philosophy; "Value", the quality of objects and events that determine their importance to human beings (Hançerlioğlu, 1999), according to psychology; (APA, 2006) ethical, social or aesthetic principles that individuals or society accept as good, desirable, and important in determining guidance; according to sociology (Seyyar, 2004, p.156) it is defined as a "shared criterion" or "idea" of which social behavior is good, true and desirable and everything that is desirable for the person and the group.

Equivalent to these definitions value is defined by the experts in more detail "a specific form of behavior, an opposite form of behavior, or a permanent belief in the purpose of life, individually or socially preferred for life purpose" (Rokeach, 1973); "a tendency to choose a particular situation" (Hofstede, 1980); "desirable attitudes that serve as principles guiding people in their importance to their lives, as a social actor, usually helping to select behaviors, to evaluate events and people, to explain their behavior" (Schwartz, 1999); "verbal representations of basic motivations approved by society" (Struch, Schwartz & Kloot, 2002).

The paradigms on the point of view of value have also brought about different classifications of values. In this study we will refer to the classifications that are frequently used in foreign and domestic literature for value. They are Rokeach's Value Inventory, Morris's Classification of Values, Spranger's Classification of Values, Kahle's List of Values, Schwartz's Theory of Values, Dilmac, Aricak and Cesur's Classification of Values (2014). The value classifications cover different dimensions according to the experts. It can be said that the differences in these dimensions are the factors of personal and cultural values reflected by the individuals. In the literature, one of the widely used classifications in the classification and measurement of values is Rokeach Value Inventory (1973) and the other is Schwartz's Value Theory (1992). In the context of using the "Schwartz Value Scale" (PDA) in this study (1992) it was preferred to focus on the Schwartz Theory of Values.

The Schwartz Theory of Values (1992) can be attributed to ten universal bases of fundamental value-based value classifications. According to Schwartz, value types derive from three universal requirements. According to these basic assumptions;

i. the individual's biological needs,
ii. the need to organize social interactions,
iii. the need to fulfill the group and social requirements (Roccas et al., 2002, p.790).

Each individual and group uses values that are cognitive representations of relevant needs in order to explain behavior, to ensure coordination between them, and to justify these behaviors (Demirutku, 2010). Schwartz (1996) moving from three universal needs has constructed ten types of values that are related to each other in a dynamic structure that contain values similar to or different from motivational infrastructures. These values are; power, success, hedonism, arousal, self-interest, benevolence, tradition, conformity, universality and security. These values are classified according to the motivating purpose of the individual. In these classifications, for example, power value contains social status, prestige and domination on people and resources, the value of success contains personal success. Hazing value contains happiness, and value of anxiety contains excitement and innovations in life (Ros, Schwartz & Surkiss, 1999).

Schwartz examined the data both individually and culturally gathered from the sample group of approximately 44,000 samples created by teachers and college students from 54 countries including Turkey (Smith & Schwartz, 1997). The values in the individual dimension are handled according to the preferences (importance) of the people to guide their lives. The purpose of examining values at the
cultural level is to produce information on abstract ideas that are shared across society and based on social norms. The cultural unit at the cultural level is the cultural group (nation, ethnic group) itself. The reason for the distinction between these two levels is the possibility that motivational relations between the values that guide the individual at the individual level cannot exhibit the same characteristics at the cultural level. Such separation leads to the avoidance of a major error (ecological mistake) that is common in social sciences, which manifests itself in the fact that it relies on the findings of an examination level and is related to another (Hofstede, 1980). According to Schwartz (1992), the most important feature that separates individual values from each other according to the basic assumptions in the theory of values is the types of motivational goal. In this context, values that are most likely to be found in all cultures must be values that symbolize the universal requirements of human nature (biological requirements, conditions necessary for harmonious social interaction) in the form of conscious goals.

Schwartz has modeled his theory to determine the dynamic relationships between these values. Value types can be in harmony or contradiction in accordance with their motivational goals. For example, in the Schwartz Value Theory and in the Portrait Values Questionnaire; (i) according to the three universal requirements mentioned above, the motivation underlying each requirement; (ii) By considering the work done in different cultures based on the theoretical framework, by examining the literature on values in many cultures and also taking into account differences with basic motivational characteristics the values were grouped into ten basic values (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003, p. 1208). Based on this theoretical framework and observations in different cultures, Schwartz (1990-1992) developed one of the most comprehensive classifications of value types.

Properties of Value Concept

Values are as important as the theoretical direction, as they are closely related to our society, which is seeking its place in a rapidly changing world. Inevitable consequence of socio-economic developments it is closely related to the fact that the healthy functioning of new social arrangements and the values of the individuals are in harmony with the regulations. This problem of conformity requires that the society to be well-recognized for the success of social policies and therefore a detailed examination of its values (Ergun, 1991; Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990). The results of the most comprehensive cultural-level value surveys (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994; Smith, Dugan & Trompenaars, 1996; Schwartz, 2001) in which samples from Turkey are included are evaluated in general. It has been seen that the Turkish culture is among the cultures that emphasize the inner group commitment and provide the social organization mainly through hierarchical roles (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000). The function of values today is important to guide individuals and collecting. Schwartz's value theory is based on observing values in different societies, based on universal bases. In this context, society is a whole of values. Traditions, customs, the structure of society and the form of government are the impulses that make up this system of values. The formation of these values is based on a long process. Everything they accumulate during the period from the emergence of societies until the last meeting, exhibited in the scene of civilization, and transmitted to future generations is regarded as a value.

These values are sometimes adopted and accepted by widespread masses and ensure the continuity of societies, and sometimes the space they adopt is limited to a small group and can lead to various problems in society. Human values; personal, institutional, social and cultural resources. In this context, social scientists should give importance to understanding and explaining their values. Values affect behavior and are a guide to the behavior of individuals (Rokeach, 1973). When the values of individuals become behavior, schools take their place as secondary social institutions. In this context, schools with strong values shared are effective, as schools are value-based institutions. At the forefront of the cultural characteristics of a successful school is the fact that it has strong values supported by a reliable environment (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Although long time has been spent on value education through implicit programs in Turkey, it has been decided in the 18th National Education Council (2010) that "value education" is officially included in school programs. In this context, it can be said that the studies on the values of the teachers have a very recent history.
The teacher who tries to educate and develop society; it is also an asset how useful it will be to the student, to the student and to the community (İlgaz & Bilgili, 2006). The training of sufficient quantity and quality of our future education and the development of education reflect the quality of the teacher to a great extent (Gürkan, 1993, p. 1). The values that the teacher has are a factor in the functioning and success in the educational systems (Köseoğlu, 1994, p. 2).

It has been found that some of Turkish teachers do not have enough professional values and as a result they have had important challenges with their students, colleagues, parents and school administrations (Altünkurt & Yılmaz, 2011; Gözütok, 1999; Obuz, 2009; Pelit & Güçer, 2006; Turgut, 2010; Yılmaz & Altünkurt, 2009). In this context, the value that teachers have and reflects has been the focus of both education policy makers and educators in the last ten years since value education is given by the teachers in this context. As the values that teachers have and reflect are the theoretical direction, the change in personal and social values is of elementary concern to the educators and the Turkish society is also closely related. The values that teachers have are expected to be reflected first to their students and then to the collective reflection. In social arrangements, the values teachers have are closely related to the relations among teachers, students and community.

In this context, there is a need for teacher values to be consistent with the values of society. In the context of the fact that teachers are a transporter of the cultural values within the process of socialization, detailed examination of the values that teachers possess is required.

Research on Turkish Teachers’ Values

Previous research showed that, the researches about the teachers’ reflection on the values in Turkey gained weight in the years of 2000, and these research studies were carried out with college students. Despite the research conducted with teacher candidates, it can be said that the teachers have limited efforts to reflect their values. In this context, the information on the work done by the teachers on the values they reflect is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Studies on Teachers’ Values Reflections in Turkey

| Researcher/s          | Participants                  | Measurement Tool                        | Study Results                                                                                     |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Kuşdil & Kağıtçibaşı (2000) | 89 Man, 94 Woman, 183 Secondary and High School Teachers | Schwartz Values List                  | gender variable to differentiate teachers' values                                               |
| Dönmez & Cömert (2007)   | 313 Woman, 262 Man Elementary Teacher | Lussier Value Scale                     | mean is an important determinant of value diversity                                              |
| Aktay (2008)            | School manager, Teacher       | Schwartz Values List                    | effect of branch in value system                                                               |
| Aktepe & Yel (2009)     | 71 Elementary Teacher         | Rokeach Value Survey                    | gender and seniority are important determinants of value disparity                               |
| Yılmaz (2009)           | 247 Man, 235 Woman Elementary Teacher | Schwartz Values List                  | no significant difference between social and individual values                                   |
| Demirutku (2010)        | 194 Man, 186 Woman University student | Adaptation of the Portrait Values Questionnaire to Turkish | gender and seniority are important determinants of value disparity                             |
| Demir (2012)            | 407 Elementary and Secondary Teacher | Schwartz Values List                  | gender is an important determinant of value diversity                                           |
| Şahin-Fırat & Açıkgöz (2012) | 255 Man, 647 Woman Elementary Teacher | Schwartz Value Scale                     | the most powerful value of teachers is universalism and virtue                                    |
| Şafak & Sadık (2015)    | 126 Man, 187 Woman High School Teachers | Demir and Koç Universal Values Attitude Scale | teachers' gender, seniority and branch are determinant in value system                           |
|                        |                               |                                         | gender is an important determinant of value diversity                                           |

*This table was adapted from a PhD thesis done by Karabacak (2016)
From the data in Table 1, it can be said that studies on the values of teachers in Turkey started in 2000 years and accelerated in the following period, but the work done is limited. In general, when we look at the common characteristics of these studies carried out for teachers' value systems;

(i) There are studies that show that gender is an important determinant of gender differences in value (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000; Aktay, 2008; Yılmaz, 2009; Demirutku, 2010; Şahin-Fırat & Açıkgöz, 2012; Şafak & Sadık, 2015) although there are studies in the literature in which gender does not create value differences (İmamoğlu and Aygün-Karakitaboğlu, 1999).

(ii) The effects of the teachers' branches on the value projections (Dönmez & Cömert, 2007; Şahin-Fırat & Açıkgöz, 2012)

(iii) Teachers' occupational seniority is influenced by their reflection on values (Aktay, 2008; Yılmaz, 2009; Şahin-Fırat & Açıkgöz, 2012). Equivalent qualifications that support the results of this research include studies in which the value projections of teachers are presented together with a different scale. These studies are given in Table 2.

**Table 2. Investigations Towards the Togetherness Explanation of Teachers’ Value Reflections in Turkey**

| Researcher        | Participants          | Measurement Tool                              | Study Results                                                                 |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Güney-Gedik (2010)| 93 Man, 202 Woman Primary Teacher 121 Man, 182 | Schwartz Value Scale, Student Transfer Value | Gender, seniority and marital status are important determinants of value disparity |
| Yılmaz & Dilmaç (2011)| Woman 303 Secondary and High School Teachers | Schwartz Values List Hackman and Oldham Business Satisfaction Scale | Teachers' job satisfaction is related to human values |
| Dilmaç & Ekşi (2012) | 275 Man, 147 Woman Teacher 109 Man, 91 Woman Primary Teacher 180 Man, 170 Woman | Schwartz Values List, Teacher Altruism Scale, Professional Self-Respect Scale Schwartz Values List, Interpersonal Problem Solving Inventory Schwartz Value Scale, DiPaola, Tarter & Hoy Organizational citizenship scale | Investigation of the values and self-worth of the teachers in terms of professional self-esteem  Gender and seniority are important determinants of value disparity There is a positive relationship between the value perception of elementary teachers and organizational citizenship behaviors and a low level of relationship |
| Işık & Yıldız (2013) | 350 Primary Teacher | | |
| Serin & Buluç (2014) | | | |

*This table was adapted from a PhD thesis done by Karabacak (2016)*

From the data in table 2, when we look the common characteristics of these studies, in which the teachers' values are measured together with another predictor, there is a close relationship between the values that teachers are trying to convey to the students with the values they are trying to convey, job satisfaction, altruistic behavior, professional self-esteem, interpersonal problem solving skills and organizational citizenship (Güney-Gedik, 2010; Yılmaz & Dilmaç, 2011, Dilmaç & Ekşi, 2012; Serin & Buluç, 2014).

In these studies, the gender, marital status, occupational seniority and the values of the branches were reflected in the studies. In the current study, the variables of gender, marital status and occupational seniority of the teachers, which are taken into consideration especially in the context of the literature, are included in the study. In addition to these three demographic variables, the level of education was also included in the study. In this study, "elementary teachers" were studied not in the branch of teachers but in special sense. In this context, the differences of "elementary teachers" on the gender, occupational seniority, marital status and educational attainment according to the variables of education level were examined. According to the literature review, two studies conducted for the reflection of values of elementary teachers (İşık & Yıldız, 2013; Serin & Buluç, 2014) the relationship.
between the values teachers possess and organizational citizenship and interpersonal problem solving skills and the relation to the values they want to transfer to their students according to their value orientations (Güney-Gedik, 2010) were sought. In this context, except for a claim made by Güney-Gedik & Memiş (2010) a study has not been carried out specifically on the reflection of the value of Turkish elementary teachers.

The task of schools in the transfer of culture is to develop values in the positive direction of teaching the values that are explicitly or unspecified in the school program, disciplining the students in accordance with the established rules, contributing to the moral development, and character and self-perception. Teachers reflect consciously or unconsciously the values they use as a criterion when they are conducting their teaching activities in the course of planning and displaying their behavior (Welton & Mallan, 1999; Mariano, 1999; Veugelers, 2000; Yüksel, 2004). For this reason, it is important for teachers to be role models for their students, to develop and shape the values of the students (Dale, 1994; Can, 2008; Cengelci, 2010). Teachers are guiding students on rearing makes values more important. The values that teachers have been shown to be influenced by student behaviors (Brophy & Good, 1986; Dickinson, 1990; Dale, 1994; Veugelers, 2000; Bakioğlu & Tokmak, 2009).

It is important that the teacher is modeled when values are brought to the pupils at an early age at elementary school level. It can be said that elementary teachers turned into a model to be taken as an example with their way of life. Teaching is not only a process involving the transmission of information, but also involves the goal of bringing values to younger generations (Şentürk, 2009; Toprakçı, Bozpolat & Buldur, 2010). The reflection of the values that the elementary teacher have and being a model on the students is also a professional value (Karabacak, Küçük & Korkmaz, 2015). In this context, it is important to reflect the values possessed by elementary school teachers in the classroom environment.

This study was conducted with the aim of contributing to the literature by filling in the gap in the literature, especially with regard to "elementary teachers", assuming that they were transferring basic cultural values within the socialization process. The aim of the study is to investigate the "values of elementary teachers in terms of gender, marital status, seniority and level of education" variables.

**METHOD**

**Sample of the Study**

This study was conducted in accordance with the relational screening model. The study sample consists of 400 elementary teachers, 182 male and 218 female teachers working in public schools in Rize City, located in the north-east part of Turkey. The study group consisted of with the stratified sampling method; the "elementary school" and "elementary teacher" variables that best represent the center of Rize province and its districts are considered as criteria. For this purpose, necessary information and statistics were obtained from Rize National Education Directorate in order to choose the most suitable elementary school according to stratified sampling method. Five Elementary School representing Rize province center and among the districts, five central elementary school were selected in line with the information received. In this context, a working group of researchers of central schools and elementary teachers in the provinces and districts of Rize has been established. The data of the study were collected between March-May 2015. For this purpose, public schools in Rize and its districts were visited. The school administration and teachers were informed about the purpose of study. Voluntary participation has been made to work. Demographic characteristics of the study group are presented in Table 3.
Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample Group

| Variables          | Subcategories    | N   | Total |
|--------------------|------------------|-----|-------|
| Gender             | Male             | 182 |       |
|                    | Female           | 218 | 400   |
| Marital status     | Single           | 96  |       |
|                    | 1-3 year         | 51  |       |
|                    | 4-6 year         | 65  |       |
|                    | 7-9 year         | 68  |       |
|                    | Married          | 304 |       |
| Seniority          | 10-12 year       | 53  |       |
|                    | 13-15 year       | 39  |       |
|                    | 16-18 year       | 34  |       |
|                    | 19-21 year       | 39  |       |
|                    | 21 and above     | 51  |       |
| Education level    | Undergraduated   | 299 |       |
|                    | Graduated student| 54  |       |
|                    | Graduated        | 23  |       |
|                    | Doctorate        | 13  |       |
|                    | Phd              | 3   |       |
|                    | Other            | 8   | 400   |

Data Collection Tool

Schwartz has based the theory on the validity of his work by collecting data from many different cultures, including Turkey, in the intercultural dimension so that comments and regulations on values can be made. Schwartz's theory of values; value priorities is based on a two-dimensional structure: (i) in the first dimension, change clearance and conservation (ii) in the second dimension; self-development and self-transcendence.

Opposite values in the first dimension; (i) preserves change (openness, self-direction, hedonism) and (ii) maintains (security, compliance, tradition). In this context, it is emphasized that values such as independence movements and thoughts and protection, keeping to old age and stagnation are in conflict.

Opposite values in the second dimension; (i) self-development (power and achievement) and (ii) self-excess (universalism and commitment). It is emphasized that values such as avoiding words and behaviors to harm others, thinking of others' benefit, proving their own success and power, putting pressure on others are in conflict. One thing to be aware of is the value of hedonism; is both opposite of the change openness and self-improvement values. In the context of these explanations, the Schwartz theory of value is mainly concerned with the motivational goals of values, and values are concerned with issues such as value priorities in a circular structure (Devos et al., 2002, p. 482)

Portrait Value Scale (PBL)

The Portraits Value Scale (PBL) was developed by Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Haris and Qwens (2001) and adapted to Turkish by Demirutku (2010). PBL is a combination of (i) power, (ii) achievement, (iii) hedonism, (iv) stimulation, (v) self-direction, (vi) universalism, (vii) benevolence, (viii) tradition, (ix) compliance and (x) security dimensions. The scale consists of 40 items, each of which consists of two culled, indirectly measuring the values of different types of values, defining the goals and desires of hypothetical individuals. In each item, short verbal portraits of a hypothetical person are drawn based on values of different value types that define their goals and desires associated with one of the ten value types. For example; "It is very important for him to help people around him. They want to get refaced" item aims to measure the importance level of...
"goodwill" value. In PBL, a six point likert-type scale was used. Participants were asked to indicate how similar the person given in the description is to you.

In the analysis of the data, the Smallest Space Analysis (Guttman, 1968; Demirutku, 2010) which is one of the suitable methods to test whether the value of each type of value is included in the predicted value type is given by Schwartz (1992) value theory was used. The data showed that the theoretical ten-value types disintegrated and validated (Demirutku, 2010). Multidimensional scaling analysis is a technique of stimuli, scales or different psychological structures as a result of measurements. Data were analyzed by EKUA using SYSTAT 11. The Schwartz (1992-1996) ten-value model was found to have a very similar circular orientation to the original model. As a result of the analysis, it was observed that the coefficient of alienation was comparable with previous studies (Schwartz et al., 2001).

Only one item out of the forty-four items was theoretically unexpected in the field of value type. Relative shifts of neighboring areas or interlinking with each other can be observed in studies that test the value model of Schwartz (1992) and can be expected according to the characteristics of the sample (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000; Schwartz, 1992). It has been observed that empirical work in this 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. For ten value types, the internal consistency coefficient observed in the first application ranged between .58 and .82, and the internal consistency coefficient in the second exercise varied between .63 and .84. The test-retest reliability for each value type was found to be .65 and .82 (Demirutku, 2010).

The "Schwartz Values Scale" (PBL) developed by Schwartz and adapted to Turkish by Demirutku was used in the study to reveal the "values of teachers". The scale was taken by the author himself/herself. The scale is organized into three parts:

(i) the directive on how to fill the scale,

(ii) demographic information of the candidates and

(iii) the scale itself. In this section, we asked to mark a single option from 6 options ranging from "Much Like Me" to "Never Say It to Me" about the scale information and participants' brief portrayal of how similar they were to themselves.

Data Analysis

SPSS 22.0 package program was used for statistical analysis of the data obtained with data collection tools. Arithmetic mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentage distributions were used in descriptive statistical analysis techniques related to the personal characteristics of the teachers participating in the study. Independent groups t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and correlation analyzes were performed in comparison with the items made in terms of personal characteristics.

FINDINGS

Since the arithmetic average, mode and median values of the total score of the scale were found to be related to each other, normality of continuous data was determined. From this hypothesis, parametric analyzes were performed.

1. Does the Schwartz Scale score show a meaningful difference according to the gender of the teachers?

This sub-objective was examined by t test analysis for independent samples.
Table 4. T-Test Results of Schwartz Scale Scores by Gender

| Gender | N   | $\bar{x}$ | S   | Sd   | t      | p      |
|--------|-----|-----------|-----|------|--------|--------|
| Male   | 182 | 176.41    | 23.33| 398  | -3.70  | .000   |
| Female | 218 | 185.70    | 26.24| 396.390 |        |        |

The Schwartz Scale score shows a significant difference by gender [$t (398) = -3.70, p < .05$]. The scores of female teachers [$\bar{x} = 185.70$] were found to be higher than those of males [$\bar{x} = 176.41$]. This situation has shown that female teachers’ views on values are more positive.

Table 5. T-Test Results of Schwartz Scale Scales for Sub-Dimensions with Gender Status Differences

| Sub Dimension | F      | t      | Sd   | p     |
|---------------|--------|--------|------|-------|
| Power         | 17.265 | .756   | 85   | .452  |
| Achievement   | .020   | .102   | 85   | .919  |
| Hedonism      | .079   | -2.467 | 85   | .016  |
| Stimulation   | 10.142 | -.880  | 85   | .381  |
| Self-Direction| .690   | .027   | 85   | .979  |
| Universalism  | 4.615  | 1.665  | 85   | .100  |
| Benevolence   | .380   | 1.665  | 85   | .116  |
| Tradition     | 15.589 | 3.814  | 85   | .000  |
| Conformity    | 1.081  | 1.933  | 85   | .057  |
| Security      | 1.594  | 1.144  | 85   | .256  |

According to gender, the difference between hedonism and traditionalism subscales were found to be meaningful. Female in hedonism ($\bar{x} = 10.63$), compared to male ($\bar{x} = 12.10$); Traditionally, the average scores of male ($\bar{x} = 15.82$) and female ($\bar{x} = 13.13$) subscales were found to be higher.

2. Does the Schwartz Scale Score show a meaningful difference according to the marital status of the teachers?

This sub-objective was examined by t test analysis for independent samples.

Table 6. Schwartz Scales for Sub-Dimensions with Gender Status Differences

| Sub Dimension | Gender  | $\bar{x}$ | df |
|---------------|---------|-----------|----|
| Hedonism      | Male    | 10.63     | 2.58 |
|               | Female  | 12.10     | 2.74 |
| Tradition     | Male    | 15.82     | 2.58 |
|               | Female  | 13.13     | 3.97 |
The Schwartz Scale Score shows a significant difference from the marital status \([t (398) = -2.363 < .05]\). Scale scores of single teachers \([\bar{x} = 186.78]\) were higher than married teachers \([\bar{x} = 179.80]\). This shows that single teachers according to marital status have higher value scores than married teachers.

Table 7. T-Test Results of Schwartz Scale Scores According to Marital Status

| Marital Status | N   | \(\bar{x}\) | S   | df  | t    | p   |
|----------------|-----|-------------|-----|-----|------|-----|
| Married        | 304 | 179.80      | 25.94| 398 | -2.363| .019|
| Single         | 96  | 186.78      | 22.72|     |      |     |

Table 8. ANOVA Results of Sub-Dimensions of Schwartz Scale Scores with Marital Status

| Differences      | SS   | df | \(S^2\) | F    | p    |
|------------------|------|----|---------|------|------|
| Power            |      |    |         |      |      |
| Between Groups   | 2.462| 1  | 31.924  | .6062| .016 |
| Within Groups    | 2.377| 85 | 447.662 |      |      |
| Total            | 4.839| 86 | 479.586 |      |      |
| Achievement      |      |    |         |      |      |
| Between Groups   | 1.351| 1  | 34.007  | 3.832| .180 |
| Within Groups    | 1.572| 85 | 1582.890|      |      |
| Total            | 3.923| 86 | 1616.897|      |      |
| Hedonism         |      |    |         |      |      |
| Between Groups   | .542 | 1  | 2.182   | 1.765| .589 |
| Within Groups    | .504 | 85 | 632.162 |      |      |
| Total            | .708 | 86 | 634.345 |      |      |
| Stimulation      |      |    |         |      |      |
| Between Groups   | -.362| 1  | .871    | 2.262| .719 |
| Within Groups    | -.345| 85 | 566.026 |      |      |
| Total            | -.677| 86 | 566.897 |      |      |
| Self-Direction   |      |    |         |      |      |
| Between Groups   | -1.266| 1   | 16.139  | .773 | .209 |
| Within Groups    | -1.569| 85  | 856.344 |      |      |
| Total            | -2.835| 86  | 872.483 |      |      |
| Universalism     |      |    |         |      |      |
| Between Groups   | -1.869| 1   | 63.311  | 3.425| .065 |
| Within Groups    | -2.700| 85  | 1540.344|      |      |
| Total            | -4.569| 86  | 1603.655|      |      |
| Benevolence      |      |    |         |      |      |
| Between Groups   | -1.946| 1   | 21.523  | 5.314| .189 |
| Within Groups    | -1.946| 85  | 1041.097|      |      |
| Total            | -3.892| 86  | 1062.621|      |      |
| Tradition        |      |    |         |      |      |
| Between Groups   | -2.221| 1   | 53.420  | 6.217| .029 |
| Within Groups    | -2.927| 85  | 920.649 |      |      |
| Total            | -5.148| 86  | 974.069 |      |      |
| Conformity       |      |    |         |      |      |
| Between Groups   | -2.891| 1   | 101.649 | 7.495| .005 |
| Within Groups    | -4.685| 85  | 1034.006|      |      |
| Total            | -7.576| 86  | 1135.655|      |      |
| Security         |      |    |         |      |      |
| Between Groups   | -2.023| 1   | 57.275  | 4.216| .046 |
| Within Groups    | -3.089| 85  | 1190.104|      |      |
| Total            | -5.118| 86  | 1247.379|      |      |
Table 9. Schwartz Scales for Sub-Dimensions with Marital Status Differences

| Sub Dimension | Marital Status | \( \bar{x} \) | df |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|----|
| Power         | Married        | 9.27           | 2.25|
|               | Single         | 7.85           | 2.41|
| Tradition     | Married        | 14.45          | 3.59|
|               | Single         | 16.28          | 2.02|
| Conformity    | Married        | 16.04          | 3.94|
|               | Single         | 18.57          | 1.07|
| Security      | Married        | 20.81          | 4.19|
|               | Single         | 22.71          | 1.52|

According to the marital status, a difference was found in the sub-scales of power and tradition. Married in power (\( \bar{x} = 9.27 \)), according to single (\( \bar{x} = 7.85 \)); In the tradition, the average values of the subscales were higher than those of the single (\( \bar{x} = 16.28 \)) and married (\( \bar{x} = 14.45 \)). Married in conformity (16.04), according to single (\( \bar{x} = 18.57 \)); married in security (20.81), according to single (\( \bar{x} = 22.71 \)).

3. Does the Schwartz Scale Score show a meaningful difference according to the seniority of the teachers?

This sub-goal was determined by one-way ANOVA analysis.

Table 10. ANOVA Results of Schwartz Scale Scores According to Seniority

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | \( S^2 \) | F     | p      | Significant Difference |
|--------------------|----------------|----|-----------|-------|--------|------------------------|
| Between groups     | 12553.177      | 7  | 1793.311  | 2.881 | .006   | (4 - 6 year)           |
| Within groups      | 244004.663     | 392| 622.461   |       |        |                        |
| Total              | 256557.840     | 399|           |       |        |                        |

According to the Levene statistical test, the variance was not homogeneous in the analysis results [p <.05]. The Schwartz scale score shows a significant difference from the seniority variable [F (7-392) = 2.88, p <.05]. In other words, the scale score changes in a meaningful way with respect to seniority. According to the Dunnett T3 results, which are the differences between the units according to seniority, between teachers with 4-6 years and 19-21 years [p <.05], there is a more distinctive result than the other units. Values have been seen to be more positive than they are to the point of view.
4. Does the Schwartz scale score differ significantly from the teachers' level of education?

This sub-goal was determined by one-way ANOVA analysis.

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | S² | F   | p    | Significant Difference |
|--------------------|----------------|----|----|-----|------|------------------------|
| Between groups     | 8517.588       | 5  | 1703.518 | 2.706 | .020 | Undergraduate - master |
|                     |                |    |       |     |      | Undergraduate - doctorate |
| Within groups      | 248040.252     | 394| 629.544 |     |      |                        |
| Total              | 256557.840     | 399|       |     |      |                        |

According to the Levene statistical test, the variances were found to be homogeneous in the analysis results [p > .05]. The Schwartz scale score shows a significant difference from the educational level variable [F (5-394) = 2.706, p < .05]. In other words, the scale score changes in a meaningful way compared to the level of education. According to the results of LSD for determining the differences among the units according to the level of education, there was a more meaningful result among the teachers who have undergraduate - master, undergraduate and doctorate units [p < .05] than the other units. Values have been seen to be more positive than they are to the point of view.

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df | S² | F   | p    |
|--------------------|----------------|----|----|-----|------|
| Power              | 33,174         | 3  | 11,058 | 2.056 | .112 |
| Within groups      | 446,413        | 83 | 5,378 |     |      |
| Total              | 479,586        | 86 |       |     |      |
| Between groups     | 14,316         | 3  | 4,772  | .247 | .863 |
| Achievement        | 1602,580       | 83 | 19,308 |     |      |
| Total              | 1616,897       | 86 |       |     |      |
| Between groups     | 18,876         | 3  | 6,292  | .849 | .471 |
| Hedonism           | 615,469        | 83 | 7,415 |     |      |
| Total              | 634,345        | 86 |       |     |      |
### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Schwartz Value Scale is an important instrument for the identification and development of cultural values in the context of the formation of a sample group of teachers and university students of the majority of the 54 countries in which Turkey is located amongst the participant group. In this study, "Value Reflections of Elementary Teachers: The Case of Rize Province" was investigated in Turkey using "Schwartz Value Scale (PBL)" which was determined to be suitable for Turkish culture. The following discussion process has been carried out in the light of findings obtained from the examination of the study. In previous studies, similar research results were not found in both the study group and the measurement tools used. In this context; some of the studies in the area (in part) have been used to contribute to the discussion part of the work.

Teachers who interact with children during elementary school; it can be said that the students have a great role in gaining a healthy personality without shaping the future of the students. If the classroom teacher does not have the values desired by society, it is a true "loser" student. It is the society that is lost in the long walks. While the classroom teacher does not have the necessary values for his / her profession, the problem is the dimensions that affect both his / her student and the society (Yeşilyaprak, 1999).

Classroom teachers work on average 6 hours a day. Considering that a child sleeps 10 hours a day during the elementary school age and he / she needs 2 hours, the rest of the day is spent with the teacher. For this reason, the teacher has the chance to shape students’ values (Suh & Traiger, 1999). In this context, it can be said that the values of the elders of tomorrow can be shaped from the values of the teachers of the day to a great extent. It is constituted by the classroom teachers of good citizens of the society, qualified parents, professionals, and politicians (Senemoğlu, 1994).

In the study of Karabacak et al., (2015) "studying the professional values of class teachers through metaphors", "class teachers" took their place as teachers who prepared the life of the individuals with the assurance of the future. The teaching profession is separated from other professions by its specific qualities. This feature; your teacher is the teacher of all the professions. The teaching profession is in this respect a sacred position of high status, which is respected in all

|                          | Between groups | Within groups | Total   |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|---------|
| **Stimulation**          | 11,510         | 555,387      | 566,897 |
| **Self-Direction**       | 12,022         | 860,461      | 872,483 |
| **Universalism**         | 46,150         | 1016,471     | 1062,621|
| **Benevolence**          | 37,584         | 936,485      | 974,069 |
| **Tradition**            | 80,169         | 1055,487     | 1135,655|
| **Conformity**           | 51,919         | 1195,460     | 1247,379|
| **Security**             | 8517,588       | 248040,252   | 256557,840|
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societies. Individuals who pursue this profession must also have the obligation to comply with "value" criteria in all their practices (Obuz, 2009; Uzbek, 2003).

Teachers are not the only practitioners of the teaching program. At the same time, they form an implicit value education for the students with their perceptions and behaviors about what teachers give importance to, what is good or bad (Doganay, 2009). For this reason, it is pleasing that the attitudes of teachers towards universal values are highly positive. They are many studies in which teachers’ values and values they consider important and value preferences examined (Aktay & Ekşi, 2009; Başol & Bardakçı, 2008; Balçi & Yanpar-Yelken, 2010; Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000; Veugelers, 2000; Demiryürek, 2008; Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000; Memiş & Güney-Gedik, 2010; Sarı, 2005; Yılmaz, 2009; Yıldırım, 2009). In this context, the values that class teachers have are not only themselves but also stakeholders; Family, and society (Brynilde, 2002; Vess & Halbur, 2003).

When the first findings obtained from the study were taken into consideration, the values of the teachers' values were found to be higher in female teachers than in the males. Despite the fact that gender is not a significant difference in value (Karakitapoglu & Imamoglu, 2002; Yapıcı & Zengin, 2003), the others found that gender is an important determinant of value differences (Aktay, 2008; Güney-Gedik, 2010; Demirru, 2010; Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000; Şahin-Firat & Açikgöz, 2012; Sarı, 2005; Şafak & Sadık, 2015; Yılmaz, 2009).

According to this study, female teachers were found to be higher in hazing and males in traditionally. There are many studies in which the value of female teachers in hazing value dimension is high (Güney-Gedik, 2010); men are in the value of tradition is high (Bacanlı, 2002). Despite these findings, it has been revealed that female teachers’ attitudes regarding universal values are more positive (Şahin-Firat & Açikgöz, 2012; Altunay & Yalçınkaya, 2011; Çelebi, 2014; Şafak & Sadık, 2015). This result may be due to the fact that in almost all societies women are expected to be sensitive, tolerant, compassionate, thoughtful, orderly and responsible from the ideal image of women (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1990). In addition, there are patterned judgments in the Turkish society that the teaching profession is a more suitable profession, especially for women (Tezcan, 1995), and that women are more conscious of choosing teaching profession (Çelenk, 1988). Basic tasks expected from women in Turkish culture; they must be emotional, collaborate, care and show interest. It is emphasized that men should act independently, to represent the family and to be competitive (Temel & Aksoy, 2001). Women’s expectation of this upbringing and the environment can make them prefer universalism, benevolence, harmony and security values more than men.

In addition, it is seen that female and male teachers have high value scores in the study. According to a survey conducted in Turkey in 2015, while the teaching profession in the Turkish society took place in the 4th occupational group with the highest percentage of 80.98%, among the top 10 occupations, the teaching profession occupied 81.50% and 80.48% (Sunar et al., 2015). According to this latest study in Turkey, it can be said that the teaching profession has changed the mold judgments (values) that it is female profession. If the teaching profession is thought to be a profession whose human values are very prominent, these results can be interpreted as the fact that teachers try to be sensitive to the individuals they serve, no matter where they work or on which conditions.

It is gratifying that male and female teachers have high value scores. It is widely believed that the teacher is not a passive person, but a professional person whose beliefs and values must be modeled (Billington, 1997; Eisenberg et al., 1987; Senemoglu, 1994). The elementary school teacher has a much more significant influence in the child's life than the teachers at the other levels of education. This is because the first years of elementary education have an influence over future achievements, schools, lectures and attitudes towards them by carrying the infrastructure qualifications for the knowledge, skills and values to be gained in the information and skill education stages which are the basis for the preparation of the child for adult life in this period (Gürkan, 1993; Senemoglu, 1994).
According to the second bullet point obtained from the study, the values of elementary teachers are higher than those of the married teachers according to the marital status of class teachers. When we review the related literature, we can find out that marital status is very limited in the sense that it creates meaningful value difference in favor of single class teachers (Aktay, 2008; Güney-Gedik, 2010; Tanit, 2007). According to marital status, value preferences do not make a meaningful difference (Tanit, 2007), whereas values of preference according to marital status differ only in strength and traditionality dimensions (Aktay, 2008); A significant differentiation in all dimensions except the power dimension according to marital status variable (Yılmaz, 2009) was observed.

This finding of the study is supported only by this work (Güney-Gedik, 2010) in the field of high altitude attitudes "worth having by single teachers". It can be said that single class teachers are more ambitious than married teachers, and their feelings of social position, control over people and resources, individual pleasure and pleasure orientation, excitement and search for innovation are more dominant. Despite this finding of the study, there is a belief in the higher value attitudes of married people in Turkish society. In a study conducted (Karabacak, 2016), it was revealed that student parents prefer married female teachers.

According to the third finding obtained from the study, the attitudes of the class teachers with 4-6 years and 19-21 years according to the seniority variable of the class teachers were found higher than the other seniority units. The seniority as an important determinant of value diversity was supported by the other studies (Erdem, 2009; Şahin-Fırat & Açıklkız, 2012; Yılmaz, 2009). When the related literature is examined, there are very limited number of studies that do not create meaningful value difference in favor of class teachers (Aktay, 2008; Aktay & Eksi, 2009; Tanit, 2007). Finding that the study created meaningful value disparity in favor of class teachers who were between 4-6 years and 19-21 years in this finding; while in a study done by Işık and Yıldız (2007) as the first ten years of the profession and between 1-5 years and 6-10 years are high (Yılmaz, 2009) was supported. On the other hand Dönmez & Cömert (2007) found out that reflection of values decreases as the senior years of the teachers increase.

The fact that the reflection of the value of the teachers between 4-6 years and 19-21 years is high; the fall of these values that they reflect in the following years while they are more excited and actively involved in reflecting basic human values during their first years of work can be attributed to the difficulty of working conditions, not the fact that teachers do not have these values. Because, under Turkish conditions, classroom teachers work in the provinces and in situations where the conditions of difficulty change. On the contrary, it can be said that they continued the motivation to keep the enthusiasm for starting the new business. The classroom teacher in the teaching profession group has a special position in all other teaching areas. In this context, it is important to emphasize who the class teacher is and what values she should bear. In the literature studies, classroom teacher; (Karabacak et al., 2015; Uslu, 2010), as a profession that is both different and difficult than other teachers and also possesses the skills that it possesses.

The fourth bulletin according to the level of educational attainment shows that the teachers of the class have a meaningful value difference in favor of having a bachelor’s degree - a master’s degree and a bachelor’s degree - doctorate. In the field there is a study that negatively supports this finding. In this study (Aktay & Eksi, 2009), value preferences do not differ according to education level. It can be said that based on the excitement of doing graduate education in the way of becoming a researcher scientist and making significant difference in favor of doing a doctorate. This data also supported by being a teacher researcher while teaching (Küçük, 2002).
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