

## Life Values Associated with Life Satisfaction in the Turkish University Sample<sup>1</sup>

Asli Tayli

*Mugla Sitki Kocman University, Education Faculty, Guidance and Counseling Department,  
Mugla, Turkey  
E-mail: atayli@mu.edu.tr*

**KEYWORDS** Values. Value Priority. Life Satisfaction. College Students. Gender

**ABSTRACT** The aim of this study is to display the life values that have a strong positive and significant relationship with life satisfaction in college students. In this context in Fall 2013-2014, Schwarz Values Scales and Life Satisfaction Scale were applied to 407 students from different departments of the Education Faculty in Mugla Sitki Kocman University. The results were studied in relation to the values, which had a meaningful relationship with life satisfaction, sex differences in preference of values, and with the priority of value preferences. According to this, the priority order of the values of the Turkish college students is *self-direction, universalism, security, benevolence, conformity, achievement, tradition, simulation, hedonism, and power*. A preference order such as *self-transcendence, conservatism, openness to change, and self-enhancement* is the topic in terms of value clusters. Moreover, girls gave importance to *universalism, conformity, and security*, while *power* is more important for boys. Lastly, whereas *benevolence, conformity, hedonism, security, achievement, tradition, universalism, and power* were found to be connected to each other, a significant relationship between life satisfaction, *stimulation* and *self-authorship* was not found. The results were studied with literature findings.

### INTRODUCTION

The science of psychology blossomed very well post- 1950. Studies about moral development and its values are the products of the times over these years. For example, Kohlberg in the 1960s and Gilligan in the 1970s, who carried out important studies on moral development, and thereafter started to work upon this topic after these years (Slavin 2005). In topics like values as a dimension of the moral development, and the classification and measurement of these values, Schwartz is one of the individuals who started to contribute after the mid-1980s to the studies of Rokeach who in turn started his studies earlier on after the 1970s and they both still make strong contributions even today (Bilsky and Schwartz 1994; Knafo and Schwartz 2012; Sagie and Schwartz 2000; Schwartz 1994, 1999; Schwartz and Bilsky 1987; Schwartz and Huismans 1995; Schwartz and Sagie 1995; Schwartz et al. 2000). Also, 1980s and the proceeding years are considered as the first years of the application of character and values education in the US (Algera and Sink 2002; Pearson and Nicholson 2000). In Turkey, the values studied in sociology and in psychology, which coincided with the years 1960s-70s (Kusdil and Kagitcibasi 2000), were the topic of the theoretical and practical applica-

tions with a tendency which accelerated after 1990 and in early 2000s. For example, a study, which examined the graduate theses on values between 2000 and 2011, showed that values were studied mostly in 2006 and after. These values were studied mostly by pedagogues who have mental education values, and this supports the fact that the study was carried out on elementary and secondary school students mostly (Adiguzel-Ergunay 2012).

Value is described as, "conceptions of the desirable that influence the way people select action and evaluate events and their own behaviors" (Schwartz 1999: 24). The lexical meaning of value is, "*an abstract scale, which helps determine the importance of something, a declared value of something, preciousness or high and the beneficial quality of something*" (TDK 2005). This definition mostly represents the daily use of value. This definition means that value, in daily language, is the worth of something. It expresses an evaluation, which examines whether a thing is precious, important, beneficial and significant or not and the decision after it. For something to be tagged valuable, it should be good, desirable, beneficial and significant.

According to Rokeach (1973), all values of an individual are listed according to their priorities within a pattern called values system. The values system changes when a new value is learned and added to the system. After the addi-

\* The paper presented in I. Euroasia Educational Research Congress as a oral presentations, Istanbul 24-26.04.2014.

tion of this new value, the order of the values according to their priorities is ordered again. Therefore, it cannot be said that values are completely stable or that they change continuously. Values are flexible enough to let individualistic or communal changes happen, but they are not stable enough to reflect the structure of the personality of an individual (Korkmaz- Devrani 2010; Rokech 1973).

Life events, which require dramatic changes in the life conditions of a person, are the most important reason for changing values in adulthood. Consequently, the strongest changes in life conditions occur as a result of the greatest changes in life values (Bardi et al. 2009). However, these changes occur according to a specific balance rather than as a random occurrence or a complex one. For example, according to Schwartz scale, there is a reverse relation between cross values, but this relation is linear between the same value groups. So, the increase in universalism, which is in the self-transcendence group leads to an increase in the benevolence value which is in the same group. However, the increase in universalism leads to a little decrease in the self-enhancement group, and even in other individualistic values. In other words, while the increase in universalism value leads to an increase in social values such as benevolence, tradition, conformity and security which are in the same group, it also leads to a decrease in the individualistic values' priorities such as achievement, power, hedonism and stimulation (Bardi et al. 2009).

Values are transmitted from generations to generations by means of different channels. As opposed to the fact that the same value is sometimes transmitted with the same content, it can still be altered according to the needs and conditions. It also changes and satisfies the needs according to the conditions. The transmission of values does not only happen to close generations, but it includes several generations with a wider cultural change. Because, parents who transmit some specific values to their children have acquired these values from their own parents, integrated them into their lives, and then transmit them to the next generations. In a research (Barni et al. 2012) which studies the resemblance of intergenerational values in the context of the transmission of the values with 381 Italian families, Schwartz Values Scales was given to three generations in order to examine the

similarities of these generations. During the evaluation, the strongest correlation was observed between the first and the second generations (.95 and .97). However, their adolescent children had less common values according to their own parents and grandparents (.39, .41, .22). Obviously, today's adolescents have been experiencing a slow change of values which will turn into more common values with their own parents as future adults. In the same study, it is found that girl adolescents' value resemblance is higher than that of boys who are with their own parents (Barni et al. 2012).

In another study, some factors which can be effective on whether adolescents adopt similar values which they share with their parents or not, was researched. In the study conducted with 547 adolescents and their parents, whereas the possibility of adoption by the adolescents of the values of their parents and integration of these values in their lives is higher if the parents are considered as responsible and affectionate, yet this possibility is less when the parents are perceived as contradicting their acts and statements. The resemblance of the values between the parents and their children is really bound to the knowledge of the values of the parents acquired by the children and the acceptance of them. Therefore, the parents transmit their own values more clearly and comprehensibly. The children take these values of the parents whom they find to be responsive and affectionate and then they most probably integrate them into their own lives and they also progress according to these values (Knafo and Schwartz 2012). If the family is away from the current cultural climate of the society, the possibility of the resemblance of their values with that of their children and the possibility of transmitting them to the children is higher (Boehnke et al. 2007).

### **The Relationship between Values and Life Satisfaction**

This study was fictionalized according to the assumption that the values internalized by individuals will affect their psychological conditions and will guide their behaviors. In this context, it was aimed to study the effects of their primary values on their perception of life satisfaction. In some studies conducted before, it was shown that some primary values of the individuals are connected with some psychological traits.

For example, in a study conducted with the help of some group of American and Chinese businessmen, it was understood that social responsibility and ethics are most connected with self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence), and conservatism (tradition and conformity) (Schneider et al. 2010). For example, the least related value with empathy is achievement, while the most related one is benevolence (Balliet et al. 2008). Social responsibility is, firstly, related to self-transcendence (benevolence and universalism), seconded by conservatism (tradition, security and conformity) (Tayli 2014). Narcistic personality is related mostly to power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, and individual tendencies and is also least related to benevolence and security (Gungor et al. 2012).

In the literature, there is no direct research on the relationship between life values and life satisfaction. However, few research on the relationship between some factors which can be attributed to life satisfaction and values have been run across. Among them, in a study conducted by Ozdemir and Koruklu (2011), it was understood that there is a meaningful relationship between the happiness points and universalism, self-direction and benevolence for the Turkish college students. In another study conducted by Savig and Schwartz (2000: 185), a meaningful relationship was found in 1261 Israelite and German adults and college students, between stimulation, self-direction, achievement and positive affect, but there is no relationship between benevolence, universalism and the positive affect. For these groups, stimulation, self-direction and achievement are important for a person to feel happy, while helping others or a mindful position, which embraces all humanity and nature, were not found to be effective on the happiness of the individual.

On the other hand, societies can determine their own priorities according to their conditions. Sometimes, societies can determine some original primary values for themselves. For example, for the Americans, tradition, universalism and security are perceived as unimportant, while they focus more on self-direction, achievement, stimulation and hedonism which complies with self-direction, self-development and self-authority values (Schwartz and Sagie 2000). Again, there are some different risks and gains of these value priorities. For example, while self-transcendence and conservatism are related to depression, self-

transcendence and openness to change are related to radicalism and openness to change. Self-enhancement also consists of risks such as being irregular and being free from care. It is better that the societies know their original structures in terms of their value priorities, and they should try to make different people acquire some positive aspects of these values by means of different ways. This is important at individual and communal levels.

The main purpose of this study is to show life values related to life satisfaction in Turkish college students. With this aim, life values, which are significantly related to life satisfaction, were studied first, followed by a study of a significant difference between the priorities of girls and boys. Lastly, the college students were ordered according to their average points of their value priorities and an order of the worthiest values was displayed. Therefore, the most and the least important values for the college students were ensured at the same time.

## METHODOLOGY

### Participants

This research was conducted with 407 second, third and fourth graders who accepted to participate in the study voluntarily. They were chosen by the basic random sampling method, being students of different departments of the Education Faculty of Mugla Sıtkı Kocman University in Fall 2013-2014. 84.8 percent of the attendants are girls (218) and 45.3 percent of them are boys (181). The age ranged between 18 and 29 ( $X: 20.77$ ,  $Sd: 1.35$ ).

### Measurement Scales

Schwartz Values Scales, The Life Satisfaction Scale and Personal Information Form.

#### *Schwartz Values Scale*

Schwartz Values Scales is the measurement gauge which consists of 10 sub-units, 57 value items which are based on the categorization of the values of Rokeach. Schwartz tested the validity of the values, firstly, with 40 countries, followed by 54 countries and he claimed that the values are eighty-two percent categorized. Similarly, there is an agreement on 8 of the 10 sub-

units cross-culturally (Sagiv and Schwartz 1995). This scale was adapted into Turkish by KUSDIL and KAGITCIBASI (2000).

### **Life Satisfaction Scale**

Life Satisfaction Scale is a likert type measurement with 5 items leveled by 7. It is appropriate for all ages from adolescents to the adults and old people and it measures life satisfaction. It was developed by Diener et al. in 1985 and was adapted into Turkish by KOKER in 1991. The test-after-test reliability of the scale is  $r=.85$ , while the item-test correlations are between  $.71$  and  $.80$ . The point acquired from one dimensional measurements vary between 7 and 35. The more the numbers increase, the more the life satisfaction increases or the less the number is, the less the level of the satisfaction too.

## **RESULTS**

Furthermore, average points evaluated the value priorities, and the differences between the sexes were measured by t-test, but the relationship between life values and life satisfaction was calculated by Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficient.

In the context of the research, firstly, it was examined which values are the most primary for all college students. In a seven-leveled evaluation, 1 represents the least, 7 represents the highest value. Therefore, the most preferred value with the highest average point in terms of the whole group is self-direction (X: 6.4561, Sd:

.5967), followed by universalism (X: 6.3994, Sd: .6349), security (X: 6.3129, Sd: .6036), benevolence (X: 6.2962, Sd: .5967), conformity (X: 6.1045, Sd: .7595), achievement (X: 6.0269 Sd: .7070), tradition (X: 5.4622 Sd: .8166), stimulation (X: 5.4355, Sd: .9712), hedonism (X: 5.3592, Sd: 1.0330), and lastly, power (X: 5.2172, Sd: 1.1368). In the evaluation of the preferences of values in terms of value groups, it was observed that the self-transcendence group (X: 6.3280, Sd: .5412), followed by conservatism group (X: 6.0021, Sd: .5782), then openness to change group (X: 5.9498, Sd: .5760) and lastly, self-enhancement (X: 5.6346, Sd: .7299) are preferred respectively (Table 1).

Secondly, in order to understand whether there is any difference resulting from the different genders, Independent Samples t-test was applied. According to this, the point of the life satisfaction of the women (X: 25.7451, Sd: 5.5012) is higher than that of the men (X: 23.3642, Sd: 7.7786) and this difference is statistically meaningful ( $t=.3,498$   $p<.001$ ). In terms of life values, the girls give importance more to conformity ( $t=.2,859$   $p<.001$ ), security ( $t=.2,270$   $p<.001$ ) and universalism ( $t=.2,143$   $p<.05$ ), while boys give more importance to power ( $t=.2,207$   $p<.05$ ). No significant differences between women and men in terms of achievement ( $t=.1,459$   $p>.05$ ), hedonism ( $t=.1,178$   $p>.05$ ), stimulation ( $t=.1,440$   $p>.05$ ), self-direction ( $t=.1,448$   $p>.05$ ), benevolence ( $t=.1,550$   $p>.05$ ) and tradition ( $t=.627$   $p>.05$ ) were observed (Table 2).

Lastly, in the context of the research, the relationship between the values and the life satisfaction was measured by Pearson Product-Mo-

**Table 1: The evaluation of value priorities of the college students in terms of average and standard deviation**

| Variables     |                    | N   | X      | Ss     | Value priorities |
|---------------|--------------------|-----|--------|--------|------------------|
| Values        | Self- direction    | 407 | 6.4561 | .6261  | 1                |
|               | Universalism       | 407 | 6.3994 | .6349  | 2                |
|               | Security           | 407 | 6.3129 | .6036  | 3                |
|               | Benevolence        | 407 | 6.2962 | .5967  | 4                |
|               | Conformity         | 407 | 6.1045 | .7595  | 5                |
|               | Achievement        | 407 | 6.0269 | .7070  | 6                |
|               | Tradition          | 407 | 5.4622 | .8166  | 7                |
|               | Stimultion         | 407 | 5.4355 | .9712  | 8                |
|               | Hedonism           | 407 | 5.3592 | 1.0330 | 9                |
|               | Power              | 407 | 5.2172 | 1.1368 | 10               |
| Values Groups | Self-transcendence | 407 | 6.3280 | .5412  | 1                |
|               | Conservation       | 407 | 6.0021 | .5782  | 2                |
|               | Open to change     | 407 | 5.9498 | .5760  | 3                |
|               | Self-enhancement   | 407 | 5.6346 | .7299  | 4                |

(\* $p<.05$ , \*\* $p<.001$ )

**Table 2: The evaluation of the value priority points of the college students according to their gender**

|                       | <i>Gender</i> | <i>N</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Ss</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>P</i> |
|-----------------------|---------------|----------|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| <i>Power</i>          | Women         | 222      | 25.6778     | 4.6675    | 2.207    | .024*    |
|                       | Men           | 185      | 26.7498     | 5.1222    |          |          |
| <i>Achievement</i>    | Women         | 222      | 29.6101     | 3.6070    | 1.459    | .128     |
|                       | Men           | 185      | 30.1523     | 3.8800    |          |          |
| <i>Hedonism</i>       | Women         | 222      | 17.0891     | 3.0380    | 1.178    | .289     |
|                       | Men           | 185      | 17.4455     | 3.0396    |          |          |
| <i>Stimulation</i>    | Women         | 222      | 21.5943     | 3.4554    | 1.440    | .089     |
|                       | Men           | 185      | 22.1147     | 3.8306    |          |          |
| <i>Self-direction</i> | Women         | 222      | 32.4839     | 2.4510    | 1.448    | .173     |
|                       | Men           | 185      | 32.0727     | 3.1227    |          |          |
| <i>Universalism</i>   | Women         | 222      | 57.7457     | 4.3458    | 2.143    | .037*    |
|                       | Men           | 222      | 56.6330     | 6.0974    |          |          |
| <i>Benevolence</i>    | Women         | 222      | 57.2802     | 7.0949    | 1.550    | .253     |
|                       | Men           | 185      | 56.2692     | 6.0653    |          |          |
| <i>Tradition</i>      | Women         | 222      | 33.4119     | 4.6034    | .627     | .556     |
|                       | Men           | 185      | 33.1113     | 5.0633    |          |          |
| <i>Conformity</i>     | Women         | 222      | 24.8533     | 2.6937    | 2.859    | .004**   |
|                       | Men           | 185      | 24.0481     | 2.9829    |          |          |
| <i>Security</i>       | Women         | 222      | 44.6104     | 3.9823    | 2.270    | .016**   |
|                       | Men           | 185      | 43.6628     | 4.4344    |          |          |

(\*p&lt; .05, \*\*p&lt;.001)

ment Correlation coefficient and these results were acquired. According to this, benevolence ( $r=.218$ ,  $p<.001$ ), conformity ( $r=.195$ ,  $p<.001$ ), hedonism ( $r=.191$ ,  $p<.001$ ), security ( $r=.165$ ,  $p<.001$ ), achievement ( $r=.159$ ,  $p<.001$ ), tradition ( $r=.148$ ,  $p<.001$ ), universalism ( $r=.131$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and power ( $r=.117$ ,  $p<.05$ ) come in the respective order as the values which are related to life satisfaction. There is a relationship between the varieties with a meaningfulness of .05 and .001, but its strength is weak. Other variables that are not related to life satisfaction are—stimulation ( $r=.096$ ,  $p>.05$ ) and self-authority ( $r=.091$ ,  $p>.05$ ), respectively (Table 3).

### DISCUSSION

The value priority of the Turkish college students was studied by several researchers. For example, in a study conducted by Aygun-Karak-

itapoglu and Imamoglu (2002), it was found that universalism and benevolence are the most preferred values among Turkish college students. The highest primary value group for the Turkish college students is self-transcendancy, seconded by self-enlargement, thirdly, to be open to change and lastly, conservatism. In another study conducted by Kusdil and Kagitcibasi (2000), it was found that the most important values of the teachers are universalism, benevolence and tradition. These three are followed by self-authority, power, security, and achievement followed by the least level, which include hedonism and conformity. In a study conducted by Tayli (2012), the priority of the preferences of the Turkish college students revealed that self-transcendancy and self-enhancement groups such as self-direction, universalism, security, benevolence, conformity, achievement and conservatism were most preferred. But power, hedonism

**Table 3: The evaluation of the relationship between the values and the life satisfaction by Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficient**

| <i>Values</i>     | <i>Power</i> | <i>Achievement</i> | <i>Hedonism</i> | <i>Stimulation</i> | <i>Self-direction</i> | <i>Universalism</i> | <i>Benevolence</i> | <i>Tradition</i> | <i>Conformity</i> | <i>Security</i> |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Life satisfaction | .117*        | .159**             | .191**          | .096               | .091                  | .131**              | .218**             | .148*            | .195**            | .165**          |

(\*p&lt; .05, \*\*p&lt;.001)

and stimulation were accepted as the least important ones. It is really interesting that there is virtually no difference between the results of Tayli (2011) who conducted this research with 579 students from the same faculty and a study conducted after two years from the former research in 2013. This situation makes us think that the value priorities of the students are stable. In both studies, the students most preferred self-transcendancy (universalism, benevolence), then conservatism (tradition, security, conformity), openness to change (self-direction, stimulation, hedonism) and lastly self-enhancement (power, achievement, hedonism).

Moreso, in one study conducted by Sahin-Firat in 2010 with some school managers and teachers, it was observed that both of the groups preferred universalism as the most important and power as the least important life value. In the same study, the school managers claimed that self-transcendancy (universalism, benevolence) within social values is important for the development of a positive culture in the school. The teachers supported the idea that self-transcendancy (universalism, benevolence) and conservatism (tradition, conformity, security) must go together if the school must have a positive school culture. The paintings, compositions of 308 Turkish which are related to the value priorities of the students from foreign countries such as Turkey, Iraq and Saudi Arabia were examined and the most debated ones among them were benevolence, patriotism and responsibility (Tasdemir 2012).

Self-direction mostly means that all people are responsible only for themselves and it consists of some sub-units such as creativity, curiosity, freedom, choosing of one's own goals, and being sovereign. Responsibility means that it makes people feel about their own actions, the consequences of these actions and in every relevant event. Universalism means to protect all humanity and nature and to care for their well-being (Schwartz 1994; Schwartz and Sagiv 1995, 2000). The countries which help the people around, and serve other people were encouraged and were placed under the category of the communal cultures. In this study, the major primary values are self-transcendancy and conservatism. They both belong to the social values category, although it is accepted that it has some exclusion from individualistic values. For example, while universalism value increases under the self-

transcendence group, benevolence from the same group increases. This makes other values such as achievement, power, hedonism, and stimulation which are individualistic values to decrease (Bardi et al. 2009). In this study, Turkish sample groups preferred social values rather than individual values, which symbolizes a communal society. While in other studies which were conducted in Western culture, it was found that individual values more important to social values. For example, a study conducted by Savig and Schwartz (2000:185) on 1261 Israelite and German adults as well as college students, showed that there is a meaningful relationship between stimulation, self-authority and achievement and positive affect, but no relationship was found between benevolence, universalism and positive affect. For these groups, stimulation, self-authority and achievement are important for a person to feel happy, while helping others or a mindful position which embraces all humanity and nature were not found to be effective on the happiness of the individual. In another study done by Ozdemir and Koruklu (2011), it was found that universalism, self-authority, and benevolence are the only values which are related to the happiness points of the Turkish college students. It will also not be out of place to say that Turkish sample groups are less focused on individuals when compared with some European students. In another study, four European countries (France, Holland, Switzerland, Portugal) were supposed to be compared with other Turkish people in a volleyball tournament. As a result, it was found that there are more similarities than differences between the choices of the players regarding values. However, an adventurous life is the dream of everyone of the other Europeans except those from Turkey. Other Europeans also all preferred to be a domineering figure, again, except those from Turkey (Sarac and Kilcigil 2004). Domineering personality coincides with the power value, while adventurous life is associated with the stimulation value and both values are shown as individualistic values in Schwartz' scale (Bilsky and Schwartz 1994; Schwartz 1994).

In terms of life values, conformity, security and universalism are the most important values for girls while boys focused more on the power value. It is beneficial to think of the preference values which seem to be appropriate for the gender roles of the traditions from different perspectives. First of all, by dividing the societies into

two groups, as individualistic and communal, and by making the assumption that gender roles of men and women are expected to occur in the communal societies would be wrong. Indeed, it is impossible to divide a society into only two categories. For example, even if there are lots of indications of a communal society, the Turkish sample, especially the educated, young and urban people have a tendency to be individualistic at some points (Kagitcibasi 2008). Therefore, the fact that the values such as conformity, security and universalism are preferred by girls and the power value is preferred more by boys should be examined under some limitations. Moreover, in a study conducted by Uyguc in 2003, it was found that girls have both masculine and feminine values, while boys have higher points in the universalism value which is normally accepted as feminine by men. In another study, it was found that while boys were interested in universalism and self-authority values, girls preferred power more. In another study, girls preferred benevolence, conformity and security, while boys gathered higher points in the level of hedonism. However, amongst 13 countries, Turkey is the country nearest within the middle limit, which was found in the gender roles category by Hofstede (Uyguc 2003; Hofstede 1991).

In the context of the research, the relationship between the value preferences and life satisfaction was also evaluated. Based on the evaluation, the most important life value for life satisfaction is benevolence. The ones who declared the best life satisfaction in the Turkish college students are the ones who preferred benevolence as a primary value. Benevolence is followed by values such as conformity, hedonism, security, achievement, tradition, universalism and power. Even though there is a relationship between the varieties in .05 and .001, yet, this relationship is weak. In some other researches conducted with the Turkish samples, it was found that benevolence is always the most preferred value, or is always among the first three (Aygün- Karakitapoglu and Imamoglu 2002; KUSDIL and Kagitcibasi 2000; Sahin- Firat 2010; Tasdemir 2012; Tayli 2012, 2014 ). Even if there is no direct research on the relationship between life satisfaction and life values, there are some studies which show the fact that good values (Sagiy and Schwartz 2000), determines the level of job satisfaction (Yilmaz and Dilmac 2011), and personal happiness (Ozdemir and Koruklu 2011). However, a second

evaluation is required in order to find which values or value groups are determiners of a society or an individual. For example, according to the sample of German and Israelite teens and adults, having a good spirit and mental health have a positive relationship with achievement, self-authority and stimulation which are a part of the self-enhancement group. On the other hand, they have a negative relationship with the conservatism group which consists of conformity and security values (Sagiy and Schwartz 2000). In another study that was conducted with 303 Turkish teachers, it was found that the values explain fourteen percent of the job satisfaction and that the most effective values for job satisfaction are tradition and security (Yilmaz and Dilmac 2011). In another study conducted in Turkey as well, the school managers accepted the fact that the self-transcendence value group from social values such as universalism, and benevolence are important for a positive school atmosphere. In the same study, teachers claimed that both conservatism and self-transcendence groups and their subunits such as conformity, security, tradition, benevolence and universalism are associated with all dimensions of a positive school climate (Sahin-Firat 2010). In another study by Ozdemir and Koruklu (2011), it was found that the happiness points of the Turkish sample groups are related to benevolence, universalism and self-direction.

In this study and other studies conducted by the Turkish sample groups, social values were found to be preferred by the majority while the individualistic values are of less importance to them. These values make communal life easier for situations where cooperation, sharing and social support are important. At the same time, to see self-tendency among the ones to be controlled is beneficial for personal responsibility and personal boundaries. On the other hand, the societies, priorities and life habits can change. A change of values can be affected by age, with time (Barni et al. 2012; Boehnke et al. 2007), by some important life events (Bardi et al. 2009) and sometimes by education (Yapici et al. 2012). Furthermore, sometimes by the fact that the society is governed by an authoritarian or democratic regime also affects the change of values (Schwartz and Sagie 2000). These changes can be both beneficial and harmful. Due to globalization, societies are affected by each other, travel, television and media, that make them change and

alter their priorities. Therefore, the direction of the change should be determined beforehand in order to prevent risks and to take precautions by calculating the effects of the primary values on interpersonal relationships, other people in the world or other living things.

## REFERENCES

- Adiguzel OC, Ergunay O 2012. An investigation of dissertation on values in Turkey from the perspective of educational science and teacher training. *Electronic Journal of Social Science*, 11(41): 18-33.
- Algera H, Sink CA 2002. Character education: Another look at character education in Christian schools. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 11(2): 161-181.
- Bardi A, Lee JA, Hofmann-Towfigh N, Soutar G 2009. The structure of intra-individual value change. *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(5): 913-929.
- Barni D, Ranieri S, Scabini E 2012. Value similarity among grandparents, parents, and adolescent children: Unique or stereotypical? *Family Science*, 3(1): 46-54.
- Balliet D, Joireman J, Daniels D, Falvy JG 2008. Empathy and the Schwartz's Value System: A test of an integrated hypothesis. *Individual Differences Research*, 6(4): 269-279.
- Boehnke K, Hajdar A, Baier D 2007. Parent-child value similarity: The role of Zeitgeist. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69: 778-792.
- Bilsky W, Schwartz S H 1994. Values and personality. *European Journal of Personality*, 8: 163- 181.
- Dilmac B, Deniz M, Deniz ME 2009. An investigation of university student's self-compassion and value preferences. *Journal of Value Education*, 7(18): 9-24.
- Gungor Y H, Eksi H, Aricak O T 2012. Value preferences predicting narcissistic personality traits in young adults. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(2): 1281-1290.
- Karakitapoglu-Aygün Z, Imamoglu E O, 2002. Value orientations of Turkish University students and adults. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142: 333-351.
- Knafo A, Schwartz S H 2012. Relational identification with parents, parenting, and parent- child value similarity among adolescent. *Family Science*, 3(1): 13-21.
- Kagitçibasi C 2008. *The Human and Humans Today*. Istanbul: Evrim Publications.
- Korkmaz-Devrani T 2010. The conceptual framework of personal values and applications in marketing. *Osmangazi University, Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 5(1): 49-70.
- Koker S 1991. *The Comparison of the Life Satisfaction Level of the Normal and Problematic Adolescents*. Master Thesis, Unpublished. Social Science Institute. Ankara: Ankara University.
- Kusdil E, Kagitçibasi C 2000. Value orientation of Turkish teachers and Schwartz's Theory of values running head: Values. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 15(45): 59-76.
- Ozdemir Y, Nermin Koruklu N 2011. Investigating relationship between values and happiness among university students. *Yuzuncu Yil University, Journal of Education Faculty*, 8(1): 190-210.
- Pearson QM, Nicholson JI 2000. Comprehensive character education in the elementary school: Strategies for administrators, teachers, and counselors. *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, 38(4): 243-251.
- Sagiv L, Schwartz SH 2000. Value priorities and subjective well-being: Direct relations and congruity effects. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30: 177-198.
- Slavin RE 2012. Social, moral and emotional development. (Trans. N. Ozabaci). In: G.Yuksel (Trans. Edit): *Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing, pp.52-76.
- Sarac G, Kilcigil E 2004. The social value understanding in volleyball players of male and female university teams of different countries. *Ankara University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Spormetre: Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 11(2): 81-89.
- Schneider SC, Zollo M, Manocha R 2010. Developing socially responsible behaviour in managers. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, 39: 21-40.
- Schwartz SH 1994. Are the universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values ? *Journal of Social Issues*, 50(4): 19-45.
- Schwartz SH 1999. A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(1): 23-47.
- Schwartz SH, Bilsky W 1987. Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Psychology*, 53: 550-562.
- Schwartz S H, Huismans S 1995. Value priorities and religiosity in four western religions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(2): 88- 107.