



Examination of the Responsibility and Tolerance of Students Raised in Families with Different Cultural Structures *

Hüseyin Çalışkan ¹, Yusuf Yıldırım ², Güneş Kılınc ³

Abstract

This study was carried out with two goals: The first is to demonstrate the predictive progress of value of tolerance by the value of responsibility. The second is to examine the levels of tolerance and responsibility value of the seventh and eighth grade students in secondary schools who are growing up in families in different cultural structures according to some variables. The study group is comprised of a total of 669 students in the seventh and grades of secondary school. Stratified sampling method is used since the population of the study is wide. Accordingly, students raised in families with different cultural structures such as Turkish, Arabic, Kurdish, Albanian, Bosnian, Romani (Gypsy), Laz, Georgian, Circassian, Bulgarian immigrant are selected. Thus, the cities of Bursa and Sakarya where majority of these students live along with the cities of İzmir, Van, Bitlis, Kahramanmaraş and Yozgat have been selected as the study area. The individuals were reached via "Fellow Citizen Associations". Required permits were obtained from the Provincial Directorates of National Education. Individuals in the sample group were selected from among villages where people with the same culture live. In addition, studies were conducted at city centers as well and the students reached were asked which cultural community they belong to. "Tolerance tendency scale" and "responsibility scale" were used in the study as data acquisition tools.

As a result, it was determined that the responsibility value of the students predict the tolerance value at a rate of 29%. In addition, statistically significant differences were determined between the responsibility and tolerance levels of students according to the cultural environment and gender of the students while no difference was determined according to class level.

Keywords

Tolerance Responsibility
Value
Cultural structure
Student

Article Info

Received: 06.12.2018
Accepted: 01.08.2019
Online Published: 06.24.2019

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2019.7986

* This article is the extended version of the paper and presented at the "6th International Symposium on Social Studies Education".

¹ Sakarya University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Education, Turkey, caliskan06@gmail.com

² Bursa İnegöl Erdem Beyazıt Religious Secondary School, Turkey, yusufyildirimakademik@gmail.com

³ Veysel Karani Religious Secondary School, Turkey, gunesbayrak@gmail.com

Introduction

Societies produce material and nonmaterial works for as long as they are in existence. "Culture is defined as the whole material and nonmaterial values produced within the social development process as well as all the tools which are used to transfer these to posterity which also indicate the dominance of mankind on its natural and social environment" (TDK, 2005, p. 1282). Culture is the complete set of norms, behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, values, traditions, language and the works of art of a certain culture. Whereas cultural elements are what set a society apart from others (MEB, 2017).

It is known that Anatolia has been a cradle for civilizations for thousands of years. In addition, Turks lived and socialised together with many different civilizations in their history for thousands of years. Due to these two main reasons, it is seen that many different cultural structures are living together in Anatolia in proportion to the size of surface area. It is focused on the existence and characteristics of regional cultural differences through the disciplines such as social studies. In this process, it is emphasized that cultural differences are a source of wealth and their unifying characteristics rather than a distinctive aspect.

There are different cultural structures living with Turks in these lands. Turkish Republic has a multicultural structure because of circumstances such as the war in the neighboring regions and natural disasters. Multiculturalism situation is not only valid for Turkey. Humanity has differentiated due to many reasons (biological, geographical, intellectual, socio-cultural, etc.) and has emerged the multicultural societies since his existence (Polat, 2012). Parekh (2002) is not only associated multiculturalism with difference and identity, but is also associated with differences and identities fused with culture and nourished by it, that is to say, with beliefs and practices which a group of people use to regulate their individual and collective lives and understand themselves and the world.

It can be understood upon an examination of the definitions of culture in literature (Adler, 1956; Chittenden, 1993; Cohen, 2006; Guo & Jamal, 2007; Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, & Sanders, 1990; Mitchell & Willower, 1992; Musamali & Barbara, 2016) that values make up a significant part of culture. Because the sum of all values makes up culture (Özkartal, 2009).

There is a strong relationship between value and culture. Values are among the important factors which make up culture in addition to being a fundamental factor that is under the influence of culture while also being shaped according to culture. Value lies at the essence of the individual; culture and environment determine what it will turn out to be (Öztürk Samur, 2011). For instance, all societies have the value of respect; however it differs among societies how respect is shown. Culture determines which behavior is respectful and which is not. Because the values of humans are affected from their environments (Hofstede, 1976) and the values are mostly determined by social structures and cultural patterns (Pennings, 1970). In short, value cannot be thought of as independent of culture (Morsümbül, 2014).

Values are mental representations used as a guide by individuals for organizing their biological requirements, behaviors as well as relationships with social institutions and their environment (Schwartz, 1992a). They generally represent what is considered by the people as good, right, valuable and important (Nguyen, 2016) passions, dreams and hopes (Chorro, Fernández, & Corbí, 2017). They are beliefs as to what is important and include normative judgments (Scott, 2000, s. 500). They point at the nature and quality of the behaviors of individuals (Davidovitch & Soen, 2015); they have an impact on the ideas, emotions and behaviors of people (Nguyen, 2016). Shortly, they form the essence of ideas, emotions and behaviors. The existence of values can be known not directly, but by way of the reflection of ideas, emotions and behaviors. Because shared values gain meaning only when they are applied to objects or events (Dimmock & Walker, 1998). In addition, values also represent social control devices, mechanisms of balance and stability in the society (Hussein, 2016). They are both internal and external to people (Ruiz-Lozano, de los Rios-Bergillos, Tirado-Valencia, & Millan-Lara, 2012). They express self-control inside the individual and social control outside of the individual.

Responsibilities are obligations acquired by individuals as a result of their roles. The responsibilities of people increase as the roles they play in the society increase. Responsibility is a fundamental means of grasping social life (Hamilton, 1978), a sense of self-obligation and commitment (Lauermaun & Karabenick, 2011). Responsibility is the type of response given to encountered behaviors (Özgökbil Biliş, 2011). In addition, it is assumed that obligations may arise due either to attributions by others or the sense of responsibility of an individual (Helker & Wosnitza, 2014). It expresses a decision on the responsibility of sanctions based on a certain rule (Hamilton, 1978). The source of responsibilities may be either internal or external (Bacon, 1991). Responsibility is a circumstance that varies between necessity and obligation. A moderate level of responsibility is desired. However, an excessive sense of responsibility automatically generates negative ideas and disturbances (Bouchard, Rheoume, & Ladouceur, 1999). While some of the responsibilities are earned naturally (being born in a certain family), others may occur via education, membership, marriage. There are different circles of responsibilities towards one's own self, family, society, nature and all of humanity. These responsibilities change at every circle that people have. The fact that people do not fully carry out their responsibilities is among the primary issues of contemporary societies. This leads to social unrest.

Tolerance is another value that is required for attaining social peace. The word tolerance is expressed as *müsamaha* in Arabic. "Tolerance is the state of condoning everything in understanding" (TDK, 2005, p. 901). Tolerance is respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world's cultures, forms of expression and ways of being human (UNESCO, 1995). It is based on accepting others by protecting the borders of one's own individuality (Belasheva & Petrova, 2016). It is the ability to stand the opinions and actions of others and to act without getting angry at them (Kaztaevna, Omarovna, Askerkhanovna, Zhanarbekovna, & Erezhepovna, 2015). The tolerance applied today is moving beyond showing respect to one's difference in thinking and behavior. It demands that almost all ideologies or personal applications are morally legitimized (Von Bergen & Collier, 2013). It is not only a moral duty but also a political and legal requirement (UNESCO, 1995). Tolerance is a whole that is comprised of patience, acceptance and kindness through compassion. "Enduring or accepting" by itself is not sufficient for tolerance (Schwartz, 1996).

Hostility towards foreigners, racism, sexism, religious intolerance and corresponding social discrimination has started to be observed more and primarily in USA which has become a varied and complex society (Shepherd & Shepherd, 2014). One of the issues of our day is the emergence of conflicts between different cultural, ethnic and religious groups both in and between countries (UNESCO, 1992). This has resulted made tolerance education as essential as ever for all societies.

Value, be it internal or external, is the component of what is desired for an individual or group. This understanding affects the selection of accessible types of action, tools and goals. Internal values may be expressed as those that are based on individuals, do not include compulsion, includes the sacrifices of individuals which organize the arrangement of social life. Tolerance, love, empathy are among several. These values are mostly related with the initiative of the individual. Whereas external values are those that arise from the obligations of the individual towards himself/herself and the society, which contain certain compulsions and which play a role in the organization of social life. Responsibility, love, fairness are among the few. These values are out of the scope of the initiative of the individual. There is always an interaction between internal and external values. The strength of value may be measured by observing the internally and externally applied enforcements and measuring the level of efforts Değerin gücü, dâhili ve harici olarak uygulanan yaptırımların gözlemlenmesi ve devletlerin, nesnelere veya olayların elde edilmesine veya sürdürülmesine yönelik çabaların derecesi ölçülerek belirlenebilir (Kluckhohn, 1951). Responsibility and tolerance stand on the two opposite tips of this interaction.

Many studies have been carried out for determining the impact of culture and society on values (Adler, 1956; Canabal, 2002; Chiu, Wong, & Kosinski, 1998; Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1992b). Certain institutions also carry out studies on values for measuring the impact of cultural values. European Value Survey (EVS) and World Value Survey (WVS) are leading. WVS is used to measure the value judgments

and beliefs of individuals living in a country in addition to their approaches towards people of different social groups accepted as the “other and hence the level of tolerance and democracy in that society is tried to be determined. The objective of examining values at the cultural dimension is to generate knowledge on abstract ideas based on social norms which are common among the society as a whole. The unit of examination at the cultural level is the cultural group (nation, ethnic group) itself (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000).

Turkey covers a geography where many nations and different cultures have lived together for centuries. It takes periodical immigration from Middle East, Balkan states, Central Asia and Turkic Republics. This has resulted in Turkey to have a multi-dimensional cultural structure as well as a different perception of the concepts of value based on this cultural structure difference. Turkish Republic that has a unitary structure make uniform application in the educational process in the country-wide. However, cultural practices differ from cultural practices in social structure. These differences also are reflected in the values of the families and the values that the students have by their families. Many researchers in the values education (Bektaş, 2007; Eser, 2012; Özensel, 2003; Sancak, 2011; Şahin & Ersoy, 2012; Yıldırım, 2014) and in the process of values’s transmission from generation to generation (Acat & Aslan, 2012; Aktay, 2003; Başaran, 2000; Baş & Beyhan, 2012; Gökdere & Çepni, 2003; Şen, 2007; Yıldırım, 2014) accepts that the family has a great importance. This situation in many researches (Çalışkan, Demirhan, & Bozkurt, 2012; Dereli & Alpay, 2012; Şahin & Ersoy, 2012) is discussed in terms of variables to measure the effect of family on values such as parents' education status (Çalışkan & Sağlam, 2012; Coşkun and Yıldırım: 2009; Dereli & Alpay, 2012; Gerris, Dekovic, & Janssens, 1997; Yıldırım, 2014), living place (Coşkun and Yıldırım: 2009; Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli, & Çıkılı, 2008), number of siblings (Yıldırım & Akpınar, 2016), family economic status (Dereli & Alpay, 2012; Dilmaç et al., 2008; Yapıcı & Zengin, 2003).

It can be observed upon an examination of the related literature that there are no studies which examine the impact of cultural differences in Turkey on values. Therefore, the objective of this study was to determine whether there are any differences with regard to the values of tolerance and responsibility between families raised in families with different cultural structures in Turkey. The reason why this study is carried out within the scope of tolerance and responsibility is that these values are directly related with social life. Since the lack of these values in community life can prevent the attainment of a healthy social life. The importance of this study is due to the fact that it will try to determine the values of tolerance and responsibility that the students in Turkey have from the perspective of various factors and that it will also put forth the impact of cultural structures on values at a local level.

Responsibility represents the tasks and duties that an individual mandatorily undertakes towards the society. Individuals have to carry out their responsibilities in a serious manner in order for the wheels of social life to operate smoothly. Otherwise, social disorder and chaos may develop. Therefore, responsibility can be expressed as the fundamental value for the society. Responsibility can be gained on by children at earlier ages in comparison with other values. Individuals may face this value starting from early ages onwards even if they have not gained it in their childhood. As all the other values, responsibility may also affect other social values or be affected by them. Tolerance is another value that is affected by the responsibility value level. Tolerance is built on acceptance, patience, and appreciation and showing empathy towards the society. It can be accepted as the smiling face of the individual turned towards the society.

The individual has to remain moderate with regard to the values of responsibility and tolerance without overdoing or neglecting them. As such, the individual may attain social and individual peace as long as he/she manages to remain at the center of these two values. If the harmony and balance between responsibility and tolerance cannot be attained, social problems starting from him/her may develop from the first, whereas individual unrest due to excessiveness and social problems due to its absence may develop from the second.

Students start to become aware of their own cultural structures starting with adolescence. It is indicated in literature that adolescence starts at around the ages of 11-13 (Koç, 2004; Selçuk 2005; Senemoğlu, 2004). Abstract thinking develops in students with reaching adolescence (Küçükkaragöz, 2007; Selçuk, 2005; Senemoğlu, 2004). Again in this period, students' interests against ideologies begin to emerge (Aydın, 2007; Küçükkaragöz, 2007). One of the most important features of this period is the beginning of the formation of value judgments of students (Can, 2007; Aydın, 2007; Senemoğlu, 2004). Students in this age group are in the position of choosing between rejection and adoption of social values (Selçuk, 2005) In other words, adolescence can be interpreted as a period of creating and developing students own values, a period of dealing with ideologies, being curious about social issues and becoming aware of values with the beginning of the abstract operational stage.

This generally corresponds to the secondary school period and covers the period when the social development of the individual takes place. During this period, adolescents start to think and discuss concepts such as philosophy, religion, politics, and death with the development of abstract thought. Social and cultural structures are indicated as sufficient conditions for the passage to abstract processes (Derman, 2008). Values are the building blocks of social and cultural structures. It is a period in which the identity of the individual forms. The individual is attracted to or affected by people from the opposite sex, heroes, religious topics, teachings and ideologies in an attempt to seek his/her own identity (Gürses & Kılavuz, 2011). Hence, this study has been carried out with seventh and eighth grade students. This research was carried out for two purposes. The first is to put forth the state of the value of responsibility in predicting the value of tolerance. The second, was to examine the levels of the values of tolerance and responsibility in secondary school seventh and eighth grade students raised in families with different cultural structures with regard to certain variables (the culture they have been raised in, gender, class level). Answers were sought for the following questions within the scope of these objectives:

1. Do responsibility value levels of students raised in families with different cultural structures predict the tolerance value levels?
2. At what level are the responsibility and tolerance levels of students raised in families with different cultural structures?
3. Do the responsibility and tolerance value levels of students raised in families with different cultural structures vary according to the cultural environment they were raised in, gender and class level?

Method

Study Model

Relational screening model from among the general screening models was used in the study. Relational screening models are research models used in studies that aim to examine whether there is covariance between two or more variables and/or the degree of this variance (Karasar, 2005). Relational screening model was used in this study since it is directed towards the relationship between the responsibility and tolerance levels of students raised in families with different cultural structures and since the state of these variables is compared with regard to different variables.

Study Group

The study group is comprised of 669 students continuing their education at the seventh and eighth grades of secondary school during the 2016-2017 academic year. Purposive sampling was used in the study. Stratified purposive sampling is the forming of certain sub-groups in order to put forth the characteristics of these sub-groups, define them and to make comparisons among them. Accordingly, students raised in families with different cultural structures including Turkish, Arabic, Kurdish, Albanian, Bosnian, Romani (Gypsy), Laz, Georgian, Abkhazian were selected as the sample group. Provinces of Bursa and Sakarya where immigrants comprise a majority were selected as the main center of the study, however data in accordance with the objective of the study were acquired from the provinces of İzmir, Bitlis, Van, Kahramanmaraş and Yozgat as well. "Fellow Citizen Associations" were used to reach most of the individuals included in the sample group. Required permits were obtained

from the Provincial Directorates of National Education. Individuals in the sample group were selected from among villages where people with the same culture live. In addition, studies were conducted at city centers as well and the students reached were asked which cultural community they belong to. Personal information for the students included in the sample group is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Personal Information of Students

Variable Name	Group Name	f	%
Gender	Female	315	47.1
	Male	354	52.9
Class Level	7 th Grade	349	52.2
	8 th Grade	320	47.8
Different Cultural Structure	Turkish	180	26.9
	Romani (Gypsy)	70	10.5
	Georgian	69	10.3
	Bosnian	59	8.8
	Kurdish	58	8.7
	Laz	56	8.4
	Arabic (Syria)	51	7.6
	Circassian	50	7.5
	Albanian	40	6.0
	Bulgaria immigrant	36	5.4
Total		669	100.0

Accordingly, of the 669 students who participated in the study 52.9% (f=354) were male, 47.1% (f=315) were female. Of these students, 52.2% (f=349) were seventh grade, 47.8% (f=320) were eighth grade students. In addition, 180 of the students who participated in the study were of Turkish (26.9%), 70 were of Romani (Gypsy) (10.5%), 69 were of Georgian (10.3%), 59 were of Bosnian (8.8%), 58 were of Kurdish (8.7%), 56 were of Laz (8.4%), 51 were of Arabic (7.6%), 50 were of Circassian (7.5%), 40 were of Albanian (6.0%) and 36 were Bulgarian immigrants (5.4%).

Data Acquisition Tools

“Responsibility Scale” and “Tolerance Tendency Scale” were used in the study as data acquisition tools.

Responsibility Scale: This scale is a Likert type single dimension scale comprised of 24 items and was developed by Abdi Golzar (2006) for measuring the responsibility levels of primary school students. Factor loads were determined to vary between .32 and .55 as a result of the exploratory factor analysis carried out. Relation coefficient was obtained via parallel scale analysis as .53, while the level of significance was determined as .01. The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 24, whereas the highest total score is 72. Cronbach Alfa coefficient calculated for determining the internal consistency of the scale was determined as .83. The internal consistency reliability coefficient for the data set acquired within the scope of this study was calculated as .74.

Tolerance Tendency Scale: The scale developed by Çalışkan and Sağlam (2012) has 18 items and is comprised of three sub-dimensions of empathy, acceptance and value. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were carried out during the scale development process. Of the total 47.97% variance explained, 35.22% is explained by the first factor, 6.88% by the second factor and 5.87% by the third factor. Fit indices of the model were examined via the confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) carried out for the construct validity of the scale and chi-square value ($\chi^2=549.39$, $N=889$, $sd=128$, $p=.00$) was determined to be statistically significant. Whereas the fit indices values were calculated as RMSEA=.061, NFI=.98, CFI=.98, IFI=.98, RFI=.97, GFI=.94, AGFI=.91 and SRMR=.04. The lowest score that can be

obtained from the scale is 18 and the highest score is 90. The internal consistency coefficient calculated for determining the reliability of the Tolerance Tendency Scale was determined as .89 and the test-retest reliability coefficient was determined as .84. Whereas the internal consistency reliability coefficient for the scale developed using the data set acquired within the scope of this study was calculated as .79.

Data Acquisition Process

The different cultural structures in Turkey were listed in detail prior to starting the application. Afterwards, it was determined in which cities these cultural structures live along with methods for how to acquire information related with them. Primarily, in these places are determined "Fellow Citizen Associations" were contacted. Then, village communities where the target groups mostly live are also among the contacted locations. New data were acquired as such. Finally, the students and their guardians included in the study were asked which other students we should get in contact with and thus new students were tried to be reached for acquiring new data. If sufficient data could not be reached, required permissions were acquired from the Provincial Directorates of National Education located at these cities. The school administrators in the pre-determined schools were contacted and the scale was applied at the schools after the school administrators and teachers were informed on the objective and content of the study. Students were informed on the objective and content of the study prior to application at each stage. The students, who wanted to continue with the study, which cultural structure of the students were determined and those with parents from a different cultural structure were not included in the study. The researchers were present during the data acquisition process and questions asked by the students were answered at once by the researchers. The items were repeated in Arabic especially when Arabic (Syrian) students could not understand an item and required explanations were made.

Data Analysis

Normality of the distributions was examined separately for the Responsibility Value Scale and Tolerance Tendency Scale prior to analyzing the data acquired within the scope of the study. Arithmetic average, mod, median, skewness and kurtosis coefficient values and histogram graphs were used when examining the normality of the distributions. It was observed that the study carried out with 800 participants does not display a normal distribution. Accordingly, extreme data were removed from the data set and it was continued as such until normal distribution was attained. Since it is desired with regard to the reliability and generalizability of the study results that the statistical tests are primarily parametric (Can, 2013).

The normality indicators of the Tolerance Tendency Scale which are Mean (Mean: 74.56), Median (Median: 76.00) ve Mod (Mod: 79.00) took on values that are close to each other. Similarly, the values of Mean (Mean: 62.99), Median (Median: 63.00), Mod (Mod: 63.00) were close to each other for Responsibility Value Scale as well. It is observed that both Tolerance Tendency Scale and Responsibility Value Scale are close to normal at acceptable levels. Skewness was determined as .422 for Tolerance Tendency Scale, while standard error was .094; kurtosis was -.558 and standard error was .189. Whereas the values of skewness, standard error, kurtosis and standard error were determined for the responsibility value scale as -.338,.094, -.549, .189 respectively. It is observed that skewness and kurtosis take on values that range between +1.96 and -1.96 when they are divided by standard error. In addition, both values are smaller than 1. As a general rule, the distribution can be accepted as normal if the values calculated when skewness and kurtosis coefficients are divided by the standard errors for skewness and kurtosis respectively (Can, 2013). In addition, this was verified by examining the histogram graphs. It can be stated based on these data and literature that the data set has normal distribution. In this case, it can be put forth that the data set is suitable for parametric analysis operations. It was also determined that the required assumptions have been met for the analyses made for providing normal distribution after the normal distribution for the data was attained after which descriptive statistics (percentage, frequency, arithmetic average, standard deviation), difference statistics (t-test and Anova) and relation analysis (regression) was carried out with regard to the objective of the study.

Results

The results obtained from the statistical operations related with the questions specified within the scope of the project goal have been given below.

Table 2. Simple Linear Regression Analysis Result Related with the Prediction of the Tolerance Value

Model	B	SE	β	t	p
Responsibility	38.739	1.488		26.036	.000
	.325	.020	.536	16.384	.000

$R = .54$ $R^2 = .29$ $F = 268.45$ $p < .001$

It was determined as a result of the simple regression carried out that there is a statistically significant relationship between responsibility and tolerance [$R = .54$; $R^2 = .29$; $p < .001$]. Accordingly, responsibility explains 29% of tolerance. It can be indicated upon examining the standardized β coefficient and t values that responsibility is a statistically significant predictor of tolerance.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics Related with the Responsibility and Tolerance Value Levels of Students Raised in Families with Different Cultural Structures

	Cultural Structures	N	Min .	Max.	\bar{x}	Ss
Responsibility	(A) Turkish	180	24	72	63.47	4.31
	(B) Romani (Gypsy)	70	24	72	60.97	4.69
	(C) Georgian	69	24	72	62.97	4.27
	(D) Bosnian	59	24	72	62.54	4.89
	(E) Kurdish	58	24	72	64.53	4.99
	(F) Laz	56	24	72	61.25	5.06
	(G) Arabic	51	24	72	64.13	4.53
	(H) Circassian	50	24	72	62.68	5.07
	(I) Albanian	40	24	72	63.65	4.35
	(J) Bulgarian Immigrant	36	24	72	63.50	4.63
	Total	669	24	72	62.98	4.71
Tolerance	(A) Turkish	180	18	90	74.72	8.44
	(B) Romani (Gypsy)	70	18	90	69.90	8.59
	(C) Georgian	69	18	90	75.72	8.23
	(D) Bosnian	59	18	90	75.74	7.76
	(E) Kurdish	58	18	90	75.86	8.35
	(F) Laz	56	18	90	73.07	7.75
	(G) Arabic	51	18	90	73.01	7.37
	(H) Circassian	50	18	90	76.44	6.67
	(I) Albanian	40	18	90	76.12	6.93
	(J) Bulgarian Immigrant	36	18	90	76.61	7.51
	Total	669	18	90	74.55	6.74

It was determined according to the cultural environment in which the students who participated in the study were raised that responsibility value level score averages were respectively for Kurdish students (64.53), Arabic (Syrian) students (64.13), Albanian students (63.65), Bulgarian immigrant students (63.50), Turkish students (63.47), Georgian students (62.97), Circassian students (62.68), Bosnian students (62.54), Laz students (61.25) and Romani (Gypsy) students (60.97). Whereas the responsibility value level score average was determined as 62.98 for all groups. It was observed upon examining the averages that the student group with the lowest score average was Romani (Gypsy) students group followed by Laz students. The students with the highest score average were Arabic, Kurdish and Albanian in that order.

It was determined according to the cultural environment in which the students who participated in the study were raised that tolerance tendency level score averages were respectively for Bulgarian immigrant students (76.61), Circassian students (76.44), Albanian students (76.12), Kurdish students (75.86), Bosnian students (75.74), Georgian students (75.72), Turkish students (74.72), Laz students (73.07), Arabic (Syrian) students (73.01) and Romani (Gypsy) students (69.90). Whereas the tolerance tendency value level score average was determined as 74.55 for all groups. It was observed upon examining the averages that the student group with the lowest score average was Romani (Gypsy) students group followed by Laz and Arabic (Syrian) students. The students with the highest score average were Bulgarian Immigrants students, Circassian students and Albanian students in that order.

Table 4. Single Factor ANOVA Results for the Responsibility and Tolerance Tendency Values of Students According to the Cultural Environment they Have Been Raised In

		Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Average of Squares	F	p	Difference
Responsibility	Intergroup	745.539	9	82.838	3.88	.000**	E-F, E-B,
	Intragroup	14075.340	659	21.359			G-F, G-B, A-B
	Total	14820.879	668				
Tolerance	Intergroup	2471.277	9	274.586	4.794	.000**	I-B, E-B,
	Intragroup	37741.757	659	57.271			C-B,A-B, D-B, H-B, J-B
	Total	40213.034	668				

It is observed that the responsibility levels of students raised in families with different cultural structures change at a statistically significant level according to the cultural environment they are raised in [$F_{(9-659)} = 3.878$; $p < .001$]. Tukey test from among the multiple comparison tests was applied for determining the averages with a difference between them and it was observed that the difference results from the difference between the responsibility level scores between Romani and Kurdish, Arab and Turkish students against Romani students; between Laz students and Kurdish and Arab students in favor of Laz students. Accordingly, it can be stated that the responsibility levels of Romani and Laz students is lower in comparison with those of the students raised in families with different cultural structures.

It is observed that the tolerance levels of students raised in families with different cultural structures change at a statistically significant level according to the cultural environment they are raised in [$F_{(9-659)} = 4.794$; $p < .001$]. Tukey test from among the multiple comparison tests was applied for determining the averages with a difference between them and it was observed that the difference results from the difference between the tolerance tendency scores between Romani and Albanian, Kurdish, Georgian, Turkish, Bosnian, Circassian and Bulgarian immigrant students against Romani students. Accordingly, it can be stated that the tolerance levels of Romani students is lower in comparison with those of the students raised in families with different cultural structures.

Table 5. t-Test Results for Responsibility and Tolerance Values of Students According to Gender

Variable	Groups	N	\bar{x}	Ss	sd	t	p
Responsibility	Female	315	63.37	4.73	667	1.98	.048
	Male	354	62.65	4.67			
Tolerance	Female	315	75.48	7.92	667	2.93	.004
	Male	354	73.73	7.53			

It is observed that the responsibility [$t_{(667)}= 1.98$; $p<.05$] and tolerance [$t_{(667)}= 2.93$; $p<.01$] levels of students raised in families with different cultural structures differ at a statistically significant level according to gender. Accordingly, it can be stated that the responsibility and tolerance levels of female students is higher in comparison with those of the male students.

Table 6. t-Test Results for Responsibility and Tolerance Values of Students According To Class Level

Variable	Groups	N	\bar{x}	Ss	sd	t	p
Responsibility	7 th Grade	349	63.10	4.58	667	.95	.483
	8 th Grade	320	62.85	4.85			
Tolerance	7 th Grade	349	74.83	7.63	667	.70	.342
	8 th Grade	320	74.25	7.89			

It is observed that the responsibility [$t_{(667)}= .95$; $p>.05$] and tolerance [$t_{(667)}= .70$; $p>.05$] values of students raised in families with different cultural structures do not differ at a statistically significant level according to class levels. Accordingly, it can be stated that the level of the grade does not affect the level of responsibility and tolerance.

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

Humans can be classified into different groups according to their characteristics. They accept the general characteristics of the groups they feel they belong to. It has been put forth in the studies carried out that individuals tend to classify themselves into social categories such as gender, race, ethnic roots and organizational commitment and that they also tend to use these categories for defining themselves (O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). People discriminate especially between groups and outside the group and they are attracted to individuals who are similar to themselves (Brewer, 1979). The sample group in this study was classified according to age, gender and cultural structure. It was examined how the values of tolerance and responsibility varied with the pre-determined factors. Because personal and social values are mostly affected by age, gender, education and the cultural changes in the society (Coombs-Richardson & Tolson, 2005).

It was determined as a result of the study carried out that the responsibility value predicts the tolerance value by 29%. Similarly, Yıldırım (2014) carried out a study in which it was determined that the values predict each other by 47%. This finding supports this study. Accordingly, it can be stated that the values are not independent from each other. Therefore, the values education process should be seen and considered as a whole. For example, any work on fairness value can provide benefits about values such as honesty and responsibility. Again a study on the value of helpfulness that can contribute to the acquisition of values such as cooperation, diligence and responsibility. It is anticipated that a study carried out on any field in values education shall have an impact on the other values as well.

Responsibility and tolerance values differ according to other groups in the study carried out. While the tolerance and responsibility levels are both high for some groups (Albanians), both had low score averages for some groups (Romani, Laz and Bosnian). These results are due to cultural structure. This is an ordinary situation. Cultures may result in changes in the value priorities of individuals. This

is due to the relationship between superiority and priority (Yıldırım, 2014). Because both values may not be as important in all societies at all times. It may be anticipated that individuals in two different societies that exist concurrently will have different value judgments due to their cultural and socio-economic differences (Özensel, 2003). This is an indication that values change among societies. Therefore, the process of values education that is planned to do at school should be designed according to popular culture, and then considering local cultural features and local value degeneration. For example, if people in a region have a problem about the patriotism, the school should take responsibility for it. If there are difficulties about respect in another place, training processes for the missing part should be developed considering this situation.

Many studies have been carried out for determining the interaction between cultures and values all over the world. Some of these are carried out continuously and systematically. Studies by WVS are among the primary studies. In these studies, WVS (2018) regularly follows up at certain intervals the value ranking and the levels of having values among countries. The most important finding among the acquired results is that values change according to both temporal and spatial dimensions. As such, the results of the studies by WVS support the findings of this study. Akiba and Klug (1999), Losa Iglesias and de Bengoa Vallejo (2011), Schwartz (1992b), Schwartz and Bilsky (1987), Schwartz, Struch, and Bilsky (1990), also acquired data that support this findings in the studies carried out for determining the impact of culture on values.

The same value may sometimes be at different levels in different societies or they may result in different perceptions as well. The fact that a value may be at different levels in different societies is one of the findings of this study. This indicates the impact of cultural structure on values. It has been determined in many international studies that values change among societies and cultures. Studies detecting that the value differences between Iranian students (Ersanlı & Mameghani, 2016), Arab and Israeli individuals (Cohen, 2006), Chinese and USA students (Giacomino, Li, & Akers, 2013), Chinese and Japanese administrators (Chiu et al., 1998), Turkish teachers (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000) and German and Israeli students (Schwartz & Bilsky 1987) are due to social and cultural differences are several of such studies. Similarly, Hofstede (1976) determined a statistically significant difference in the study carried out on students from different countries. Randall (1993) compiled the articles in different countries with an objective of determining the impacts of cultures on values and put forth that occupational values differ between cultures. Because each society attribute different meanings to the values according to their own cultural perspective thereby forming a value priority. People from different cultures such as individualistic or social have beliefs that are in accordance with the cultural values of their respective societies such as idiocentric (interest centered on the self) and allocentric (interest centered on others) (Earley, 1989). Some of these values may be considered as serving different benefits in different cultures. For instance, in a highly collectivist society such as China, values of success may be considered to serve a more collective purpose rather than one that is centered on individualistic benefits (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987).

Culture can be considered as a series of cognitive elements shared with the members of a social unit (Smircich, 1983). There is a strong and dynamic relationship between culture and value. Therefore, culture studies generally start with a series of values (Enz, 1988; Martin & Siehl, 1983; Weiner, 1988). Values differ among societies since culture also does so. Hence, it is normal that different perceptions and experiences of values are observed based on the different cultural structures between societies. This was more distinct and sharper centuries ago. Because values are relative, they can vary from society to society in the same age (İşcan Demirhan, 2007). Thus, every society designs a value education according to its own needs. This education may take place via media, school, family and society. Based on the secondary school level course books in Turkish, Kazakh and Russian, Yılmaz, Yakar, Arslan, Safranova, and Satbay (2017) determined as a result of a study on values that there are differences between values. The fact that the texts used at schools contain different values leads to the raising of a human model

with different values. The fact that the study is not international but puts forth that people who live in the same country, study in the same education system, use the same media connections and share the same society generate different cultures or put forth their own social values by continuing the already existing different cultures is a finding that makes the study results significant.

It was observed upon an evaluation of the score averages that while the tolerance tendency levels of Arab (Syrian) students were low, their responsibility levels were determined to be high. The reason for the low tolerance tendency levels of Arab (Syrian) students may be due to the fact that they had to leave their countries because of the war and had to take refuge in other countries. Again, it can be stated that the reason why they have high responsibility levels may be related with the fact that they have to cope with more responsibilities both inside and outside their families in comparison with other student groups. Because many Arabs (Syrian) at school age work and try to contribute to their family economy. Female students also take care of their siblings and help household chores more in comparison with the other student groups. It may be stated that these two reasons cause the Arab (Syrian) students to have lower tolerance levels and higher responsibility levels.

Romani students received a lower than average score for both responsibility and tolerance value levels. Almost all of the intergroup relations observed at both responsibility and tolerance levels were in Romani students. It is indicated in many studies in literature that the participation of Romani students to educational activities and their attendance rates are not at desired levels (Akkan, Deniz, & Ertan, 2011; Öksüz, Güven Demir, & Baba Öztürk, 2018). Studies carried out put forth that Romani students act incompatibly with the school culture and that they are insufficient with regard to accordance with obeying the rules as well as the stability and seriousness expected from the education institution (Yavuzak Taban, 2010). This is consistent with the findings related with responsibility. Indeed, it was determined as a circumstance realized during the study that majority of the Romani students stop their education after secondary school. School administrations visited for the study indicated that majority of the Romani students are continuously absent. Similarly, the administration and guidance services of the schools visited during the study indicated that Romani students are generally quarrelsome and that disciplinary problems are observed more frequently among these students. This explains and supports their low scores for the tolerance value. In addition, the limitedness of education enrollment rates in Turkey as in Europe along with issues such as irregular participation, exclusion, marginalization and discrimination at schools and low success levels are frequently observed among Romani people (Diktaş, Deniz, & Balcıoğlu, 2016).

Teachers should acquire information on the children and society they serve as well as the values that they encounter during their daily lives (Stachowski, Richardson, & Henderson, 2003). Because values are shaped according to the society and the culture of the society. Indeed, values can be expressed as the building blocks of society. Therefore, teachers can plan the education process they will apply according to their students if they are familiar with the values of the students. Knowing the values of the society they serve shall ensure a more efficient education process for the teachers.

Responsibility and tolerance values differ at statistically significant levels according to gender in the study. There are many studies that examine the moral and value development of students according to gender. One of the researchers who have been involved with this subject is Gilligan known for his work on Moral Theory. Gilligan indicates that females and males differ significantly with regard to moral development (Yıldırım, 2014). Neittaanmäki, Gross, Virjo, Hyppölä, and Kumpusalo (1999) carried out studies in which they determined that personal values change according to gender. Similarly, Losa Iglesias and de Bengoa Vallejo (2011) concluded that values change with gender. It has also been observed during studies carried out for examining the impact of gender on values that the values of females and males differ (Ersoy, 2009, p. 213).

The responsibility level of female students was determined to be higher in comparison with those of male students in the study carried out. Similar results have been acquired by Akbaş (2004), Abdi Golzar (2006), Ersoy (2009), Gömleksiz and Cüro (2011), Şahan (2011), Yıldırım (2014), Yıldırım and Akpınar (2016) as well. Based on the findings of the literature survey and the study carried out, it can be indicated that the gender factor has an impact on the responsibility value. Female students are more aware of their responsibilities than male students. According to Uyguç (2003), responsibility has a special importance among the values of female students. Gilligan puts forth that the moral sensitivities of females and males develop differently (Yıldırım, 2014). One of the reasons for this is that males tend to enter their adolescent period at a later stage than female students. Because female students with early adolescence also start their moral maturity process at an earlier stage (Yıldırım & Akpınar, 2016). The fact that differences in values with regard to gender generally favor girls is due to the fact that female students are more emotional than male students (Ersoy, 2009; Ergün, 2010). The fact that females are relatively more emotional than males helps them to gain fundamental humane values such as benevolence, responsibility, respect and love (Yıldırım & Akpınar, 2016). Another reason why a statistically significant difference is observed in studies carried out on values is the gender roles imposed by the society. The roles imposed by societies based on gender result in changes in the values of females and males over time even if females and males have similar values in the same society at first (Yıldırım, 1993; Ersoy, 2009; Uyguç, 2003). However, no statistically significant difference has been determined between male and female students in the study by Aladağ (2012). However, it was determined that the score average of females is higher than that of males. Turan and Aktan (2008) carried out a study in which no statistically significant difference was determined for the gender variable in any of the scale dimensions.

It has been determined in the study carried out that there is a statistically significant difference between the tolerance values of students according to gender. It was observed that females tend to be relatively more tolerance in comparison with male students. Similar results can also be observed in studies by Büyükkaragöz (1990), Büyükkaragöz and Kesici (1996), Sağlam (2000), Aycan and Çalık (2003), Saracaloğlu, Evin, and Varol (2004), Genç and Kalafat (2008), Gömleksiz and Kan (2008), Gömleksiz and Çetintaş (2011), Çalışkan and Sağlam (2012), Yüksel, Bağcı, and Vatansever (2013). In addition, this result is also in accordance with the results of the study by Akın and Özdemir (2009). Karadağ, Baloğlu and Yalçınkayalar (2006) carried out a study in which it was put forth that the gender of teachers has no impact on the democratic values they have adopted. When data acquired in literature and this study are taken into consideration, it can be indicated that special attention should be given to the gender factor when planning the education process and education goals.

It was determined in the study that the responsibility levels of students do not differ at a statistically significant level with regard to class levels. However, a decrease was observed in the responsibility value score averages from the seventh to the eighth grade. Similar results have been obtained in the study by Yıldırım (2014). WVS (2018) carried out a study (2012-2014) on Turkish citizens in which it was observed that the responsibility value decreases with increasing age. Sezer and Çoban (2016) carried out a study for determining the responsibility value judgments of students in which it was determined that certain fundamental values of secondary grade students decreased as they moved from the fifth to the eighth grade. Şahan (2011) carried out a study and examined the responsibility values of fifth grade and eighth grade students. It was put forth as a result of the study that the averages of fifth grade students were higher in comparison with those of eighth grade students. Aslan (2007) and Sezer (2008) determined in their studies that even though responsibility is the value that teachers want to teach their students the most, it is the value that is taught the least. The reason for this has been expressed by Sezer and Çoban (2016) as the students entering their adolescence and thereby the impact of popular culture or peer group. Teachers have indicated that negative examples displayed in vehicles of communication may have adverse impacts on the teaching of responsibility value. Including related activities in the education programs of students starting from an early age may contribute to students developing responsible behavior at early ages.

It was determined as a result of another finding of the study that the tolerance levels of students do not differ at statistically significant levels according to class levels. In addition, it was also concluded that the state of being tolerant decreased as the class levels of the students increased. Similar results have been obtained by Çalışkan and Sağlam (2012). It can be observed in a study carried out by WVS (2018) (2012-2014) on Turkish citizens that the tolerance value decreased with increasing age. The decrease in the tolerance values of students which is a social value is worrisome. However, the reasons for this are considered as the fact that eighth grade students are at an age which encompasses adolescence; that they are preparing for high school entrance exams and the resulting competitive environment they are faced with. Karadağ et al. (2006) carried out a study in which it was determined that the age of teachers varied at a statistically significant level in favor of the 40 and above group with regard to the democratic value they have adopted. This is in contradiction with our finding that the tolerance tendencies of secondary school students decrease with age. Taking into account this situation, value education should be given more importance with increasing class levels. Value education should have a greater scope within our education system.

In conclusion, values comprise a whole. They are in mutual interaction with one another. The fact that the impact of the responsibility levels of students on their tolerance levels have been put forth is in accordance with the findings in literature. Values change from society to society. Many studies have been carried out to prove this at an international level. The importance of this study is that it has determined the impact of the culture that the individuals have been raised in with the same education system and the same media connections on the values of the individual. Another result of the study is again in accordance with the literature findings and indicates that the values change with age and gender but that the change with age is not as distinctive as the change with gender.

References

- Abdi Golzar, F. (2006). *İlköğretim 5. sınıf öğrencilerine yönelik sorumluluk ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi ve sorumluluk düzeylerinin cinsiyet, denetim odağı ve akademik başarıya göre incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Acat, M. B., & Aslan, M. (2012). Yeni bir değer sınıflaması ve bu sınıflamaya bağlı olarak öğrencilere kazandırılması gereken değerler [Special issue]. *Kuramdan Uygulamaya Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(2), 1460-1474.
- Adler, F. (1956). The value concept in sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 62(3), 272-79. doi:10.1086/222004
- Akbaş, O. (2004). *Türk milli eğitim sisteminin duyuşsal amaçlarının ilköğretim II. kademedeki gerçeğe derecesinin değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Akın, U., & Özdemir, M. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının demokratik değerlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi örneği. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42(2), 183-198. doi:10.1501/Egifak_0000001182
- Akiba, D., & Klug, W. (1999). The different and the same: Reexamining east and west in a cross-cultural analysis of values. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 27(5), 467-73. doi:10.2224/sbp.1999.27.5.467
- Akkan, B. E., Deniz, M. B., & Ertan, M. (2011). *Sosyal dışlanmanın roman halleri*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Sosyal Politika Forumu.
- Aktay, Y. (2003). Amerika'da Kudüs'ü kurmak için: Mormonlarda din ve değerler eğitimi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(3), 27-64.
- Aladağ, S. (2012). İlköğretim sosyal bilgiler öğretiminde değer eğitimi yaklaşımlarının öğrencilerin sorumluluk değerini bilişsel düzeyde kazanmalarına etkisi. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 16(1), 123-146.
- Aslan, R. (2007). *Öğretmen görüşlerine göre ilköğretim birinci basamaktaki öğrencilerin temel bilgi, beceri ve değerler kazanma düzeyleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Anadolu University, Eskişehir.
- Aycan, N., & Çalık, D. (2003). İlköğretim okullarında demokrasi eğitimi: Manisa ili örneği. *C.B.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(2), 19-29.
- Aydın, B. (2007). Gelişimin Doğası. In B. Yeşilyaprak (Ed.), *Eğitim Psikolojisi Gelişim Öğrenme Öğretim* (3rd ed., pp. 29-54). Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Bacon, C. S. (1991). Being held responsible versus being responsible. *The Clearing House*, 64, 395-398. doi:10.1080/00098655.1991.9955903
- Baş, G., & Beyhan, Ö. (2012). Türkiye'de değerler eğitimi konusunda yapılmış lisansüstü tezlerin farklı değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 10(24), 55-77.
- Başaran, İ. E. (2000). *Eğitim psikolojisi* (5th ed.). Ankara: Kadioğlu Matbaası.
- Bektaş, M. (2007). Hayat bilgisi dersinde ailelerin çoklu zekâ kuramı hakkında bilgilendirilme biçimlerinin öğrencilerin proje başarıları ve tutumlarına etkisi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 5(14), 9-28.
- Belasheva, I. V., & Petrova, N. F. (2016). Psychological stability of a personality and capability of tolerant interaction as diverse manifestations of tolerance. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(10), 3367-3384.
- Bouchard, C., Rheoume, J., & Ladouceur, R. (1999). Responsibility and perfectionism in ocd: An experimental study. *Behavior Research And Therapy*, 37(3), 239-248. doi:10.1016/S0005-7967(98)00141-7
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 393-480. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.86.2.307
- Büyükkaragöz, S. (1990). *Ortaöğretimde demokrasi eğitimi*. Ankara: Türk Demokrasi Vakfı Yayını.

- Büyükkaragöz, S., & Kesici, Ş. (1996). Öğretmenlerin hoşgörü ve demokratik tutumları. *Eğitim Yönetimi*, 2(3), 353-365.
- Can, A. (2013). *SPSS ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Can, G. (2007). Kişilik Gelişimi. In B. Yeşilyaprak (Ed.), *Eğitim Psikolojisi Gelişim Öğrenme Öğretim* (3rd ed., pp. 117-150). Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Canabal, M. (2002). Social values of Indian and United States female university students: Implications for exchange programs. *Journal of College and Character*, 3(1), 1-7. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1309
- Chittenden, A. (1993). How can a pastoral care programme improve a school culture? Pastoral care in education. *An International Journal of Personal, Social and Emotional Development*, 11(3), 29-35. doi:10.1080/02643949309470844
- Chiu, R. K., Wong, M. M., & Kosinski, F. A. (1998). Confucian values and conflict behavior of Asian managers: A comparison of two countries. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 26(1), 11-22. doi:10.2224/sbp.1998.36.1.11
- Chorro, E. G., Fernández, M. Á. M., & Corbí, R. G. (2017). Happiness and values in the formation of personal identity in students of the fifth and sixth grade at primary school. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(5), 881-890. doi:10.13189/ujer.2017.050520
- Cohen, A. (2006). The relationship between multiple commitments and organizational citizenship behavior in Arab and Jewish culture. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 105-118. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.12.004
- Coombs-Richardson, R., & Tolson, H. (2005). A Comparison of values rankings for selected American and Australian teachers. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 4(3), 263- 277. doi:10.1177/1475240905057805
- Coşkun, Y. ve Yıldırım, A. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin değer düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4 (1), 311-328.
- Çalışkan, H., & Sağlam, H. İ. (2012). Hoşgörü eğilim ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi ve ilköğretim öğrencilerinin hoşgörü eğilimlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Special issue]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 12(2), 1431-1446.
- Çalışkur, A., Demirhan, A., & Bozkurt, S. (2012). Değerlerin belirli meslek alanları ve demografik değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Suleyman Demirel University The Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 17(1), 219-236.
- Davidovitch, N., & Soen, D. (2015). Teaching civics and instilling democratic values in Israeli high school students: The duality of national and universal aspects. *Journal of International Education Research*, 11(1), 7-20.
- Dereli, E., & Alpay, A. (2012). Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin empatik eğilimleri ve işbirliği yapma karakterlerinin insani değerlerini yordaması ve bu özelliklerinin incelenmesi. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 12(2), 1249-1270.
- Derman, O. (2008). Ergenlerde psikososyal gelişim. *Adolesan Sağlığı II Sempozyum*, 63, 19-21
- Diktaş, A., Deniz, A. Ç., & Balcıoğlu, M. (2016). Uşak'ta yaşayan Romanların Türk eğitim sistemi içerisinde yaşadıkları problemler. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(4), 1121-1142.
- Dilmaç, B., Bozgeyikli, H., & Çıkılı, Y. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının değer algılarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 6(16), 69-91.
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (1998). Comparative educational administration: Developing a cross-cultural conceptual framework. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(4), 558-595. doi:10.1177/0013161X98034004006
- Earley, P. (1989). Christopher, social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of The United States and the people's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 565-581. doi:10.2307/2393567

- Enz, C. (1988). The role of value congruity in intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33, 284-304. doi:10.2307/2393060
- Ergün, M. (2010). Eğitimin felsefi temelleri. In Ö. Demirel, & Z. Kaya (Eds.), *Eğitim bilimine giriş* (5th ed., pp. 67-94). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Ersanlı E., & Mameghani, S. S. (2016). Construct validity and reliability of the tolerance scale among Iranian college students. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(34), 99-105.
- Ersoy, E. (2009). Cinsiyet kültürü içerisinde kadın ve erkek kimliği (Malatya örneği). *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19(2), 209-230.
- Eser, A. (2012). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinin insani değer düzeyleri ile çevresel tutumları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Istanbul.
- Genç, S. Z., & Kalafat, T. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumları ile empatik becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi üzerine bir araştırma. *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Dergisi*, 19, 211-222.
- Gerris, J. R. M., Dekovic, M., & Janssens, J. M. A. M. (1997). The relationship between social and childrearing behaviors: Parents' perspective taking and value orientations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 59(4), 834-847.
- Giacomino, D. E., Li, X., & Akers, M. D. (2013). An examination of personal values and value systems of Chinese and U. S. business students. *American Journal of Business Education*, 6(1), 119-128.
- Gökdere, M., & Çepni, S. (2003). Üstün yetenekli çocuklara verilen değerler eğitiminde öğretmenin rolü. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(2), 93-107.
- Gömleksiz, M. N., & Cüro, E. (2011). Sosyal Bilgiler dersinde yer alan değerlere ilişkin öğrenci tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8(1), 95-134.
- Gömleksiz, M. N., & Çetintaş, S. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumları (Fırat, Dicle, 7 Aralık, Cumhuriyet ve Erzincan Üniversiteleri örneği). *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17, 1-14.
- Gömleksiz, M. N., & Kan A. Ü. (2008). Eğitim fakültesi ve tezsiz yüksek lisans programlarına kayıtlı öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi (Fırat Üniversitesi örneği). *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 178, 44-63.
- Guo, S., & Jamal, Z. (2007). Nurturing cultural diversity in higher education: A critical review of selected models. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 37(3), 27-49.
- Gürses, İ., & Kılavuz, M. A. (2011). Erikson'un psiko-sosyal gelişim dönemleri teorisi açısından kuşaklararası din eğitimi ve iletişiminin önemi. *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(2), 153-166.
- Hamilton, L. (1978). Who is responsible? Toward a social psychology of responsibility attribution. *Social Psychology*, 41(4), 316-328. doi:10.2307/3033584
- Helker, K., & Wosnitza, M. (2014). Responsibility in the school context-development and validation of a heuristic framework. *Frontline Learning Research*, 2(3), 115-139. doi:10.14786/flr.v2i2.99
- Hofstede, G. (1976). Nationality and espoused values of managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(2), 148-55. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.61.2.148
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 10(4), 15-41. doi:10.1080/00208825.1980.11656300
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 286-316. doi:10.2307/2393392
- Hussein, I. M. T. (2016). The effect of social network "snapchat" on the emergence of some negative social values (social hatred) based on the perspectives of qassim female students: A survey study. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(24), 86-98.

- İşcan Demirhan, C. (2007). *İlköğretim düzeyinde değerler eğitimi programının etkililiği* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Karadağ, E., Baloğlu, N., & Yalçınkayalar, P. (2006). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin öğretmenler tarafından algılanan demokratik tutumları ile öğretmenlerin demokratik değerleri üzerine ilişkisel bir araştırma. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 4(12), 65-82.
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kaztaevna, T. G., Omarovna, A. R., Askerkhanovna, T. K., Zhanarbekovna, B. A., & Erezhepovna, K. N. (2015). Education of tolerant personality of a future specialist as the social-pedagogical phenomenon. *International Education Studies*, 8(2), 169-175. doi:10.5539/ies.v8n2p169
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In T. Parsons, & E. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 388-433). Cambridge: Harvard University Press. doi:10.4159/harvard.9780674863507.c8
- Koç, M. (2004). Gelişim psikolojisi açısından ergenlik dönemi ve genel özellikleri. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17(2), 231-256.
- Kuşdil E., & Kağıtçıbaşı. Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerinin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz değer kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(45), 59-76.
- Küçükkaragöz, H. (2007). Bilişsel gelişim ve dil gelişimi. In B. Yeşilyaprak (Ed.), *Eğitim psikolojisi gelişim öğrenme öğretim* (3th ed., pp. 82-115). Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Lauermann, F., & Karabenick, S. A. (2011). Taking teacher responsibility into account(ability): Explicating its multiple components and theoretical status. *Educational Psychologist*, 46(2), 122-140. doi:10.1080/00461520.2011.558818
- Losa Iglesias, M. E., & de Bengoa Vallejo, R. B. (2011). Personal and interpersonal value system, self-perception and identity of Spanish nurses: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Beliefs & Values: Studies in Religion & Education*, 32(3), 281-294. doi:10.1080/13617672.2011.627675
- Martin, J., & Siehl, C. (1983). Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12(1), 52-64. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(83)90033-5
- MEB. (2017). *Sosyal bilgiler eğitimi taslak programı*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. Retrieved from <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/ProgramDetay.aspx?PID=354>
- Mitchell, J. T., & Willower, D. J. (1992). Organizational culture in a good high school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(1), 6-15. doi:10.1108/09578239210008781
- Morsümbül, Ş. (2014). Kültürel değerlerin üç kuşak arasındaki değişimi üzerine bir inceleme: Ankara örneği. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 21, 137-160.
- Musamali, K., & Barbara, M. N. (2016). Comparing higher education practices and cultural competences in Kenya and the United States. *Higher Education Studies*, 6(3), 127-137. doi:10.5539/hes.v6n3p127
- Neittaanmäki, L., Gross, E. B., Virjo, I., Hyppölä, H., & Kumpusalo, E. (1999). Personal values of male and female doctors: Gender aspects. *Social Science & Medicine*, 48, 559-680. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(98)00375-X
- Nguyen, Q. T. N. (2016). The Vietnamese values system: A blend of oriental, western and socialist values. *International Education Studies*, 9(12), 32-40. doi:doi.org/10.5539/ies.v9n12p32
- O'Reilly, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person organization fit. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 487-516. doi:10.5465/256404
- Öksüz, Y., Güven Demir E., & Baba Öztürk, M. (2018). Roman çocukların okul doyumları düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (Samsun ili örneği). *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33(1), 256-268. doi:10.16986/HUJE.2017029312
- Özensel, E. (2003). Sosyolojik bir olgu olarak değer. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(3), 217-239.

- Özgökbil Biliş, P. (2011). *Çizgi filmlerde temsil edilen toplumsal değerler sistemi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ege University, Izmir.
- Özkartal, M. (2009). *İlköğretim sanat etkinlikleri dersinde Dede Korkut Destanı'nın milli değerlerin kazanılmasına etkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Öztürk Samur, A. (2011). *Değerler eğitimi programının 6 yaş çocuklarının sosyal ve duygusal gelişimlerine etkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Selçuk University, Konya.
- Parekh, B. (2002). *Çokkültürlülüğü yeniden düşünmek*. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınları.
- Pennings, I. M. (1970). Work value systems of white collar workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 397-405. doi:10.2307/2391330
- Polat, S. (2012). Okul müdürlerinin çokkültürlülüğe ilişkin tutumları. *H.Ü. Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42, 334-343.
- Randall, D. M. (1993). Cross-cultural research on organizational commitment: A review and application of Hofstede's value survey module. *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 91-110. doi:10.1016/0148-2963(93)90045-Q
- Ruiz-Lozano, M., de los Rios-Bergillos, A., Tirado-Valencia, P., & Millan-Lara, S. (2012). Ethical and social values in business administration and management studies. *US-China Education Review*, B, 2, 187-201.
- Sağlam, H. İ. (2000). Sosyal bilgiler dersinin demokratik tutum geliştirmedeki rolü. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 146, 67-71.
- Sancak, Y. (2011). *Mevlana'nın mesnevi adlı eserinin sosyal bilgilerde değer kazanımındaki rolü (nitel bir araştırma)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Niğde University, Niğde.
- Saracaloğlu, A. S., Evin, İ., & Varol, S. R. (2004). İzmir ilinde çeşitli kurumlarda görev yapan öğretmenler ile öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumları üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(2), 335-364.
- Schwartz, B. (1996). Tolerance: Should we approve of it, put up with it, or tolerate it? *Academe*, 82, 24-28. doi:10.2307/40251476
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992a). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50(4), 19-45. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb01196.x
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992b). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(3), 550-562.
- Schwartz, S. H., Struch, N., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Values and intergroup social motives: A study of Israeli and German students. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53(3), 185-198. doi:10.2307/2786958
- Scott, E. D. (2000). Moral values: Situationally defined individual differences. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 10(2), 497-521. doi:10.2307/3857888
- Selçuk, Z. (2005). *Gelişim ve Öğrenme*. (12th ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayın ve Dağıtım.
- Senemoğlu, N. (2004). *Eğitim Psikolojisi, Gelişim, Öğrenme, Öğretim*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Sezer, A., & Çoban, O. (2016). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin sorumluluk değeri algıları. *Uşak Üniversitesi Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(1), 22-39.
- Sezer, T. (2008). *İlköğretim 6. sınıf sosyal bilgiler dersinde sorumluluk değerinin öğretimine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Shepherd, G., & Shepherd, G. (2014). Civic tolerance among honors students. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, 15(1), 85-113.
- Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 339-359. doi:10.2307/2392246

- Stachowski, L., Richardson, W. J., & Henderson, M. (2003). Student teachers report on the influence of cultural values on classroom practice and community involvement: Perspectives from the Navajo reservation and abroad. *The Teacher Educator*, 39(1), 52-63. doi:10.1080/08878730309555329
- Şahan, E. (2011). *İlköğretim 5. ve 8. sınıf ders programlarındaki sorumluluk eğitimine dönük kazanımların gerçekleştirme düzeyleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ahi Evran University, Kırşehir.
- Şahin, T., & Ersoy, F. (2012). Sosyal bilgiler ders kitaplarının değerler eğitimi yaklaşımları açısından incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(2), 1535-1558.
- Şen, Ü. (2007). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nun 2005 yılında tavsiye ettiği 100 temel eser yoluyla değerler öğretimi üzerine bir araştırma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- TDK. (2005). *Türkçe sözlük* (5th ed.). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Turan, S., & Aktan, D. (2008). Okul hayatında var olan ve olması düşünülen sosyal değerler. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 227-259.
- UNESCO. (1992). *Education facing the crisis of values: Strategies for strengthening humanistic, cultural, and international values in formal and non-formal education*. 1-38. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration of principles on tolerance proclaimed*. 1-16. Paris: UNESCO.
- Uyguç, N. (2003). Cinsiyet, bireysel değerler ve meslek seçimi. *D.E.Ü.İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 18(1), 93-103.
- Von Bergen, C. W., & Collier, G. (2013). Tolerance as civility in contemporary workplace diversity initiatives. *Administrative Issues Journal: Education, Practice, and Research*, 3(1), 86-97.
- Weiner, Y. (1988). Forms of value systems: A focus on organizational effectiveness and cultural change and maintenance. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 534-545. doi:10.5465/amr.1988.4307410
- WVS. (2018). Online data analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSONline.jsp>
- Yapıcı, A., & Zengin, S. Z. (2003). İlahiyat Fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer tercih sıralamaları üzerine psikolojik bir araştırma: Çukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(4), 173-206.
- Yavuzak Taban, E. (2010). *Roman öğrencilerin eğitime erişimleri (Fatih ilçesi örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Beykent University, İstanbul.
- Yıldırım, A. (1993) Gender role influences on Turkish adolescents' self-identity. *Adolescence*, 32(125), 217-231.
- Yıldırım, Y. (2014). *Ortaokul 5. ve 6. sınıf öğrencilerinin ahlaki olgunluk düzeyi ile sosyal tutumlarının incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Erzincan University, Erzincan.
- Yıldırım, Y., & Akpınar, E. (2016). Cinsiyet faktörünün ortaokul 5. ve 6. sınıf öğrencilerinin sosyal olgunluk düzeyine etkisi. *International Journal of Field Education*, 2(1), 20-32.
- Yılmaz, O., Yakar, Y. M., Arslan, M. A., Safranova, L., & Satbay, G. (2017). Values analysis in reference to the fictional texts in secondary education course books: A Turkey and Kazakhstan case. *International Journal of Turkish Literature, Culture, Education*, 6(4), 2694-2710.
- Yüksel, İ., Bağcı, Ş., & Vatansver, E. (2013). İlköğretim son sınıf öğrencilerinin demokratik değerlere sahip olma düzeylerinin belirlenmesi. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12(6), 309-334. doi:10.14520/adyusbd.427