Full Length Research Paper

Analyzing the value priorities of families, students and teachers

Tahiroğlu Mustafa* and Aktepe Vedat

Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Education, Nevşehir University, Nevşehir/Turkey.

The purpose of this study is to determine to what extent families and teachers required students to have or not the values and to what extent students give priorities to these values. The study group of the research chosen through random sampling model included 79 teachers, 136 parents of students, and 149 students from 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades studying at secondary education schools affiliated to Aksaray Directorate of National Education. In the research, 57-item Schwartz' Value Inventory developed by Schwartz (1992) and adapted into Turkish and studied upon its validity and reliability by Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı (2000) was used as the data collection tool. For the analysis of the data obtained from the study group, One-Way Analysis of Variance (One-Way ANOVA) benefited the random samplings. Consequently, no significant difference was found according to the whole value expressions in Schwartz's Value Inventory between the value priorities of teachers and students and the value priorities the families want a student to have. However, when the items were analyzed one by one, some significant differences were found between parents, teachers, and students in some value expressions.

Key words: Family, teacher, student, value priorities, analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Values are the body of rules that determine the affective and cognitive feeling, thought, belief, attitude, and behavior of each society. Schwartz (1994) and Harcar (2005) defined the concept of value as such. It is the purpose requested in situations that display difference and serve as a lodestar to the life of social formations and individuals, and accepted as "the best," "the most correct," "the most beneficial" and "the most useful" by the society.

In order to adapt and experience the values well, children should be allowed to acquire them. To manage

this, interfamilial education, school and environment are essential (Bolay, 2007). Because the values are learned in the family from childhood, children distinguish the values which are more important for them among the ones they learn together with their social surrounding and school life, and realize social values. Therefore, the education that the children have in their families and schools is essential. Because the families and schools make efforts and insist on making their children acquire value judgments of the society. And if the children resist these values, a conflict is experienced. According to the

broadly accepted perception of recent times, values vary from culture to culture, society to society, family to family, and person to person, and more importantly, those values can contradict with each other. While the children model their families, the society, teachers, and the individuals around them on themselves, they encounter with these confronting values, as well. When considering the recent technological advancement, the dimensions of this conflict can be noticed to be much clearer.

According to Simon et al. (1972: 16), values can be efficient if only they are consistent with the desires of the individual. However, the conditions today's youths confront have to be revised. For example, parents offer a series of "must" and "mustn't," their peer friends offer a different viewpoint, cinema and popular magazines offer a different viewpoint, elementary education teachers offer a different viewpoint, seventh grade teacher offer a different viewpoint, politicians offer a different viewpoint, spokesmen of different cultures offer a different viewpoint, religious beliefs suggest their own values and continues as such. The young individuals who are bombarded with these effects confront a great conflict whose suggestions and values they should take as a choice.

On the other hand, the societies which undergo change and progress on social and economic fields in recent times have witnessed the conflicts of feeling, thought, and values. Financial welfare of individuals provides economic improvement and development of families, schools, and the society, and also changes the life styles and value systems. Because values are re-interpreted together with economic developments, new values appear, and the list of priority between the value systems of the individuals changes.

Consequently, the young individuals who are in afore-mentioned chaos, conflicts, and contradictions cannot compromise values, and also cannot make their own choices. As a result of this, youths and children cannot create their own values, and experience incoherence in adapting the values of the society. Under these circum-stances, these young individuals cannot find a community they belong to, they become isolated, display negative behaviors and are sensitized to social problems, etc. However, as mentioned by Thiroux (1980): "In order for humankind to create and experience love, friendship, happiness, freedom, and peace, and to achieve creativity and coherence at the highest level, they should adapt themselves to ethical values. Human is a living being that thinks, has feelings, is aware of these feelings and shares them. He creates, shares the thing created, can transfer and have common values with the society he lives in. For that reason, the individual should have the broadly accepted values that form the basis of common life (Cited in Akbaba-Altun, 2003: 8-9)." As known, families and schools have a very important place to make individuals acquire these generally accepted values.

Families and schools have important roles to play in

correcting and transferring of values that will help the society and individuals to live happily, peacefully, and healthily. Therefore, educationalists (parents and tea-chers) should transfer values correctly and efficiently to children. In order to transfer values correctly and efficiently, it is essential that the educated ones should respect values, conflicting values should be determined, personal value judgments should not be imposed, finding the least common denominator should be to cooperate with families, school and students. According to Pigozzi (2004), an efficient education of values should cover the society as a whole. The values should be taught fairly and equally (different genders, cultures and beliefs) without distinction and respecting the views of anyone who learns. Learners should be integrated with common values that establish trust.

Teachers do not deal with values and training within a classroom systematically; they do not know how to teach the approaches to value, cannot focus on the required training of values because education is more cognitive process oriented and cannot be role model because students determine different models for themselves from television, internet etc. Families and the society cannot provide adequate support for values and training. Moreover, in some researches (Yalar and YanparYelken, 2011; Gömleksiz and Cüro, 2011), the most important problems of teaching of values were teachers not following the approaches of values teaching syste-matically, not planning the lesson process, families and the society not supporting the training adequately and not accomplishing the activities out of the classroom.

After solving of the problems experienced in teaching of values, the values of individuals should be respected, educationalists should not impose their judgment of values, and the conflicting values should be determined. In order to provide this, it is necessary to find the least common denominator of the values cooperating with families, school, teachers, and students. In order to find the least common denominator, it is necessary for families, teachers and students involved in the process to be aware of their values, and their point-of-views related to these values. In our research, value priorities of fami-lies, teachers, and students are determined and analy-zed. When considering the determined value priorities, this study is considered as an avenue to minimize conflicts.

The purpose of this study is to determine to what extent families and teachers required students to have or not values and to what extent students give priorities to these values.

In accordance with this purpose, the answers to the questions below were looked for:

1. Is there a significant difference between the value priorities the families require the students to have and the value priorities the teachers require the students have?

2. Is there a significant difference between the value priorities the families require the students to have and the value priorities of students?

3. Is there a significant difference between the value priorities the teachers require students to have and the value priorities of students?

METHOD

Research model

This research is a study that uses a screening model.

Study group

The study population included the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students studying at secondary schools affiliated to Aksaray Directorate of National Education, parents of these students, and students teachers currently training the students and who will also train in following years. The sample chosen with random sampling method included 149 students who participated voluntarily from 9 secondary schools in Aksaray central district, 136 parents (parents of the students who participated in the research), and 79 teachers (the teachers who have been training the students and the ones who will train in the following years).

Data collection and analysis

For the analysis of the data obtained from the study group, one-way variance of analysis for random samplings (One-way anova) was used. Firstly, whether the data showed a normal distribution or not along the groups (each group) for the practicability of this statistics was analyzed. According to the test results (p=.078; p>0.05), it was noticed that the data showed normal distribution. The 0.05 reliability level was adapted as the level of significance. According to the evaluation results, when whole inventory was analyzed in one dimension, no significant difference was found between the value priorities families and teachers require the students to have and value priorities of students (p=.091; p>0.05). It was found appropriate to evaluate the data obtained for the value expressions in the inventory to be analyzed one by one in order to reveal to what extent families and teachers require students to have value priorities and to what extent students give priority to these values. In this process, the items in the inventory were exposed to analysis one by one in accordance with the purpose of the research, and we tried to reveal which items had difference and which items did not.

In the research, 57-item Schwartz' Value Inventory developed by Schwartz (1992) and adapted into Turkish by Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı (2000) was used as the data collection tool. Because Schwartz's Value Inventory is comprehensive and accepted internationally, it is a tool in line with the purposes of our research. Furthermore, this inventory has been used in different researches in our country, proving its reliability and validity; and its appropriateness for Turkey was determined (Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000; Uncu, 2008).

During the process of collecting the research data, 1 village secondary school, 2 town secondary schools, and 2 central secondary schools were visited, and the students (5th, 6th, 7th, and 8^{th}grade students) studying at these schools and the teachers were informed about the purpose and importance of the research in interviews. Moreover, via the students the parents who wanted to participate in the study were asked to complete the scale. They sent the Schwartz's Scale Inventory together with the notes which indicate the purpose and importance of the research. In the scale a direction was provided to parents as "Which value and to what extent (between 7 and 1) you require your child to give priority, please specify? However, please consider that your child cannot give priority to whole value expressions equally while acting this procedure." After this, the students and teachers were asked whether they wanted to participate in this research or not. The ones who wanted to participate in it were requested to read the direction primarily after handing out the Schwartz's Value Inventory. The direction provided to parents in the handed-out scale was, "Which value and to what extent (between 7 and 1) you require your students to give priority, please specify? However, please consider that your student cannot give priority to whole value expressions equally while acting this procedure." In the scale handed out to students, the direction was, "Please specify to what extent (between 7 and 1) you give priority to any values according to the value expressions? You are expected to reflect your real consideration while performing this. You will not write anything that can reflect your identity on the scale. By this means, we will not know to what extent you give priority to any values individually. For that reason, I kindly request you to reflect your own real considerations." After this process, the data were collected by the researchers for analysis.

FINDINGS

In order to determine which values and to what extent families and teachers require students to have and to what extent students want to give priority to these values, Schwartz's Value Inventory was performed and the obtained data were evaluated using Single Factor Variance Analysis (One-Way ANOVA) for Random Sampling method. The data related to evaluation results were presented in details. The findings related to mono-dimensional Variance Analysis (One-Way ANOVA) results of the data obtained from Schwartz's Value Inventory performed to families, teachers and students are presented in Table 1.

When the data in Table 1 were analyzed, it was noticed that there was no significant difference between the value priorities families and teachers require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=2.087; *p>0.05*). In other words, no significant difference was found between the value priorities families and teachers require students to have and value priorities of students according to the whole expressions in Schwartz's Value Inventory. In order to understand whether there was a difference among the units, results of Scheffe test were analyzed, and it was noticed that all found values were over 0.05 level of significance. According to these results, it can be said there was no significant difference between the units (parent-teacher, teacher-student and student-parent).

As it can be seen above, the value priorities families and teachers require students to have and value priorities of students were close to each other in general. However, Schwartz's Value Inventory consisted of items including 57 value expressions. When those items were analyzed one by one, significant differences were found between parents-teacher, teacher-student, and student-

Table 1. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from Schwartz's Value Inventory Performed to families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	3.058	2	1.529	2.087	.126	No
Intragroup	262.301	358	.733			
Total	265.360	360				

p>0.05.

Table 2. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 1st Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	42.302	2	21.151	6.484	.002	2 – 1, 2 – 3
Intragroup	1167.731	358	.793			
Total	1210.033	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 3. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 3rd Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	226.520	2	113.260	29.163	.000	2 – 1, 2 – 3
Intragroup	1390.372	358	3.884			
Total	1616.892	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

parents in some value expressions. In these circumstances, no problem was noticed –in accordance with the purpose of the researcher- in value expressions in which parents, teachers and students arrived at a consensus; however, it was needed to determine the value priorities on which no consensus was arrived.

According to analysis results, value expressions in 2nd, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th, 11th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 19th, 20th, 22nd, 24th, 26th, 28th, 29th, 30th, 31st, 32nd, 36th, 38th, 40th, 42nd, 43rd, 44th, 45th, 46th, 48th, 49th, 50th, 52nd, 54th, 55th and 56th items compromised with the priorities families and teachers require the students to have and own priorities of students. Value expressions in 1st, 3rd, 4th, 9th, 12th, 18th, 21st, 23rd, 25th, 27th, 33rd, 34th, 35th, 37th, 39th, 41st, 47th, 51st, 53rd and 57th items did not compromise with the priorities families and teachers require the students to have and own priorities of students. The analysis results related to parents-teacher, teacher-student, and student-parents disagreement related to these items are presented in Table 2.

In the value of "equality (Item 1)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the

value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=6.484, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, it was noticed that the teachers (M=6.88, SD=0.45) want equality value to be given priority rather than parents and students; and no significant difference was determined between priorities of parents (M=6.08, SD=2.03) and students (M=6.03, SD=2.01) (Table 3).

In the value of "having social power (item 3)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$= 29.163, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, whereas it was noticed that the teachers (M=3.58, SD=2.04) wanted students not to have the value of social power more than the parents and students, no significant difference was found between the priorities of parents (M=5.63, SD=1.97) and students(M=5.31, SD=1.92) (Table 4).

In the value expression of "pleasure (item 4)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant

Table 4. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 4th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	229.275	2	114.67	37.404	.000	1 – 2, 2 – 3
Intragroup	1097.207	358	3.065			1 - 3
Total	1326.482	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 5. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 9th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	244.587	2	122.23	29.427	.000	1 – 2, 2 – 3
Intragroup	1487.790	358	4.156			1 - 3
Total	1732.377	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 6. One-Way Variance Analysis Results of the Data Obtained from the 12th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	151.457	2	75.728	38.996	.000	2 – 1, 2 – 3
Intragroup	695.214	358	1.942			
Total	846.670	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$= 37.404, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, whereas the students (M=6.02, SD=1.44) were noticed to give more priority to the value of pleasure more than parents (M=5.33, SD=1.78), parents were noticed to require more than teachers (M=3.91, SD=2.16) (Table 5).

According to the value expression of "an exciting life (item 9)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=29.427, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, students (M=5.87, SD=1.53) were noticed to give the value of an exciting life more priority than parents, and the parents (M=4.91, SD=2.33) required this to be given more priority rather than teachers (M=3.70, SD=2.29) (Table 6).

In the value expression of "to be rich (item 12)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=38.996, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, whereas teachers (M=4.86, SD=2.03) required the value of being rich to be given less priority than parents and students, no significant difference was determined between the priorities of parents (M=6.35, SD=1.19) and students (M=6.47, SD=1.10) (Table 7).

In the value expression of "respect for traditions (item 18)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=9.688, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, students (M=4.94, SD=2.56) required the value of respect for traditions to be given less priority than parents and teachers, and no significant difference was noticed between the priorities of parents (M=6.05, SD=1.85) and

Table 7. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 18th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	91.791	2	45.895	9.688	.000	3 – 1, 3 – 2
Intragroup	1696.027	358	4.738			
Total	1787.817	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 8. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 21st Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory Performed with families, teachers, and students,

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	48.287	2	24.144	5.781	.003	2 – 1, 2 – 3
Intragroup	1495.026	358	4.176			
Total	1543.313	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 9. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 23rd Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	119.088	2	59.544	27.445	.000	2 – 1, 2 – 3
Intragroup	776.436	358	2.169			
Total	895.524	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

teachers (M=5.74, SD=1.86) (Table 8).

In the value of "privacy, respect for special rights (item 21)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=5.781, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional diffe-rences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, teachers (M=6.53, SD=1.06) required the value of privacy/respect for special rights to be given more priority rather than parents and students, and no significant difference was found between the priorities of parents (M=5.60, SD= 2.31) and students (M=5.69, SD=2.17) (Table 9).

In the value expression of "social prestige (item 23)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$= 27.445, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, whereas teachers (M=5.20, SD=2.15) required the value of

social prestige to be given less priority rather than parents and students, no significant difference was noticed between the priorities of parents (M=6.70, SD=1.05) and students (M=6.41, SD=1.34) (Table 10).

In the value expression of " a changeable life (item 25)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=23.926, *p<0.05*). When the inter-divisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, students (M=6.36, SD=0.99) require the value of a changeable life to be given more priority rather than parents and teachers, and no significant difference was found between the priorities of parents (M=5.00, SD=2.46) and teachers (M=5.07, SD=1.62) (Table 11).

In the value expression of "being an authority (item 9)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$= 29.427, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences

Table 10. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 25th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	51.121	2	77.583	23.926	.000	3 – 1, 3 – 2
Intragroup	1160.834	358	3.243			
Total	1316.000	360				

p<0.05 (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 11. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 27th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	327.213	2	163.67	43.367	.000	1 – 2, 2 – 3
Intragroup	1415.889	358	3.955			1 - 3
Total	1743.102	360				

p<0.05 (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 12. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 33rd Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	30.571	2	15.286	5.558	.004	3 – 1, 2 – 1
Intragroup	984.542	358	2.750			
Total	1015.114	360				

p<0.05 (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 13. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 34th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	76.548	2	38.274	20.619	.000	2 – 1, 2 – 3
Intragroup	664.527	358	1.856			
Total	741.075	360				

p<0.05 (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, whereas parents (M=5.90, SD=1.79) require the students (M=5.18, SD=2.14) to give more priority to the value of being an authority rather than the students, students were noticed to give more priority to this value rather than teachers (M=3.35, SD=1.98) (Table 12).

In the value expression of "being loyal (item 33)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students $(F_{(2,358)}=$

5.558, $p<0.05$). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, parents (M=5.74, SD=2.06) required the value of being loyal to be given less priority rather than the teachers and students, and no significant difference was found between the priorities teachers (M=6.22, SD=1.07) and students (M=6.39, SD=1.48) (Table 13).

In the value expression of "being ambitious (item 34)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require

Table 14. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 35th Item Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	95.395	2	47.697	21.038	.000	3 – 1, 3 – 2
Intragroup	811.647	358	2.267			
Total	907.042	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 15. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 37th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	461.833	2	230.97	48.983	.000	3 – 1, 3 – 2
Intragroup	1687.691	358	4.714			
Total	2149.524	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 16. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 39th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	221.406	2	110.703	32.095	.000	2 – 1, 2 – 3
Intragroup	1234.838	358	3.449			
Total	1456.244	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$= 20.619, $p<0.05$). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, teachers (M=5.29, SD=1.36) require the value of being ambitious to be given less priority rather than parents and students, and no significant difference was noticed between the priorities of parents (M=6.50, SD=1.23) and students (M=6.26, SD=1.46) (Table 14).

In the value expression of "being open-minded (item 35)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=21.038, $p<0.05$). When the inter-divisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, students (M=5.64, SD=2.16) require the value of being open minded to be given less priority rather than parents and teachers, and no significant difference was found between the priorities of parents (M=6.65, SD=0.74) and teachers (M=6.73, SD=0.77) (Table 15).

In the value expression of "being brave/looking for adventure and risk (item 37)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=48.983, $p<0.05$). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, students (M=6.09, SD=1.69) require the value of being brave/looking for adventure and risk to be given more priority rather than parents and teachers, and no significant difference was determined between the priorities parents (M=3.85, SD=2.61) and teachers (M=3.69, SD=2.13) (Table 16).

In the value expression of "being influential (item 34)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$= 32.095, $p<0.05$). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, teachers (M=4.02, SD=2.21) were noticed to require the value of being influential to be given less priority rather than parents and students, and no significant difference was

Table 17. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 41st Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	66.408	2	33.204	15.872	.000	3 – 1, 2 – 1
Intragroup	748.916	358	2.092			
Total	815.324	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 18. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 47th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of variance	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p	Significant difference
Intergroup	43.859	2	21.929	9.050	.000	3 – 1, 3 – 2
Intragroup	867.493	358	2.423			
Total	911.352	360				

p<0.05,   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 19. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 51st Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Significant Difference
Intergroup	125.623	2	62.811	18.812	.000	1 – 2, 1 – 3
Intragroup	1195.309	358	3.339			
Total	1320.931	360				

p<0.05   (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

specified between the priorities of parents (M=5.88, SD=1.71) and students (M=5.94, SD=1.76) (Table 17).

In the value expression of "choosing one's own aims (item 41)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=15.872, *p<0.05*). When the inter-divisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, parents (M=5.85, SD=2.07) were noticed to require the value of choosing one's own aims to be given less priority rather than teachers and students, and no significant difference was found between the priorities of teachers (M=6.84, SD=0.36) and students (M=6.67, SD=1.06) (Table 18).

In the value expression of "being submissive (item 47)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$= 9.050, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, the students

(M=5.55, SD=1.59) require the value of being submissive to be given less priority rather than the parents and teachers, and so significant difference was found between the priorities of parents (M=6.49, SD=1.50) and teachers (M=6.20, SD=1.59) (Table 19).

In the value expression of "being religious (item 51)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$= 18.812, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, the parents (M=6.73, SD=0.86) require the value of being religious to be given more priority rather than teachers and students, and no significant difference was found between the priorities of teachers (M=5.22, SD=2.36) and students (M=5.78, SD=2.11) (Table 20).

In the value expression of "being curious/being a researcher (item 53)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value

Table 20. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 53rd Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Significant Difference
Intergroup	139.384	2	69.692	23.494	.000	1 – 2, 1 – 3
Intragroup	1061.967	358	2.966			
Total	1201.352	360				

p<0.05 (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

Table 21. One-way variance analysis results of the data obtained from the 57th Item of Schwartz's Value Inventory performed with families, teachers, and students.

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	Significant Difference
Intergroup	160.089	2	80.044	23.433	.000	1 – 2, 2 – 3
Intragroup	1222.881	358	3.416			1 - 3
Total	1382.970	360				

p<0.05 (1=Parent, 2=Teacher, 3=Student).

priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=23.494, *p<0.05*). When the interdivisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, the parents (M=5.03, SD=2.33) require the value of being curious/being a researcher to be given less priority rather than teachers and students, and no significant difference was determined between the priorities of teachers (M=6.51, SD=0.88) and students (M=6.17, SD=1.36) (Table 21).

In the value expression of "one being fond of requests (item 57)," the analysis results presented that there was a significant difference between the value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students ($F_{(2,358)}$=37.404, *p<0.05*). When the inter-divisional differences were analyzed according to Scheffe test results, whereas the students (M=6.33, SD=1.30) were noticed to be given more priority to the value of being fond of their requests rather than teachers (M=5.31, SD=1.48), the teachers were also determined to be given more priority to this value rather than parents (M=4.85, SD=2.45).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Consequently, no significant difference was found between value priorities teachers require students to have, the value priorities families require students to have and value priorities of students according to the whole value expressions in Schwartz's Value Inventory. However, when the items in the scale were analyzed one by one, some significant differences were found between parent-teacher, teacher-student, and student-parent in some value expressions. As is also understood from this, some

values requested by parents to be in their children primarily are not requested by teachers or children; some values requested primarily by teachers to be in students are not requested by parents or students; and the values given priority by the students are not requested primarily by parents or teachers.

Whether items include difference or not according to the 57 value expressions of the scale were as: The priorities parents require students to have, the priorities teachers requires students to have, and priorities of students correspond to each other in the value expressions such as, inner peace, freedom, a spiritual life, loyalty, social order, a meaningful life, being polite, self-esteem, returning the favor, creativity, a world in peace, love, self-control, family safety, integrity with nature, being virtuous, a beautiful world, social justice, being independent, being moderate, being modest, protecting the environment, esteeming the parents and olds, being healthy, being competent, accepting the world on one's share, being honest, protecting one's appearance in the society, being intelligent, being helpful, enjoying life, being responsible, being forgiving, being successful and being clean. However, according to the rating between 1 and 7 (the highest priority is 7, the lowest priority is 1), these priorities were noticed to be low in some items, and as high in the some others. According to Raths et al. (1978: 31-58), "Priority and indicators of values are deter-mined according to purposes, needs, interests, feelings, beliefs, and worries." With reference to this explanation, it is possible to say that purposes, needs, interests, requests, feelings, beliefs, and worries of parents, teachers, and students are close to each other in the value expressions in items 2nd, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th, 11th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 19th, 20th, 22nd, 24th, 26th, 28th,

29th, 30th, 31st, 32nd, 36th, 38th, 40th, 42nd, 43rd, 44th, 45th, 46th, 48th, 49th, 50th, 52nd, 54th, 55[th]and 56th (the item numbers corresponding to aforementioned value expressions) which are all included in Schwartz's Value Inventory.

In value expression in the 1st, 3rd, 4th, 9th, 12th, 18th, 21st, 23rd, 25th, 27th, 33rd, 34th, 35th, 37th, 39th, 41st, 47th, 51st, 53rd and 57th items, the priorities parents required students to have, the priorities teachers required students to have, and priorities of students did not correspond with each other. In this sense, teachers were noticed to require students to have values such as "equality," "privacy/respect for special life," rather than parents and students at a high rate. It was also specified that the parents requested students to have the value of being religious in terms of priority rather than teachers and students. And the students were noticed to give more priority to the values such as "a changeable life," "being courageous, looking for adventure and risk," rather than parents and teachers.

Whereas parents and students were noticed to require the students to have values such as "having a social power," "being rich," "social prestige," "being ambitious," and "being influential" rather than teachers, no significant difference was determined between each other (parent – student). Whereas teachers and students required the students to have values such as being loyal, choosing one's own purposes, being curious/a researcher rather than parents, no significant difference was found between each other (teacher – student). Whereas the parents and teachers were noticed to require the students to have values such as respect for traditions, being open-minded, being submissive at a higher rate rather than students, no significant difference was determined between each other (parent-teacher). Apart from these, students require having the values of "pleasure," "an exciting life," more prior rather than the parents and teachers, and the parents require their children to have these values more than teachers. The parents also require the students to have the value of "having an authority" rather their own priorities and the one which teachers require the students to have. Students required to give more priority to the value of "being keen on their requests" rather than the one which teachers and parents require students to have. Both teachers and students require giving more priority to this value rather than parents.

The values can only be efficient when in a consistency with the requests of the person acquiring them (Simon et al., 1972, p. 16). It cannot be developed through obliging the individuals to memorize the words they do not understand or are not interested in. Therefore, if the learner does not require the aforementioned value or does not accommodate this value, integration with the value cannot be provided (UNESCO, 2005, p. 31-32). From this point of view, in order for the provided values training to achieve its purposes, knowing he requests, needs, and

value priorities of the acquirer is important.

Another important aspect in training of values is family and school cooperation. This is because parents are the primary character trainers of children. Parents should consider schools as partners providing ethical values and strong characters to their children. And this expresses the regular and transparent communication between the school and parents (Bolay, 2007; Ryan, 1995). If this communication cannot be provided, the values acquired at home and the ones acquired in school cannot compromise with each other. And this makes children to experience value conflict.

In this study, the value priorities of parents, teachers, and students within a specific group were revealed. However, in order to pass a more reliable judgment on the subject, the research is suggested to be carried out with different groups in different provinces and schools. Furthermore, whether the revealed value priorities cause a conflict between parents, teachers, and students is also suggested to be researched.

Conflict of Interests

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

Akbaba-Altun S (2003). Eğitim yönetimi ve değerler.Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi 1(1):7-18. http://www.academia.edu/3123829/Egitim_yonetimi_ve_degerler

Bolay SH (2007). Değerlerimiz ve günlük hayat. Değerler Eğitimi Merkezi Dergisi 1(1):12-19. http://dem.org.tr/dem_dergi/1/dem1mak3.pdf

Dilmaç B, Bozgeyikli H, Çıkılı Y (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının değer algılarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Değerler EğitimiDergisi 6(16):65-92. http://www.degerleregitimi.org/ded/16/ded16mak3.pdf

Gömleksiz MN, Cüro E (2011). Sosyal Bilgiler Dersi Öğretim Programında Yer Alan Değerlere İlişkin Öğrenci Tutumlarının Değerlendirilmesi Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi [Bağlantıda]. 8(1) Erişim: http://www.j-humansciences.com/ojs/index.php/IJHS/article/viewFile/1299/648

Harcar T (2005). 2000'li yıllarda amerikan ve türk yöneticilerinin bireysel yöneticilik değerlerine ilişkin iki kültür arası karşılaştırmaya yönelik bir araştırma. Doktora Tezi. İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Kuşdil ME, Kağıtçıbaşı Ç (2000). Türk öğretmenlerin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz Değer Kuramı. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi 45:59-76.

Pigozzi MJ (2004). The implications of globalchallenges for education for shared values for intercultural and interfaith understanding. http://www.winderdoon.com/WEFT/files/newhorizons_volume112_pigozzi2.pdf

Raths LE, Harmin M, Simon SB (1978). Values and teaching: Working with values in the classroom. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merill Company. http://books.google.com.ng/books/about/Values_and_teaching_working_with_values.html?id=k_07AAAAIAAJ&redir_esc=y

Ryan K (1995). The ten commandments of character education. School Adm. 8(52):18-19.

Schwartz SH (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical test in 20 countries, In: Zanna MP (ed.). Academic Press, Orlando, Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol. 25:1-65.

Schwartz SH (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values?. J. Soc. Issues 50(4):19-45.

Simon SB, Howe LW, Kischenbaum H (1972). Values clarification: A handbook of practical strategies for teachers andstudents.New York: Hart Publishing Company, İnc.

Uncu Ü (2008). Öğretmen ve eğitim yöneticilerinin değer yönelimlerinin çok boyutlu olarak incelenmesi (İstanbul İli Örneği). Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

UNESCO (2005). Learning to do: Values for learning and working together in a globalized world (Eds. L. R. Quisumbing & J. Leo). Bonn, Germany: UNESCO-UNEVOC. Retrieved January 06, 2009 from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001480/148021e.pdf

Yalar T, Yanpar Yelken T (2011). Değerler eğitiminin iyileştirilmesi ile ilgili öğretmen görüşlerinin belirlenmesi ve bir program modülü örneğinin geliştirilmesi. Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi 10(38):79-98.
http://web.b.ebscohost.com/abstract?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=13040278&AN=67095911&h=PvsJYuxkGJc51f1DzDpfAMb65c%2fGu7kRowtZXpHpAbdInBp88h4qtCgewbQ4fm1ELnc7RooFxdjtlW%2fSebcLJA%3d%3d&crl=c