Examination of Value Orientations and Levels of Tolerance of Teacher Candidates

Aykar Tekin Bozkurt [a] *

[a] Gaziantep University, Faculty of Education, Gaziantep, 27310, Turkey

Abstract

Individuals continue their lives by learning many values in life and making them experiences. Teachers play important roles in this process. Values education, which can also be described as the transfer of values to new generations, is among the main topics in our present day's education process. It is very important for the success of education for teachers to perform classroom activities with an understanding attitude toward their students by keeping the value of tolerance at the forefront of the education-teaching processes. In this context, the purpose was to examine the value orientations and tolerance levels of teacher candidates in the present study in which the Quantitative Method was adopted. With the Screening Model Approach, teacher candidates' value orientations and tolerance levels were evaluated by using the Portrait Values Scale and Tolerance Scale. A total of 351 teacher candidates who were studying at the Faculty of Education in the fall semester of the 2022-2023 academic year participated in this study. The SPSS program, descriptive statistical calculations, T-test, ANOVA and correlation analysis were performed in the analysis of the data. As a result of the analysis, it was found that the value orientations of the teacher candidates concentrated on the values of Universalism, Self- direction, and Security at a high level. In the value orientations of teacher candidates according to gender, a significant difference was found in favor of women in the sub-dimensions of Hedonism and Universalism. At the end of the study, recommendations are included based on the findings.

Keywords: Teacher candidates; values; tolerance

1. Introduction

Traditions, customs, norms, and values have an important place in the cultural process that emerged as a product of people who were living together in the social life process. Value refers to the beliefs accepted as the reason for the existence, unity, functioning, and continuation of a social structure, which are approved and encouraged, and which are tried to be protected (Genç, 2020, p.6). In this context, the importance of values in

---

* Corresponding author: Aykar Tekin Bozkurt. ORCID ID.: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1936-2808
  E-mail address: aykarbozkurt@gantep.edu.tr

social life is great. Recently, values are chosen among the fields in which research and discussions are made the most (Güçlü, 2015). When the dictionary of the Turkish Language Association (TLA) is referred to, the concept of value is expressed as "the abstract measure that helps to determine the importance of something, the value that something is worth". The scope of the concept of value involves people and their thoughts, beliefs, and activities (Ekşi & Katılmış, 2020, p.18). Values play important roles not only in sociology but also in psychology, anthropology, and related disciplines.

When the literature was reviewed, it was found that many researchers (Spranger, 1928; Allport, 1960; Schwartz, 2006) made various groupings in terms of many characteristics of values and influencing sources. According to Schwartz (2006), who conducted important studies on values, values can be defined as goals that serve as guiding principles in people's lives, change in importance, are desired, and are beyond the current situation. In his study, Schwartz put forward his model, which he named "Theory of Values" with ten basic value classifications and introduced all the core values recognized in the cultures of the world and developed a broad framework that aimed to include the names and contents of these ten core values, which are expressed as follows (Schwartz, 2006).

Self-Direction: Independent thought and action; *Stimulation*: Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life; *Hedonism*: Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself; *Achievement*: Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards; *Power*: Social status and prestige; *Security*: Safety, harmony; *Conformity*: Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms; *Tradition:* Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self; *Benevolence:* Preserving and enhancing the welfare of those with whom one is in frequent personal contact; *Universalism*: Understanding, appreciation, tolerance.

As mentioned above, ten value grades were detected in the scope of the theory of values. There is a harmonious holistic structure between all these values. The theory was based on these values by analyzing the needs that all individuals and societies had to deal with. Also, within this theoretical structure, the model was given by specifying sub-longitudes such as self-improvement, self-transcendence, openness to change, and conservatism (Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris & Owens, 2001).

Individuals continue their life by learning many values in life and making them become experiences. It is considered worth emphasizing the value of "tolerance" among other values as a concept based on the rational part of human nature and associated with ethical education, but having strict values is not the same as being tolerant (Saulius, 2013). Tolerance is showing patience to those whose views and feelings conflict with ours (Kıroğlu, Elma, Kesten & Egüz, 2012). When considered in the context of its contribution to society and individuals, tolerance can be described as a very important value, which

has a special place in Turkish society (Çalışkan & Çavuş, 2020). Teaching the value of tolerance and spreading it to society becomes easier with education (Gündüz, 2019). Teachers need to have a tolerant approach toward their students. The purpose of education is to strengthen the tendency of children towards truth, good, and beauty, and while doing this, teachers must encourage children to think, and when they confess a mistake and tell the truth, they must be tolerant, far from being violent (Aydın, 2021, p.118). Also, it is necessary to prepare teacher candidates to work with individuals or groups that have culturally different characteristics in social life and schools where there is a multicultural structure, and to organize teacher education programs in this respect (Leonard & Leonard, 2006). In this regard, it is expected that the tolerance levels of teacher candidates who will take part in the values education processes in schools are high. It can be argued that it is also important to evaluate the levels of teacher candidates in these processes.

In our present day, rapid changes are experienced in many fields (social, political, and economic). The 21st century requires raising harmonious individuals, equipping students with academic knowledge and basic skills, accessing information, and using the acquired knowledge to solve the problems they face, as well as having some positive personality traits (Tüzel İşeri, 2022, p. 300). With the effect brought about by the current century, the increase in the emphasis on *the individual* in education requires that this be given importance in the process of raising young people, and we need to ensure that students understand this importance in our education system and that they adopt their nation, culture, and values (Erdemir, 2019, p.300). Right at this point, the importance of raising individuals in terms of character and value acquisition, as well as academic development, is seen in the scope of the aim of developing the individual in education. In this respect, it can be argued that the importance of studies on value education processes is increasing day by day.

The most effective way of transferring knowledge and values to the growing generations is education, which is why educational institutions and organizations have an important role in protecting or changing the values and value system of individuals and society (Mehmedoğlu, 2006). In this respect, value education, which can be considered the process of transferring values to new generations, is among the main topics in the education-teaching targets in schools. According to Şimşek (2012), changes are experienced in many fields in societies with the rapid development of science and technology, and to minimize the negative effects of these changes, it is necessary to raise individuals who have adopted values and transferred them to social life, and the role of schools and teachers is very critical in this process. Educators must know these processes well and professionally complete the education process, particularly when value education is given in formal education institutions (Diktaş & Baş, 2020). For this reason, the practices and evaluations of teachers in the training process in values education are important.

Ensuring the future and continuity of societies and states depends on well-educated individuals who have character (Ünal, 2019, p.42). According to Getzels (1957), the difficulties in the processes associated with the adoption of values are at the root of many problems that schools face in our present day. In this process, parents and teachers who take part in children's internalization of values have responsibility. The family, the environment, the school, and the student themselves need to actively participate in character and value education, and it is recommended to establish close cooperation among all stakeholders (Uygun, 2021, p.32). In this process, the first institutions where individuals start their education are families, then the role of teachers in their education in the school environment begins. In this respect, when the *"General Competencies for Teaching Profession Report" (2017)* of the Ministry of National Education was evaluated, three main competence fields came to the forefront in the teaching profession ("professional knowledge", "professional skills", "attitudes and values"). In the C Group "attitudes and values" competence area, there are sub-competences such as C1. National, Spiritual, and Universal Values, C2. Approach to the Student, C3. Communication and Cooperation. In this respect, it can be argued that the competence development of teachers in the context of values is prioritized and supported in the education system of our country. For this reason, it is also important for teachers to develop themselves as individuals with knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values in their fields in many aspects within the framework of competence, and for the candidates to train their students in the best way in this respect from the moment they graduate and start their profession in line with these gains. In this context, the present study was conducted to measure the values adopted by teacher candidates and to determine their tolerance levels.

The purpose of the study was to examine the value orientations and tolerance levels of teacher candidates who were studying at Gaziantep University Faculty of Education in the fall semester of the 2022-2023 academic year. The main question of the study was shaped around "What are the value orientations and tolerance levels of teacher candidates?". And, the sub-questions to be answered are listed as follows.

1. What are the value orientations of teacher candidates?

2. Do value orientations of teacher candidates differ according to variables such as gender, type of department they study, grades, mother's education levels, father's education levels, and place of residence?

3. What is the tendency of teacher candidates in tolerance and its sub-dimensions?

4. What kind of a correlation is there between the values that teacher candidates show orientation and their tolerance tendencies?

2. Method

2.1. Study Design

The quantitative method was preferred in the present study along with the 'screening model'. Studies that aim to collect data to determine certain characteristics of a group in quantitative studies are called *survey studies* and the advantage of such studies is that they provide many data obtained from a sample consisting of quite a lot of individuals (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2015, p.14). The present study was accepted suitable as a relational screening model, which is a sub-model of the survey model, in terms of trying to uncover the value orientations of teacher candidates by examining them according to different variables, as well as examining the relationships between the value orientations of the participants and their tolerance levels.

2.2. Study Sample

The study started after obtaining the Ethics Committee Permission from Gaziantep University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee. (Ethics Committee Permission Date and Number: 26.07.2022-212926, Meeting No: 08, 05.07.2022/Decision No:17).

A total of 360 teacher candidates who were studying in various departments of the Faculty of Education of Gaziantep University, a state university, in the fall semester of the 2022-2023 academic year, participated in the sample of the study. However, after reviewing the completed scale forms, 9 forms were excluded from the study for various reasons (particularly due to incomplete information). In this respect, the number of participants in the study was detected as 351 in total. The principle of volunteering was adopted in the study. The Simple Random Sampling Technique from probability-based sampling methods was preferred in the selection of the sample. The entry of a unit into the sampling does not depend on the sampling of the others in this sampling type (Balcı, 2007, p.84). In this way, teacher candidates were included in the study with equal participation probability. Also, considering the maximum diversity sampling, participants were expected to show diversity in terms of many variables. In the present study, the variables of the candidates were related to personal information, gender, department, class, mother and father education level, and place of residence. Table 1 shows the distribution of the personal characteristics of the participants in terms of different variables.

Table 1. The Distribution of the Participants by Demographic Characteristics

Variables	**Categories**				
Gender:	Female	Male			
	239	112			
Program Type:	Primary School Class Teaching	Elementary Mathematics Teaching	Turkish Teaching	English Language Teaching	Psychological Counseling and Guidance Teaching
	49	68	70	59	105
Class Level:	1st grade	2nd grade	3rd grade	4th grade	
	171	33	102	45	
Education Level of Mother:	Illiterate	Primary school graduate	Secondary school graduate	High-school graduate	
	59	161	89	42	
Education Level of Father:	Illiterate	Primary school graduate	Secondary school graduate	High-school graduate	
	12	122	129	88	
The Place of Residence:	Village/Town	District	City		
	33	74	244		
				Total:	351

As seen in Table 1, most of the participants in the study were female (n: 239, 68.1%). The students of the Guidance and Psychological Counseling Department (n: 105, 29.9%) had the highest participation according to the departments studied and it was detected that most of the participants were 1st-grade students (n: 171, 48.7%). Also, when the educational status of the parents of the participants was evaluated, it was found that the mothers were mostly primary school graduates (n: 161, 45.9%) and fathers were mostly secondary school graduates (n: 129, 36.8%). Finally, it was found that most of the participants (n: 244, 69.5%) lived in the city centers in terms of their place of residence.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

The data were collected by using the scales in the study. A three-part form was prepared to collect the data. There is the "Personal Information" section that was developed by the researcher in the first part of the form with questions about the gender, department, grade, mother's and father's education levels, and the type of place of residence of the teacher candidates. There is the "Portrait Values Scale" (Demirutku & Sümer, 2010) in the second part, and there is the "Tolerance Scale" in the third part (Çalışkan & Çavuş, 2020).

Portrait Values Scale (Portrait Values Scale-PVS): The Turkish adaptation of the scale, which was originally developed by Schwartz et al. (2001), was conducted by Demirutku

and Sümer (2010). The Portrait Values Scale (PVS) is expressed as an appropriate measurement tool for studies to examine the correlations between values and behaviors that express values. The scale has ten sub-dimensions (value types) and 40 items the names of which are Power (2, 17, 39), Achievement (4, 13, 24, 32), Hedonism (10, 26, 37), Stimulation (6, 15, 30), Self-direction (1, 11, 22, 34), Universalism (3, 8, 19, 23, 29, 40), Benevolence (12, 18, 27, 33), Tradition (9, 20, 25, 38), Conformity (7, 16), 28, 36), and Security (5, 14, 21, 31, 35). The items on the scale are graded in a 6-point Likert style. Participants mark the statements in each item according to their similarity (Very similar to me (6), ..., Not at all similar (1)) by choosing from the appropriate options. In this way, according to the opinions of the participants, the expressions in each item were interpreted based on the score ranges of "1.00-1.83: Not similar at all", "1.84-2.67: Not similar", "2.67-3.50: Very similar", "3.50-4.33: A little similar", "4.33-5.17: Similar", "5.16-6.00: Very similar".

The Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficients of scale factors were; Strength .81, Success .81, Hedonism .77, Stimulation .70, Self-direction .65, Universalism .72, Benevolence .66, Tradition .82, Conformity .75, Security .80. In the present study, as a result of the reliability analysis, the Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficients of the scale factors were found as; Power .788, Success .762, Hedonism .778, Stimulation .768, Self-direction .771, Universalism .765, Benevolence .771, Tradition .797, Compliance .751, and Security .759. Also, Alpha value of the overall scale was calculated as .869.

Tolerance Scale: The tolerance Scale (Adult Form) was developed with 2 dimensions and a total of 10 items. The first sub-dimension (Respect for Differences) includes 6 items (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10) and the second sub-dimension (Acceptance) includes 4 items (2, 4, 6, 8). The items of the scale are graded in a 5-point Likert style. In this way, according to the opinions of the participants, the expressions in each item are evaluated as; "Not at all appropriate (1)", ..., and "Totally appropriate (5)" by selecting the appropriate option. In evaluating the arithmetic averages, the findings were interpreted based on the score ranges as "1.00-1.80 meant not appropriate at all"; "1.81-2.60 meant somewhat appropriate"; "2.61-3.40 meant appropriate"; "3.41-4.20 meant very appropriate". "4.21-5.00 meant totally appropriate".

The overall Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient of the scale was determined to be .82, the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of the first factor (Respect for Differences) was determined to be .85 and the Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient of the second factor (Acceptance) was determined to be.67. As a result of the reliability analyzes in the study, the overall scale Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient was found to be .828. The Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient was calculated to be .833 for the first factor (Respect for Differences) and .716 for the second factor (Acceptance).

Regarding the permissions to use the scales, notification was received from the relevant scale authors through e-mails. Also, the data were reported sequentially by

giving codes such as K1, K2, K3 to the collected participant forms to increase the reliability of the study.

2.4. Data Analysis

Before the data analysis, the definition of the data structure was checked to clear the dataset from errors by checking whether there was an error in the data entry. In this way, if the data entry person had a coding error, it was based on the principle of detecting and correcting such errors (Durmuş, Yurtkoru & Çinko, 2013, p.52). As the first step, the data analysis process was started. In this process, the SPSS Version 20 package program was used. In the second step, it was checked whether the data showed a normal distribution, and the skewness and kurtosis values of the data were evaluated. In this process, the explanations in the literature were evaluated. For example, Tabashnick and Fidell's (2007) report that values for kurtosis and skewness could range from -1.5 to +1.5, and George and Mallery's (2010) report arguing that skewness and kurtosis coefficients should be between +2 and -2 were taken into consideration to accept that the data were normally distributed.

In the present study, according to the analysis of the normal distribution, the skewness and kurtosis values were determined to be sufficient in terms of gender (Skewness: .78, Kurtosis -1.40), department studied (Skewness: -.195, Kurtosis -1.308), grade (Skewness: .411, Kurtosis: -1.398), maternal education level (Skewness: -.332, Kurtosis: -.588), father's education level (Skewness: -.025, Kurtosis: -.963), and place of residence (Skewness: -1.391, Kurtosis: .649). In this way, it was accepted that the data were in accordance with the normal distribution, and the analysis process was continued.

In data analysis, descriptive statistics (arithmetic mean, frequency, and percentage calculation), parametric T-test, and ANOVA test were used. Also, correlation analysis was used to determine the correlation between the values that teacher candidates tend to and their tolerance tendencies. In evaluating the correlation coefficient, a correlation score below 0.50 was accepted as a weak correlation score between 0.50 and 0.70, and a correlation score of 0.70 and above showing a strong correlation (Durmuş, Yurtkoru & Çinko, 2013, p.145).

3. Results

3.1. Results regarding the first sub-question

Regarding the first sub-question of the study, "What are the value orientations of teacher candidates?", the descriptive findings obtained as a result of the analysis are given in Table 2.

Table 2. The Average Scores and Standard Deviation Values Received from the Portrait Values Scale regarding the value orientations of teacher candidates

Factor Title	Power (P)	Achievement (A)	Hedonism (H)	Stimulation (Sti)	Self-direction (Self)	Universalism (U)	Benevolence (B)	Tradition (T)	Conformity (C)	Security (Sec)
x̄	4,0950	4,5178	4,8148	4,6106	5,1353	5,1643	4,8925	4,2215	4,5249	5,1066
SS	1,06719	,96337	,94829	,87959	,63992	,71852	,76135	,90706	,82587	,68863
Min.	1,00	2,00	1,67	2,00	3,00	2,33	1,50	1,50	2,00	2,60
Max.	6,00	6,00	6,00	6,00	6,00	6,00	6,00	6,00	6,00	6,00
n	351	351	351	351	351	351	351	351	351	351

Regarding the results of the analysis, it is seen in Table 2 that the value orientations of the teacher candidates in the context of average scores were concentrated on the values of Universalism (x̄ = 5.1643), Self-direction (x̄ = 5.1353), and Security (x̄ =5.1066), and these values were found to have high average scores. The Universalism value was rated highly in the range of "*Very similar to me"* by respondents. Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self- direction, Benevolence, Conformity, and Security values were scored in the "*similar"* range. On the other hand, Power (x̄ = 4.0950) and Tradition (x̄ = 4.2215) values were found to be "*A little similar to me*, with a lower average score from the participants compared to other value types. For this reason, it can be argued that these two value dimensions were lower in teacher candidates.

3.2. Results regarding the second sub-question

The findings obtained as a result of the analysis conducted to examine whether there is a significant difference concerning the second sub-question of this study, "Does value orientations of teacher candidates differ according to variables such as gender, type of department, grade, mother's education level, father's education level, place of residence?" are given below.

Table 3. The T-test results of the teacher candidates in the Portrait Value Scale according to gender

	Gender	N	x̄	SS	df	t	p
Hedonism	Female	239	4,9484	,87854	349	3,934	,000*
	Male	112	4,5298	1,02964			
Universalism	Female	239	5,1778	,62826	349	2,745	,006*
	Male	112	5,0446	,65778			

As seen in Table 3, it was found that the value orientations of the pre-service teachers showed a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of Hedonism (p=.000<.05) and Universalism (p=.006<.05) according to gender, and the scores for these two dimensions were presented. When the mean values of the difference were examined, a significant difference was detected in favor of women in the Hedonism and Universalism sub-dimensions.

Table 4. The ANOVA results regarding the Portrait Values Scale scores of the teacher candidates according to the departments

Factor Title	P	A	H	Sti.	Self.	U	B	T	C	Sec.
F	1,065	,403	1,255	,345	1,438	1,832	1,965	2,093	1,337	,335
Sig. (p)	,373	,806	,287	,848	,221	,122	,099	,081	,256	,854

No significant differences were detected in the value orientation dimensions of the teacher candidates according to the department they studied. In this case, it was not necessary to look at other Post-Hoc Test values.

Table 5. The ANOVA results regarding the Portrait Values Scale scores of the teacher candidates according to grades

Factor Title	P	A	H	Sti.	Self.	U	B	T	C	Sec.
F	,754	1,801	,748	,260	,282	1,895	1,870	2,907	1,851	4,501
Sig. (p)	,521	,147	,524	,854	,839	,130	,134	,035*	,138	,004*

As seen in Table 5, the F value and Sig. (p) value in the analysis of ANOVA, in the value orientation dimensions of the teacher candidates according to the grades, there was a significant difference in Tradition (p=.035<.05) and Security (p=.004 <.05) dimensions. In this case, the Post-Hoc Test values for the Tradition and Security dimensions were evaluated. The Scheffe Test results revealed that there was a significant difference in the Tradition dimension between Grade 2 ($\bar{x}$ = 4.4924) and Grade 4 ($\bar{x}$ = 3.9167). According to these results, it was determined that the 2nd-grade students had a higher average score than the 4th-grade students in the Tradition dimension. It was determined that the significant difference in Security dimension was between Grade 1 ($\bar{x}$ = 5.2058) and Grade 4 ($\bar{x}$ = 4.8178). According to these results, it was determined that the 1st-grade students had a higher average score than the 4th-grade students in the Security value dimension.

Table 6. The ANOVA results of teacher candidates' Portrait Values Scale scores according to the mother's education level

Factor Title	P	A	H	Sti.	Self.	U	B	T	C	Sec.
F	,721	2,409	5,092	,640	,711	,979	2,653	2,475	2,288	,561
Sig. (p)	,540	,067	,002*	,590	,546	,403	,050	,061	,078	,641

It is seen in Table 6 that according to ANOVA analysis and the F value and Sig. (p) value, there was a significant difference in teacher candidates' mother's education levels in Hedonism (p=, 002 <.05) dimension. In this case, Post-Hoc Test values in the Hedonism dimension were evaluated. When the Scheffe Test results were evaluated, a significant difference was detected between the groups in terms of mothers' education levels and not being graduated from school and secondary and higher education graduates in the "Hedonism" value dimension. Considering the average scores of the mothers of the participants in the Hedonism dimension for this difference, it was detected that the mean value of the group not graduating from school ($\bar{x}$ = 4.4520) differed from the averages of the secondary school graduates ($\bar{x}$ = 5.0337) and higher education graduates ($\bar{x}$ = 4.9762). The significant difference was found to be in favor of the mother being a secondary or higher education graduate.

Table 7. The ANOVA results of teacher candidates' Portrait Values Scale scores according to the father's education level

Factor Title	P	A	H	Sti.	Self.	U	B	T	C	Sec.
F	,798	1,622	1,539	1,181	,569	2,307	1,448	2,966	3,042	1,067
Sig. (p)	,496	,184	,204	,317	,636	,076	,229	,032*	,029*	,363

As seen in Table 7, as a result of the analysis of the F value and Sig. (p) value, in the value orientation dimensions of teacher candidates according to father's education levels, it was determined that there was a significant difference in Tradition (p=.032<.05) and Conformity (p=.029<.05) dimensions. In this case, Post-Hoc Test values for Tradition and Conformity dimensions were evaluated. When the Scheffe Test results were examined, a difference was determined between the father's education level being not a school graduate ($\bar{x}$ = 4,7500) and the father's higher education degree ($\bar{x}$ = 4,0455) in the "Tradition" value dimension. In this context, when the average score values were examined, it was found that the Tradition value score was higher if the father did not have school graduation when compared to the father's higher education graduate. In the "Conformity" value dimension, a significant difference was detected between the father's

being a primary school graduate and higher education graduate. Considering the average scores in the Conformity value dimension, a difference was detected in mean scores between the father's being higher education graduate ($\bar{x}$ =4.3722) and the father's being a primary school graduate (4,6742). In this regard, it was also found that the father's being primary education graduate had a higher score in the Conformity value dimension compared to his higher education graduate.

Table 8. The ANOVA results of teacher candidates' Portrait Values Scale scores according to the place of residence

Factor Title	P	A	H	Sti.	Self.	U	B	T	C	Sec.
F	1,094	4,636	1,212	,477	,496	,368	2,404	4,618	,543	,738
Sig. (p)	,336	,010*	,299	,621	,610	,693	,092	,010*	,582	,479

As seen in Table 8, when the F value and Sig. (p) values were evaluated, the teacher candidates participating in the study were classified according to the place of residence in value orientation dimensions, and significant differences were determined in the Achievement (p=.010 <.05) and Tradition (p= .010 <.05) dimensions. In this case, Achievement Post-Hoc Test values were checked for the Achievement and Tradition dimensions. When the Scheffe Rest results were evaluated, the "Achievement" value dimension differed between the groups living in a village-town settlement ($\bar{x}$ =4.0379) and a district settlement ($\bar{x}$ =4.5473) or a city center settlement ($\bar{x}$ =4.5738). Also, according to the average scores, it was found that the level of success value of the participants residing in the district or city center settlement fields was higher than the participants residing in the villages/towns. Also, a difference was detected between the village/town settlement ($\bar{x}$ =4.6061) and the city center settlement ($\bar{x}$ =4.1373) in the "Tradition" value dimension. In this regard, it was determined in the Tradition value dimension that the participants residing in the village-town settlement area had a higher level of traditionalism compared to the participants residing in the city center.

3.3. Results obtained in the third sub-question

The third sub-question of the study, "What is the tendency of teacher candidates in tolerance and sub-dimensions?" The descriptive findings obtained as a result of the analysis conducted for this question are given in Table 9.

Table 9. The Average Scores and Standard Deviation Values of the teacher candidates received from the Tolerance Scale

Factor Title	Respect for Differences	Acceptance
x̄	3,9117	2,8946
SS	,79430	,86123
Min.	1	1
Max.	5	5
n	351	351

The average scores and standard deviation results obtained within the framework of the sub-dimensions of the tolerance scale can be seen in Table 9. It was determined that the teacher candidates who participated in the study had higher scores in "Respect for Differences" (x̄ = 3.9117), the first sub-dimension of tolerance, compared to the second sub-dimension "Acceptance" (x̄ = 2.8946). When the mean scores of the dimensions were evaluated in the context of scale options, the tolerance level of the participants was determined as *very appropriate* in terms of respect for differences, and the level of tolerance was detected as *appropriate* in terms of acceptance.

3.4. Results obtained in the fourth sub-question

The fourth sub-question of the study, "What kind of a correlation is there between the values that teacher candidates tend towards and their tolerance tendencies?" The findings obtained as a result of the correlation analysis made to determine the correlation status in terms of this question are given in Table 10.

Table 10. The correlation between teacher candidates' value orientations based on Portrait Values Scale scores and tolerance levels based on Tolerance Scale

		Power (P)	Achievement (A)	Hedonism (H)	Stimulation (Sit.)	Self-direction (Self.)	Universalism (U)	Benevolence (B)	Tradition (T)	Conformity (C)	Security (Sec.)	Respect for Differences (R)	Acceptance (Ac.)
P	r	1	,487**	,305**	,295**	,246**	,051	,030	-,064	,394**	,183**	-,014	-,106*
	p		,000	,000	,000	,000	,337	,573	,235	,000	,001	,796	,048
A	r		1	,334**	,352**	,331**	,251**	,133*	,073	,437**	,386**	,094	-,076
	p			,000	,000	,000	,000	,013	,172	,000	,000	,079	,154
H	r			1	,506**	,324**	,210**	,226**	-,057	,170**	,224**	,117*	-,045
	p				,000	,000	,000	,000	,291	,001	,000	,028	,404
Sit.	r				1	,475**	,267**	,275**	,034	,186**	,237**	,175**	,014
	p					,000	,000	,000	,528	,000	,000	,001	,791
Self.	r					1	,408**	,274**	,003	,247**	,344**	,196**	-,027
	p						,000	,000	,956	,000	,000	,000	,616
U	r						1	,479**	,334**	,452**	,545**	,393**	,084
	p							,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,114
B	r							1	,393**	,427**	,414**	,295**	,426**
	p								,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
T	r								1	,500**	,388**	,115*	,155**
	p									,000	,000	,031	,004
C	r									1	,521**	,167**	,072
	p										,000	,002	,175
Sec.	r										1	,210**	,006
	p											,000	,915
R.	r											1	,433**
	p												,000
Ac.	r												1
	p												

*p < .001

As seen in Table 10, the correlation between teacher candidates' (n: 351) value orientations based on Portrait Values Scale scores and tolerance levels based on Tolerance Scale was analyzed with the Correlation Analysis in terms of the sub-dimensions of the scales. When the Pearson r and p significance values given in the table were evaluated, a significant correlation was detected between the "Universalism" and "Respect for Diversity" dimensions (r: 0.388, p≤0.05). This correlation was detected at a positive and weak level according to the r-value. Also, the correlation between the

"Benevolence" value dimension and both dimensions of tolerance drew attention. A positive and weak correlation was detected between Benevolence value and Respect for Diversity (r: 0.295, p≤0.05) and Acceptance (r: 0.426, p≤0.05). Regarding the other correlation scores in the table, it was also found that most of the correlation scores between value dimensions and tolerance dimensions showed a weak and low-level correlation.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

As a result of the present study, many findings were reached in the scope of the sub-questions of the study. It was found in the scope of the first sub-question that the value orientations of the teacher candidates participating in the study focused on the values of *Universalism, Self-direction, and Security.* Universalism value was "*Very similar*", with the highest average rating. Power and Tradition values, on the other hand, were detected as values with lower average scores when compared to other value types. Oğuz (2012) also reported in his study that teacher candidates mostly participated in the values of universalism, benevolence, and security. Özdemir (2018), on the other hand, reported that the values that teacher candidates most adopted were "universality, security, and benevolence", respectively. İnce and Bilgiç (2021) also reported the value that teacher candidates attached the most importance to was universalism in the first place and security in the second place, according to their average value scores. These findings are similar to our study findings.

Parametric tests were conducted in the scope of the second sub-question of the study by considering the value orientations of teacher candidates in the context of many variables. As a result of these tests, it was found that the value orientations of the teacher candidates differed significantly in the sub-dimensions of Hedonism and Universalism according to gender. The direction of this difference showed a difference in favor of women in both dimensions. In this regard, in the findings obtained in the study of Köksoy and Daşdemir (2019), a difference was reported in the *Universalism* value dimension in the value orientations of teacher candidates according to gender, and it was detected that female teacher candidates had a higher tendency in this value compared to males. Similarly, in the study of Mehmedoğlu (2006), the result of the *t*-test for the value orientations of the participating university students according to gender revealed a difference in favor of women in the *Universalism* value dimension. On the other hand, in the study of Yılmaz, Avşaroğlu, and Deniz (2010), no statistical differences were reported as a result of the analysis of teacher candidates' value orientations in terms of gender.

No significant differences were detected in the value orientation dimensions of the teacher candidates participating in the study according to the department they studied. However, there were differences in value orientation dimensions in terms of the grades in which the teacher candidates studied. In the Tradition value dimension, it was

determined that the 2nd Year students had a higher average score than the 4th Year students. In the Security dimension, it was determined that 1st Year students had a higher average score compared to 4th Year students. When the literature was reviewed in this respect, Dilmaç, Hasan Bozgeyikli and Çıkılı (2008) found a significant difference in Tradition dimension according to the grades of teacher candidates in their studies and stated that the Tradition value perceptions of the third-grade students, first, second and fourth-grade students are higher than the Tradition value perceptions. Yapıcı, Kutlu and Bilican (2012) analyzed the value orientations of pre-service teachers according to the grades of the pre-service teachers and found a significant decrease in the Security values of senior students among Philosophy Group Teaching students. In addition, he found a significant decrease in 4th-grade students in the Tradition category among Art Education students. These findings are similar to the findings of the current study.

In this study, the effect of parents' education levels of teacher candidates participating in the study on value orientations was examined. As a result of the analysis, according to the mother's education level, a significant difference was determined between the groups whose mother's education level was not a school graduate and who was a secondary or higher education graduate in the Hedonism dimension. The direction of the difference was determined to be higher levels of the participants whose mothers were graduates of secondary or higher education when compared to the group whose mothers did not graduate from school. Similarly, in the study of Köksoy and Daşdemir (2019), it was reported that as the education level of the mother increased, the teacher candidates' Hedonism value tendency scores increased and the hedonism value tendencies of the teacher candidates whose mothers were university graduates were higher than those whose mothers were illiterate or primary, secondary and high school graduates. This finding is consistent with our study findings.

In addition, according to the father's education level of teacher candidates, it was determined in the "Tradition" value dimension that the average value score of the participants whose fathers did not graduate from school was higher than the group whose fathers graduated from higher education. It was determined in the Harmony value dimension that the participants whose fathers were primary school graduates were at a higher level in this dimension than those whose fathers were graduates of higher education. In this regard, Köksoy and Dasdemir (2019) reported in their study that the educational status of fathers did not affect the value tendencies of teacher candidates. This finding differs from our study findings. Right at this point, in the study of Sarıcı Bulut (2012), as a result of examining the value tendencies of teacher candidates according to the education level of their parents, it was found that in the Benevolence value dimension, the education level of the parents was higher (university and post-graduate), illiterate and primary school graduates. In the context of these determinations, it can be argued that the education level of the parents may affect the value orientations of the teacher candidates.

It was found in the study that the value orientation of the teacher candidates according to the place of residence is in the value dimension of "Achievement", and the level of achievement value of the participants who resided in the district or city center settlement areas was higher than the participants who resided in the village/town settlement area. In the "Tradition" value dimension, it was determined that the participants who resided in the village-town settlement area had a higher level of traditionalism when compared to the participants who resided in the city center. Similar to this finding, Dilmaç, Hasan Bozgeyikli and Çıkılı (2008) reported in their study that the Tradition dimension of teacher candidates who spent most of their lives in villages and towns was higher than in the city center. However, Köksoy and Daşdemir (2019) did not detect any differences between the value orientations of teacher candidates according to the place they lived and argued that the place where the teacher candidates lived did not affect their value tendencies. In this respect, different findings are reported in the literature. Right at this point, it can be argued that the social structure and lifestyle that is widely accepted in the place of residence have effects on the process of individuals' upbringing and the formation of value orientations.

Regarding the third sub-question of the study, the tolerance tendency levels of teacher candidates were determined at a higher level in the "Respect for Differences" dimension when compared to the "Acceptance" dimension. As a result of the present study, although the tolerance level of the participants was very appropriate in Respect for Differences, the level of tolerance was determined as appropriate in terms of acceptance. It was also found that the general average score in the tolerance tendency scale used by Gündüz (2019) corresponded to the "Appropriate" range. Gül and Alimbekov (2020) determined the average of the scores obtained by the candidates at a high level in the tolerance scale used to determine the tolerance tendency levels of teacher candidates. These findings support our findings. Finally, in the fourth sub-question of the study, the relationship between value orientations and tolerance was examined. According to the correlation analysis, a significant and low-level weak relationship was detected between the value dimensions, especially in "Universalism" and "Benevolence", and "Tolerance". No results were detected in the literature regarding this finding.

Suggestions developed in line with the results of the study are as follows.

- In the present study, the value orientation and tolerance levels of teacher candidates were evaluated with the quantitative method. In future studies, the subject can be evaluated in more detail by using techniques such as interviews and qualitative methods in the teacher candidates.

- Value orientations of teacher candidates were high in *Universalism, Self- direction, and Security* dimensions, but *Power and Tradition* values were detected to be at a lower level. Qualitative studies can be prepared with teacher candidates to examine the reasons for these findings in more detail.

- The finding can be evaluated in more depth by conducting qualitative studies on the finding of teacher candidates that women have a higher level of adoption than men in the Hedonism and Universalism value dimensions.

- A difference was detected in some sub-dimensions between the value orientations of the teacher candidates according to the place of residence, but it was found that there was no difference in some studies in the literature. Future qualitative studies focusing on the theme of value and living environment can be prepared within the framework of questions such as what are the effects of the settlements where the teacher candidates live on their value tendencies, and why.

- Tolerance tendency levels of the teacher candidates were determined to be at a high level, in this respect, many educational activities can be organized to increase the tolerance levels of students in the process of training teacher candidates.

References

Aydın, M. Z. (2021). Karakter, değerler ve ahlak eğitiminin özellikleri, ilkeleri ve felsefi temelleri. M.Z. Aydın (Eds.), In *Karakter ve değer eğitimi* (pp.106-120). Nobel Yayıncılık.

Balcı, A. (2007). Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma. Yöntem, Teknik ve Araştırma. Pegem Yayıncılık.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö.E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2015). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. Pegem Yayıncılık.

Çalışkan, H., & Çavuş, E. (2020). Tolerance tendency scale form for adults: A Study of reliability and validity. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi, 18* (40), 181-205. https://doi.org/10.34234/ded.731250

Demirutku, K. & Sümer, N. (2010). The measurement of basic values: Turkish adaptation of Portrait Values Questionnaire, *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları, 13 (25), 17-25.*

Diktaş, A. & Baş, K. (2020). Değer eğitimi dersinin sosyal bilgiler öğretmen adaylarına kazandırdıkları. *Turkish Studies Education*, 15(5), 3261-3275.

Dilmaç, B., Bozgeyikli, H., & Çikili, Y. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının değer algılarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, *6*(16), 69-91.

Durmuş, B., Yurtkoru, E. S. & Çinko, M. (2013). Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS'le veri analizi. Beta Yayıncılık.

Ekşi, H. & Katılmış, A. (2020). Kavramsal çerçeve: Temel kavramlar. H. Ekşi, & A. Katılmış (Eds.), In *Karakter ve Değer Eğitimi* (pp.1-21). Nobel Yayıncılık.

Erdemir, B. (2019). Yirmi birinci yüzyılda eğitimle ilgili yönelimler..M. Şahin & T. Aytaç (Eds.), In *Eğitime Giriş*, (pp.294-306). Pegem Yayıncılık.

Genç, S. Z. (2020). Değerler: Temel kavramlar. S. Z. Genç ve Beldağ, A. (Eds.) In *Karakter ve Değer Eğitimi* (pp.3-15). Pegem Yayıncılık.

George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: a simple guide and reference, 17.0 update (10a ed.).* Pearson.

Getzels, J. W. (1957). Changing values challenge the schools. *The School Review*, *65*(1), 92-102.

Güçlü, M. (2015). Türkiye'de değerler eğitimi konusunda yapılan araştırmalar. *Journal of International Social Research*, *8*(38), 720-733.

Gül, Y. E., & Alimbekov, A. (2020). Öğretmen adaylarının hoşgörü ve yaşam doyum düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies*, *15*(2), 831-849. https://dx.doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.39864

Gündüz, M. (2019). Öğretmen adaylarının sahip oldukları hoşgörü düzeylerinin belirlenmesi. *SDU International Journal of Educational Studies, 6*(2), 43-52.

İnce, A., & Bilgiç, F. (2021). Öğretmen adaylarının değer yönelimlerinin Milli Eğitimin Genel Amaçları çerçevesinde incelenmesi. *PESA Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *7*(2), 76-84. Doi: https://doi.org/10.25272/j.2149-8385.2021.7.2.01

Kıroğlu, K., Elma, C., Kesten, A., & Egüz, Ş. (2012). Üniversitede demokratik bir değer olarak hoşgörü. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, *3*(2), 86-104.

Köksoy, A. M., & Dasdemir, I. (2019). Factors affecting teacher candidates' value preferences. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, *15*(6), 102-121. DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2019.215.7

Leonard, P., & Leonard, L. (2006). Teachers and tolerance: Discriminating diversity dispositions. *The Teacher Educator*, *42*(1), 30-62.

Mehmedoğlu, A. U. (2006). İlâhiyat Fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer yönelimleri ve dindarlık-değer ilişkisi (M.Ü. İlâhiyat Fakültesi Örneği). *Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 30* (1): 133-167.

Oğuz, E. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının değerler ve değerler eğitimine ilişkin görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, *12*(2), 1309-1325.

Özdemir, S. (2018). *Öğretmen adaylarının değer tercihleri.* [II. Uluslararası Sınırsız Eğitim ve Araştırma Sempozyumu]. Bildiri Kitabı. Muğla. https://acikerisim.bartin.edu.tr/handle/11772/1673

Saulius, T. (2013). What is "tolerance" and "tolerance education"? Philosophical perspectives. *Baltic Journal of Sport and Health Sciences*, *2*(89).

Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M., & Owens, V. (2001). Extending the Cross-Cultural Validity of the Theory of Basic Human Values with a Different Method of Measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *32*(5), 519–542. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032005001

Schwartz, S. H. (2006). Basic human values: An overview. https://uranos.ch/research/references/Schwartz_2006/Schwartzpaper.pdf

Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116

Şimşek, N. (2012). Değişen toplumda değerler ve eğitimi: Bireysellik ve dayanışma, *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(4):1358-1386 ISSN: 1303-0094.

T.C. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (2017). Öğretmenlik Mesleği Genel Yeterlikleri (The Ministry of National Education). Öğretmen Yetiştirme ve Geliştirme Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Pearson.

Tüzel İşeri, E. (2022). 21. Yüzyılda Eğitim Becerileri. Ö. Demirel & Z. Kaya & K. Kıroğlu (Eds.) In *Eğitime Giriş.* (pp.294-313). Pegem Yayıncılık.

Uygun, M. (2021). Karakter gelişimi ve eğitiminde aile, çevre ve okul. M. Z. Aydın (Eds.) In *Karakter ve Değer Eğitimi* (pp.25-41). Nobel Yayıncılık.

Ünal, F. (2019). Karakter gelişiminde ve eğitimde aile, çevre ve okul. V. Aktepe & M. Gündüz (Eds.), In *Karakter ve Değer Eğitimi*. (pp.42-61). Pegem Yayıncılık.

Yapıcı, A., Kutlu, M. O., & Bilican, F. I. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının değer yönelimleri. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *11*(42), 129-151.

Yılmaz, E., Avşaroğlu, S., & Deniz, M. (2010). An investigation of teacher candidates' value preferences. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 4943-4948. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.800