



Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research

Volume 13, Issue 3 September 2018

epasr.penpublishing.net

ISSN: 1949-4270 (Print) 1949-4289 (Online)

Analysis of the Relationship between Pre-service Teachers' Value Orientations and Empathic Tendencies

Mehmet Ali Akin

To cite this article

Akin, M.A. (2018). Analysis of the Relationship between Pre-service Teachers' Value Orientations and Empathic Tendencies. Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research, 13(3), 45-73. doi: 10.29329/epasr.2018.150.3

Published Online	September 29, 2018
Article Views	5 single - 9 cumulative
Article Download	20 single - 20 cumulative
DOI	https://doi.org/10.29329/epasr.2018.150.3

Pen Academic is an independent international publisher committed to publishing academic books, journals, encyclopedias, handbooks of research of the highest quality in the fields of Education, Social Sciences, Science and Agriculture. Pen Academic created an open access system to spread the scientific knowledge freely. For more information about PEN, please contact: info@penpublishing.net



Analysis of the Relationship between Pre-service Teachers' Value Orientations and Empathic Tendencies

Mehmet Ali Akinⁱ

Mardin Artuklu University, Mardin, Turkey

Abstract

This research aimed at analyzing pre-service teachers' value orientations and empathic tendencies. It was based on quantitative, descriptive and relational approach. Pre-service teachers' value orientations and empathic tendencies were evaluated according to the variables including gender, subject area and types of education. Following this evaluation process, the correlation relationship between value orientations and empathic tendencies was examined. According to the independent variables, it was found that pre-service teachers' value orientations show significant differentiations for some value dimensions as opposed to the other value ones. Besides, pre-service teachers' empathic tendencies show significant differences with regard to gender, subject area and types of education variables. Based on gender variable, a significant difference occurs in favor of the female pre-service teachers and a significant difference takes place in favor of those pre-service teachers graduated from non-formal education in respect to types of education variable. The correlation value for pre-service teachers' value orientations and empathic tendencies are significant and low. It was revealed that the relationship between the value orientations and the empathic tendency dimensions are positive and low for some value dimensions and negative and low for the other ones.

Keywords: *Pre-service teacher, value orientation, empathic tendency.*

DOI: 10.29329/epasr.2018.150.3

ⁱ **Mehmet Ali Akin**, Assist. Prof. Dr., Department of Educational Sciences, Literature Faculty, Mardin Artuklu University, Mardin, Turkey.

Email: akina7215@hotmail.com

Introduction

Values, which affect thoughts, attitudes, behaviors and decisions, shape preferences in one's life, shortly give meaning to life, are a consensus base which societies value and share (Zevalsiz, 2014:1744), "enduring belief" (Rokeach, 1973), deep rooted abstract motivators which lead individuals' thought, attitude and behaviors or account for them (Schwartz, 2017, p.261). As values are concerned with the principles to solve problems among people in addition to dealing with the relationships between people and nature, it has a long-lasting history as communal living (Doğan, 2007:38).

Values have a significant role in preferring one particular behavior to other one on account of creating social life criteria (Yıldız, Dilmaç and Deniz, 2013, p. 741). It is an important expectation for individuals to arrange their lives according to the value systems they embrace. Therefore, values constitute a basic perception source for individuals who are a member of any social group (Şişman, 2002, p. 93).

As a result, values are inspiration sources for people and societies indicating what it is "good, beautiful, important and positive and so forth". They are also defined as an evaluation criterion to enable people to justify what they do (Bacanlı, 2011:19-21, Doğan, 2016). In this respect, value refers to "**good**" in ethics, the "**quality**" of objects and events according to societies in sociology, "**truth**" in logic, "**beauty**" in esthetics. In dictionary, it is defined as "**abstract measure**" helping describing an important thing and "**a value for something**"(Hançerlioğlu, 1976: 275. Türk Dil Kurumu, 2005: 483, Püsküllüoğlu, 2003: 352-353). The fact that value concept has been a research issue in different fields in social sciences for a long time can be explained through its role in understanding people (Asan, 2011, p. 16).

A significant consensus point for a number of social scientists is that values are a crucial social fact and, therefore, can be a subject for scientific research and examination. So, value concept has an interdisciplinary characteristic used in social sciences including psychology, sociology, social psychology, anthropology, economy and politics (Güney, 2011. p.31). However, social disciplines prefer explaining value concept from the point of subjective view. To illustrate, Allport (1968) dealt with the concept psychological perspective and defined the value as "perceived meanings with regard to self". According to Allport's evaluation, value means perceiving any object valuable, psychologically attaching to that object or making an effort to acquire or preserve it. Based on the social evaluation, value is "basic moral principles or beliefs reflecting the shared thoughts, aims and interests which are regarded as true and necessary by the majority of group members to enable a society or any social group to keep its entity, unity, running and continuation" (Kızılçelik & Erjem, 1996). Güngör, who explains the value concept through social psychology approach, defines value as

"belief indicating what can or cannot be desired" and regards it as a component of our thoughts, emotions and knowledge with regard to any part of our life in a belief dimension. In other words, value involves three components namely, knowledge, emotion and behavior. When we have a value, we think that value the most accurate way to follow, emotionally focus on it developing a positive attitude and are led towards a particular direction by that value (Güngör, 1998: 27-29).

Where does the importance of knowing people's value orientations stem from? The easiest and clearest answer for this question is that values are mostly concerned with basic reasons and explanatory factors underlying an individual's whole thought, emotion, attitude and behaviors. In this regard, knowing an individual's value can give an idea about what affects and activates that person (Robbins & Judge, 2013, p. 157). It is important to know value orientations consisting of the values which have a power to affect and shape individuals' thought, emotion, attitude, perception and behaviors.

Value orientation comprises of a set of values which influences people's decisions, preferences and behaviors. If those values are consistent with each other and can shape people's life, they can live free of inconsistencies. Otherwise, they can continue their life with inconsistencies.

People's value orientations enliven their whole concepts in their life more or less (Genc & Eryaman, 2008). Empathy can be regarded as one of the basic values affecting the concepts. The quantity of empathy density experienced in relationships can be found in people's different value orientations.

Empathy has functions in modern history of psychology including psychological counseling and guidance and clinical psychology (Akkoyun, 2001: 74-83). Besides, empathy is one of the important concepts in self-psychology and social psychology literature (Dökmen, 2002). Concept of empathy in social psychology refers to the inner sense of an individual who has been affected and impressed. It is known as a capacity to predict other's reactions in interpersonal relationships. In this regard, an individual with a high sense of empathic tendency can experience another's feelings better and evaluate an issue from his/her perspective better. Empathy which is, generally, a psychological effort to understand the opposite person as "other" and guess other's potentials, stresses out the capacity to put oneself in other's position. So, this effort requires individual to get away from self-centered thinking to other's perspective/approach instead of evaluating outer world and other from his/her self-centered perspective (Bilgin, 2003: 101-102).

Dökmen (cited from Rogers, 1970 & 1983) indicates that empathy is a process where counselor puts himself/herself in counselees' position, enters their phenomenological world, correctly understand their feelings and thoughts, feel their feelings and convey this counseling case to them.

Counselor should avoid reflecting his/her own feelings to counselees. Besides, counselor should use his/her own sentences while conveying the emphatic reaction formed in his/her mind to counselee. However, counselee's words should be sometimes included in those sentences (Dökmen, 1988 & 2002).

Individual realizes his/her inner self who he/she has not been aware of before as a result of his/her inner self revealed by another through empathy (Tangül Özcan, Oflaz & Türkbay, 2003). People feel understood and cared when they are empathized with. The fact that they are understood and cared, makes them relax and feel good. Empathic skill has a significant role in ensuring interpersonal and healthy communication (Yüksel, 2004).

Empathy, which is a shared emotional and cognitive effort, can be utilized in every area where healthy and effective communication is needed. Empathy strengthens solidarity capacity. Besides, it is an activity which makes positive contributions to social behaviors and is a counselee centered emotional and cognitive understanding and sharing process. If such a profound and intense empathy becomes a part of teacher's personality, his/her student is expected to develop his/her academic, pedagogic, religious, moral and social behaviors (Aydın, 2009).

This research is based on the premise that if empathy becomes a crucial part of a teacher's personality, it will make significant contributions to his/her students' achievements in life. So, in this research, the answer of the question "how is the relationship between pre-service teachers' value orientations and empathic tendencies?" was sought.

Purpose

The general purpose of this research is to analyze the relationship between pre-service teachers' value orientations and empathic tendencies. Besides, it is to reveal whether there are significant differences in the relationships of their value orientations and empathic tendencies according to gender, subject area and types of education variables.

Method

Relational screening model was employed in the current descriptive research. The model is a research model which aims to determine the existence of significance between two or more variables (Karasar, 1998, p.81).

The population of the research consisted of 1000 students who attended the Pedagogical Formation Training Certificate Program held at Mardin Artuklu University in 2016-2017 academic year. Its sampling comprised of 230 students who were randomly selected.

Table 1. Data concerning the sampling group

Gender	N	%	Subject Area	N	%	Type of education	N	%
Female	139	60.4	History	39	16.9	Formal	181	78.7
Male	91	39.6	Philosophy Group	67	29.1	Non-formal	49	21.3
			Theology	46	20			
			Art	19	8.2			
			Turkish Literature	21	9.1			
			Health	38	16.5			

When the data in Table 1 is examined, it is seen that the participants were 39.6% (N=91) male students and 60.4% (N=139) female students. 16.9% (N=39), 29.1% (N=67), 20% (N=46), 8.2% (N=19) and 9.1% (N=21) and 16.5% (N=38) of the students study in History, Philosophy Group, Theology, Art, Turkish Literature and Health, respectively. 78.7% (N=181) of the participants graduated from formal education, whereas 21.3% (N=49) of them graduated from non-formal education.

The Portrait Values Questionnaire with 40 questions developed by Schwartz and Bilsky (2001) and "Personal Information Form" were used to collect the data concerning pre-service teachers' value orientations. A fictional individual is described corresponding to the aims or desires in ten values types for each item in the questionnaire. The value types and the related item numbers are displayed below (Demirutku, 2004: 9-10).

1- Power: he/she wants to have much money and expensive things; **2- Achievement:** he/she wants people to admire what he/she has accomplished; **3- Hedonism:** it is important for him/her to do the things which give pleasure; **4- Stimulation:** he/she always looks for something to try; **5- Self-direction:** he/she wants to perform an action distinctively and originally; **6- Universalism:** he/she believes that everybody should have the equal opportunities; **7- Benevolence:** it is very important to help people around him/her; **8- Tradition:** he/she thinks about the best way to do the things is in traditional ways; **9- Conformity:** he/she believes that people should do what they are asked; **10- Security:** he/she avoids everything which will jeopardize his/her security.

The validity and reliability were tested on the questionnaire in the research which was adapted into Turkish. The validity and reliability of the Portrait Values Questionnaire were conducted during the adaptation for Turkish (Demirutku & Sümer, 2010, p. 21-22). According to these results, it can be expressed that the empirical structure in the research does not show significant fluctuations from the theoretical model and the observed fluctuations are consistent with the previous ones.

The coefficients for Cronbach's Alpha and test-retest reliability were calculated for value (types) orientations in the Portrait Values Questionnaire. According to the calculations, the lowest coefficient value occurred in "*Self-direction*" with .56, whereas the highest coefficient one happened in "*Achievement*" with .82. Besides, test-retest reliability calculations indicated that the lowest reliability coefficient value was in "Self-direction" with .65 and the highest one in "*Tradition*" with .82.

"Empathic Tendency Scale" developed by Dökmen (1988) was used to collect the data concerning pre-service teachers' empathic tendencies. 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 9th, 10th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th items in the scale are positive and in standard calculation, whereas 3rd, 6th, 7th, 8th, 11th, 12th, 13th and 14th items are negative and in reverse calculation. The high point derived from the scale demonstrates high empathic tendency and the low point indicates low empathic tendency. In the context with the validity of the scale, the correlation for the scores obtained from Empathic Tendency Scale and "Understanding Feelings" part in Edwards Personal Preference Schedule which were applied with 24 participants, were examined and it was found that the correlation value was 0.68. Test-retest and split test methods were used to test the reliability of the scale. The reliability of the scale based on test-retest occurred as $r=0.82$. The correlation between even and odd items in the scale was $r=0.86$ (Dökmen, 1988). The formula for Cronbach's Alpha was used in this research and Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was calculated as .60.

Data Analysis

Arithmetic mean and standard deviation were used to analyze the data in the research. In addition, correlation technique was employed to test the relationship between value orientation and empathic tendency. T-test or Mann-Whitney -U were utilized for the variables including "gender" and "type of education", while One-Way Anova or Scheffe tests were used for "subject area" variable. Tukey HSD test was implemented to reveal the source of differences for significant F values.

Findings

The findings of the research as follows: 1. Pre-service teachers' value orientations with regard to the variables; 2- Pre-service teachers' empathic tendencies with regard to the variables; and 3- The correlation between pre-service teachers' value orientations and empathic tendencies.

The findings concerning value orientations

The findings for general value orientations

Table 2. The findings for general value orientations

Pre-service Teachers' Value Orientations	N	\bar{x}	S
Universalism	230	1,64	,66
Self-direction	230	1.86	,65
Benevolence	230	1,88	,73
Security	230	2.08	,80
Conformity	230	2.20	,91
Tradition	230	2.51	,88
Stimulation	230	2.57	,97
Hedonism	230	2.79	1.05
Achievement	230	2.82	1.07
Power	230	3.49	1.64

When the data in Table 2 is taken into account, it is seen that pre-service teachers' uppermost preferences go for "*Universalism*", "*Self-direction*" and "*Benevolence*" values as opposed to "*Power*", "*Achievement*" and "*Hedonism*" values. Low arithmetic mean indicates high similarity and high mean for low similarity.

Findings for value orientations with regard to gender variable

As the normal distribution was observed among the value orientations except "*Universalism*", t-test was used. Therefore, Mann-Whitney-U test was implemented for "*Universalism*" value.

Table 3. The findings for general value orientations with regard to gender variable

Gender	N	\bar{x}	S	sd	T	P
Female	139	2.32	.866	228	-3.255	.001
Male	91	2.45	.901			

* p<.05

According to Table 3, female teachers' arithmetic mean with regard to value orientations is \bar{x} =2.32, while the mean for male teachers is \bar{x} =2.45. As a result of t-test analysis, it was found that the significant difference is in favor of the female teachers (t=3.255; p<0.05).

Table 4: The results of Mann-Whitney-U test for Universalism with regard to gender variable

Group	N	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	P
Female	139	109.38	15204.50	5474.500	.082
Male	91	124.84	11360.50		

* p<.05

Table 4 reveals that there is not a significant difference for pre-service teachers' "*Universalism*" value orientation with regard to gender variable (U=5474.500; p>0.05)

Table 5. T-test results for value orientations with regard to gender variable

Value Orientation		N	X	SS	Sd	T	p	
Self-direction	Gender	Female	131	1.77	.65	228	-2.15	0.03
		Male	91	1.96	.65	228		
Benevolence	Gender	Female	131	1.81	.66	228	-1.54	0.12
		Male	91	1.96	.81	228		
Security	Gender	Female	131	1.98	.76	228	-1.82	0.06
		Male	91	2.18	.84	228		
Conformity	Gender	Female	131	2.28	.93	228	1.20	0.23
		Male	91	2.13	.89	228		
Tradition	Gender	Female	131	2.52	.91	228	0.24	0.81
		Male	91	2.49	.85	228		
Stimulation	Gender	Female	131	2.48	.98	228	-1.33	0.18
		Male	91	2.66	.95	228		
Hedonism	Gender	Female	131	2.59	1.06	228	-2.86	0.00
		Male	91	3.00	1.04	228		
Achievement	Gender	Female	131	2.72	1.07	228	-1.32	0.18
		Male	91	2.92	1.06	228		
Power	Gender	Female	131	3.57	1.06	228	0.95	0.34
		Male	91	3.42	1.17	228		

* p<.05

According to Table 5, there are significant differences in favor of female pre-service teachers in "*Self-direction*" (t=-2.15; p<.05) and "*Hedonism*" (t=-2.86; p<.05) value orientations with regard to gender. Significant differences have not been observed in "*Power*", "*Achievement*", "*Stimulation*", "*Conformity*", "*Security*", "*Benevolence*" and "*Tradition*".

Findings for value orientations with regard to subject area variable

One-Way Anova test results indicate that there are not significant differences in pre-service teachers' value orientations including "*Universalism*", "*Benevolence*", "*Security*", "*Tradition*", "*Conformity*", "*Stimulation*", "*Achievement*", "*Hedonism*" and "*Self-direction*". The difference occurs in "*Power*" value orientation.

Table 6: One Way test results for power value orientation with regard to subject area

Value orientation	Subject area	N	X	SS	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	P	Difference
Power	History	39	3.70	0.97	Inter groups	19.380	5	3.876	3.32	0.006	*
	Philosophy	67	3.83	1.16	Within groups	261.405	22	1.167			
	Theology	46	3.26	1.16	Total	280.785	22				
	Art	19	3.66	1.28			9				
	Turkish Literature	21	3.00	0.76							
	Health	38	3.27	0.93							
	Total	230	3.51	1.10							

* p<.05

Table 6 revealed that there is a significant difference in pre-service teachers' "*Power*" value orientation with regard to subject area variable ($F(5.224)=3.32$; $p<0.05$). Tukey test results were consulted to learn in which groups the significant difference took place.

Table 7: Tukey test results for power value orientation with regard to subject area

Subject Area	Subject Areas	Mean difference	P
Philosophy	History	0.12	0.99
	Theology	0.56	0.06
	Art	0.16	0.99
	Turkish Literature	0.83*	0.02
	Health	0.55	0.11

* p<.05

According to Table 7, it is seen that there is a significant difference in pre-service teachers' Philosophy Group and Turkish Literature subject areas and this difference is in favor of Turkish Literature ($p<0.05$).

Table 8: Kruskal-Wallis-H test results for "Achievement" value orientation with regard to subject area

Value orientation	Subject Area	N	Mean rank	Sd	X ²	P
Achievement	History	39	137.28	5	15.963	0.007
	Philosophy Group	67	122.51			
	Theology	46	110.95			
	Art	19	110.11			
	Turkish Literature	21	68.21			
	Health	38	115.,12			
	Total	230				

* p<.05

When Table 8 is examined, it is revealed that "*Achievement*" value orientation has statistically significant difference ($X^2(2, 230)= 15.963; p>0.05$). When the mean rank is taken into account, it is seen that the significant difference is favor of Turkish Literature subject area. Mann Whitney-U test was implemented to find out which subject area has statistically significant difference. The test results are provided in Table 9.

Table 9: Mann-Whitney-U test results with regard to subject area

Subject Areas	N	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	P
History	39	57.47	2241.50	1151.500	0.309
Philosophy Group	67	51.19	3429.50		
History	39	48.42	1888.50	685.500	.061
Theology	46	38.40	1766.50		
History	39	31.45	1226.50	294.500	.206
Art	19	25.50	484.50		
History	39	36.77	1434.00	165.000	.000
Turkish Literature	21	18.86	396.00		
History	39	43.17	168.50	578.500	.096
Health	38	34.72	1319.50		
Philosophy Group	67	59.34	3975.50	1384.500	.359
Theology	46	53.60	2465.50		
Philosophy Group	67	44.40	2975.00	576.000	.528
Art	19	40.32	766.00		
Philosophy Group	67	49.29	3302.50	382.500	.002
Turkish Literature	21	29.21	613.50		

Philosophy Group	67	54.30	3638.00	1186.000	.560
Health	38	50.71	1927.00		
Theology	46	33.08	1521.50	433.500	.960
Art	19	32.82	623.50		
Theology	46	38.11	1753.00	294.000	.010
Turkish Literature	21	25.00	525.00		
Theology	46	41.76	1921.00	840.000	.759
Health	38	43.39	1649.00		
Art	19	23.08	438.50	150.500	.182
Turkish Literature	21	18.17	381.50		
Art	19	28.39	539.50	349.500	.845
Health	38	29.30	1113.50		
Turkish Literature	21	20.98	440.50	209.500	.003
Health	38	34.99	1329.50		

* p<.05

According to Table 9, the mean ranks of the "*Achievement*" value orientation with regard to History and Turkish Literature are 36.77 and 18.86, respectively. The mean rank difference is (U=165.000; p<0.05). The mean ranks of Philosophy Group and Turkish literature are 49.29 and 29.21, consecutively. The mean rank difference is (U=382.500; p<0.05). The mean ranks of Theology and Turkish Literature are 38.11 and 25.00, respectively. The mean rank difference is (U=294.000; p<0.05). The mean ranks of Turkish Literature and Health are 20.98 and 34.99, respectively. The difference for this mean rank is statistically significant (U=209.500; p<0.05). These differences are generally statistically significant.

When Table 9 is regarded, it is seen that the mean ranks of the "Achievement" value orientation in terms of History and Philosophy Group subject areas are 57.47 and 51.19, respectively. The mean rank difference is (U=1151.500; p>0.05). The mean ranks of History and Theology are 48.42 and 38.40, consecutively and the mean rank difference is (U=685,500; p>0.05). The mean ranks of History and Art are 31.45 and 25.50, respectively and the mean rank difference is (U=294.500; p>0.05). The mean ranks of History and Health are 43.17 and 34.72, consecutively and the mean rank difference is (U=578.500; p>0.05). The mean ranks of Philosophy Group and Theology are 59.34 and 53.60, respectively and the difference is (U=1384.500, p>0.05). The mean ranks of Philosophy Group and Art are 44.40 and 40.32, consecutively and the difference is (U=576.000; p>0.05). The mean ranks of Philosophy Group and Health are 54.30 and 50.71, respectively and the difference is (U=1186.000; p>0.05). The mean ranks of Theology and Art are 33.08 and 32.82, consecutively and the difference is (U=433,500; p>0.05). The mean ranks of Theology and Health are 41.76 and 43.39, respectively and the difference is (U=840,000; p>0.05). The mean ranks of Art and Turkish Literature

are 23.08 and 18.17, consecutively and the difference is (U=150.500; p>0.05). The mean ranks of Art and Health are 28.39 and 29.30, respectively and the difference is (U=349.500; p>0.05). These differences are not statistically significant.

Findings for value orientations with regard to type of education variable

Table 10: T-Test results for value orientations with regard to type of education

Value orientations		N	X	SS	Sd	T	P
Power	Type of edu. Formal	181	3.55	1.13		1.33	.25
	Type of edu. Non-formal	49	3.37	.99	228		
Achievement	Type of edu. Formal	181	2.8679	1.08	228	.40	.52
	Type of edu. Non-formal	49	2.5731	1.00			
Hedonism	Type of edu. Formal	181	2.8250	1.09	228	.71	.39
	Type of edu. Non-formal	49	2.5238	.96			
Stimulation	Type of edu. Formal	181	2.6179	1.02	228	4.63	.03*
	Type of edu. Non-formal	49	2.3401	.76			
Self-direction	Type of edu. Formal	181	1.8895	.69	228	9.71	.00*
	Type of edu. Non-formal	49	1.6990	.48			
Universalism	Type of edu. Formal	181	1.6869	.71	228	18.41	.00*
	Type of edu. Non-formal	49	1.3980	.37			
Benevolence	Type of edu. Formal	181	1.9641	.77	228	17.85	.00*
	Type of edu. Non-formal	49	1.5612	.42			
Tradition	Type of edu. Formal	181	2.5387	.93	228	4.33	.03*
	Type of edu. Non-formal	49	2.4133	.71			
Conformity	Type of edu. Formal	181	2.3039	.94		3.35	.06
	Type of edu. Non-formal	49	1.9439	.75	228		
Security	Type of edu. Formal	181	2.1271	.84	228	2.82	.09
	Type of edu. Non-formal	49	1.8490	.60			

* p<.05

Table 10 indicates that there are statistically significant differences in favor of the pre-service teachers who attended in non-formal education in "*Stimulation*" ($t= 4.63$; $p< 0.05$), "*Self-direction*" ($t= 9.71$; $p< 0.05$), "*Universalism*"($t= 18.41$; $p< 0.05$), "*Benevolence*" ($t= 17.85$; $p< 0.05$) and "*Tradition*" ($t= 4.33$; $p< 0.05$) value orientations. However, statistically significant differences do not occur in "*Power*" ($t= 1.33$; $p> 0.05$), "*Achievement*" ($t= 0.40$; $p> 0.05$), "*Hedonism*"($t= 0.71$; $p> 0.05$), "*Conformity*"($t= 3.35$; $p> 0.05$) and "*Security*" ($t= 2.82$; $p> 0.05$) value orientations.

Findings for pre-service teachers' empathic tendencies

The findings for pre-service teachers' empathic tendencies were evaluated with regard to "gender", "subject matter" and "type of education" variables, respectively.

Table 11: The findings for empathic tendencies with regard to gender variable

Gender	N	\bar{x}	S	sd	T	P
Female	139	3.39	.352	228	3.440	.001
Male	91	3.22	.386			

* $p<.05$

According to Table 11, the arithmetic mean for female pre-service teachers' empathic tendency with regard to gender is $\bar{x}=3.39$, whereas the mean for male ones is $\bar{x}=3.22$. T-test result indicates that there is a significant difference in female teachers' perceptions for empathic tendency ($t=3.440$; $p<0.05$).

Table 12: One-Way Anova Test results for empathic tendencies with regard to subject matter

Dimension	Subject Matter	N	X	SS	Variance Source	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	P	Difference
Empathy	History	39	3.27	.342	Inter-groups	3.192	5	.638	4.926	0.000	*
	Philosophy	67	3.46	.378		29.031	224	.130			
	Theology	46	3.34	.381	Within groups	32.222	229				
	Art	19	3.25	.405	Total						
	Turkish Literature	21	3.40	.365							
	Health	38	3.12	.282							
	Total	230	3.33	.375							

* $p<.05$

When the analysis results of pre-service teachers' subject areas with their empathic tendencies are examined, it is revealed that the results are statistically significantly different ($F(4.926)=0.000$; $p<0.05$). Tukey test was implemented to identify in which groups significant difference occurred.

Table 13: Tukey test results for pre-service teachers' empathic tendencies with regard to subject area

Subject area	Subject areas	Mean difference	P
Philosophy Group	History	.19462	.211
	Theology	.11968	.698
	Art	.21115	.408
	Turkish Literature	.06166	.993
	Health	.4010*	.001

* $p<0.05$

When Table 13 is taken into account, it is seen that pre-service teachers' empathic tendencies indicate statistically significant differences between their subject areas, namely Philosophy Group and Health and this difference is favor of Philosophy Group ($p<0.05$).

Table 14: *The findings for empathic tendencies with regard to type of education*

Type of education	N	\bar{x}	S	sd	T	P
Formal	181	3.26	.355	228	-5.297	.000
Non-formal	49	3.56	.352			

* $p<0.05$

Table 14 indicates that the arithmetic mean of empathic tendencies for the pre-service teachers who graduated from the formal education is $\bar{x}=3.26$, whereas the mean for those who graduated from non-formal education is $\bar{x}=3.56$. There is a significant difference in favor of the pre-service teachers who graduated from non-formal education with regard to empathic tendency ($t=-5.297$; $p<0.05$).

Correlation findings for pre-service teachers' value orientations and empathic tendencies

Table 15: Correlation results for value orientations and empathic tendencies relationships

	General means for value orientations	Empathy
R	1	-.116
P		.079
N	230	230
	Value orientations	
	Power	
R	1	.030

P		.653
N	230	230
	Achievement	
R	1	-.052
P		.430
N	230	230
	Hedonism	
R	1	-.141*
P		.032
N	230	230
	Stimulation	
R	1	-.100
P		.129
N	230	230
	Self-direction	
R	1	-.019
P		.778
N	230	230
	Universalism	
R	1	.282**
P		.006
N	230	230
	Benevolence	
R	1	.266*
P		.012
N	230	230
	Tradition	
R	1	.148
P		.471
N	230	230
	Conformity	
R	1	-.048
P		.473
N	230	230
	Security	
R	1	-.009
P		.897
N	230	230

According to Table 15, it is seen that the general relationship of pre-service teachers' value orientations and empathic tendencies is negative and weak. This relationship is statistically not significant ($r=-.116$; $p>0.05$). The relationship of pre-service teachers' value orientations "**Power**" ($r=.030$; $p>0.05$), "**Universalism**" ($r= .282$; $p>0.05$), "**Benevolence**" ($r=.280$; $p>0,05$) and "**Tradition**" ($r= 0.148$; $p>0.05$) with their empathic tendencies are positive and low, whereas the relationship between their value orientations "**Achievement**" ($r=-0.052$; $p>0.05$), "**Hedonism**" ($r=-.141$; $p>0,05$), "**Stimulation**" ($r=-.100$; $p>0.05$), "**Self-direction**" ($r=-.019$; $p>0.05$), "**Conformity**" ($r=-.019$; $p>0.05$) and "**Security**" ($r=-.019$; $p>0.05$) and their empathic tendencies are negative and weak.

Discussion, Result and Suggestions

In this part, pre-service teachers' value orientations and empathic tendencies with regard to the independent variables including gender, subject area and type of education in addition to the correlation between their value orientations and empathic tendencies were discussed. Besides, the results of the current research were summarized and the suggestions were put forward.

In our research, it was revealed that the pre-service teachers' uppermost preferences include "**Universalism**", "**Self-direction**" and "**Benevolence**" values. Besides, the participants mostly prefer "Universalism", "Benevolence" and "Self-direction" in the study by Akın (2018); "Benevolence", "Self-direction" and "Security" in the study by Özcan and Erol (2017); "Self-direction", "Benevolence" and "Security" in the study by Acar, Akar and Acar (2016); "Benevolence", "Universalism" and "Security" in the study by Kızılgöçit, Acuner and Toklu (2015); "Tradition", "Benevolence" and "Conformity" in the study by Yapıcı and Emre (2015); "Benevolence", "Security" and "Universalism" in the study by Dündar (2013); "Benevolence", "Universalism" and "Security" in the study by Arslan and Tunç (2013); "Universalism", "Benevolence" and "Security" in the study by Oğuz (2012a); "Benevolence", "Universalism" and "Security" in the research by Dilmaç, Deniz and Deniz (2009); "Universalism", "Security" and "Benevolence" in the study by Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı (2000).

In the current research, the pre-service teachers infrequently prefer "**Hedonism**", "**Achievement**" and "**Power**" values. It is found that the least preferred values are "Achievement", "Hedonism", and "Power" in the study by Akın (2018); "Power", "Stimulation" and "Hedonism" in the study by Özcan and Erol (2016); "Power", "Stimulation" and "Hedonism" in the study by Acar, Akar and Acar (2016); "Power", "Hedonism" and "Stimulation" in the study by Kızılgöçit, Acuner and Toklu (2015); "Hedonism", "Power" and "Stimulation" in the study by Yapıcı and Emre (2015); "Achievement", "Tradition" and "Power" in the study by Dündar (2013); "Conformity", "Stimulation" and "Power" in the study by Arslan and Tunç (2013); "**Stimulation**" and "**Hedonism**" in the

research by Oğuz (2012a); "**Stimulation**", "**Hedonism**" and "**Power**" in the study by Dilmaç, Deniz and Deniz (2009).

When the results of the above-mentioned studies are, on the whole, taken into account, it is deduced that teachers and pre-service teachers mostly embrace "**Benevolence**", "**Universalism**" and "**Security**" values, whereas they least embrace "**Hedonism**", "**Stimulation**" and "**Power**" ones. Based on these results, it can be understood that teachers and pre-service teachers should pay more attention to "**Benevolence**", "**Universalism**" and "**Security**" and less attention to "**Hedonism**", "**Stimulation**" and "**Power**" ones. Depending on the adoption of these values, it can be possible to train responsible, good people, citizens and students who have healthy and balanced personality with respect to health for feelings, mind and behavior.

In our research, it was indicated that there is a significant difference in favor of the female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Hedonism**" value orientation with regard to **gender** variable. This finding is also supported with the study by Akın (2018) indicating that there are significant differences in "**Hedonism**" value orientation in both qualitative and quantitative data in terms of gender variable. The significant difference is favor of the female pre-service teachers in the quantitative data, while the difference is in favor of the male pre-service ones in the qualitative data. A significant difference is found in favor of the male pre-service teachers in the study by Dilmaç, Deniz and Deniz (2009), whereas a significant difference with regard to gender does not occur in the researches by Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012), Oğuz (2012a), Sarıcı Bulut (2012), Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli and Çakılı (2008). These findings conclude that teachers and pre-service teachers' preferences for hedonism value in relation to gender variable show differentiations. It can be interpreted that these differentiations can stem from the different meanings they attach to hedonism value.

It was found in the current research that the pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Self-direction**" value in relation to **gender** variable show significant differentiations in favor of the female teachers. In this regard, it was revealed in the research by Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli and Çakılı (2008) that there is a significant difference in favor of the female pre-service teachers with regard to "**Self-direction**" value. This finding overlaps with our research finding. On the other hand, Dilmaç, Deniz and Deniz (2009) indicated that there is a significant difference for the male pre-service teachers in relation to "**Self-direction**" value. Furthermore, a significant difference does not take place in the teachers and pre-service teachers' "**Self-direction**" value with regard to gender variable in the studies implemented by Akın (2018), Sarıcı Bulut (2012) and Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012). It is understood that there are inconsistent findings for the teachers and pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Self-direction**" value concerning gender variable in the above-mentioned studies. Teachers and pre-service teachers' having socio-economic-cultural differences and their psychological mood filling

out the data collection instruments could have an impact on deriving the contradictory findings for "Self-direction" value.

In our research, the male and female teachers' perceptions for "**Power**", "**Benevolence**", "**Tradition**" and "**Universalism**" values do not differ with regard to *gender* variable. Likewise, a significant difference is not observed in the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Power**", "**Universalism**", "**Benevolence**" and "**Tradition**" values with regard to gender variable in the quantitative and qualitative data in the research conducted Akın (2018). In this regard, Sarıcı Bulut (2012) found that a difference does occur between the male and female pre-service teachers concerning "**Power**", "**Universalism**", "**Benevolence**" and "**Tradition**" values. This finding is also supported with the study by Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli and Çakılı (2008) indicating that there is not a significant difference in the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Benevolence**" and "**Tradition**" value orientations. Besides, a significant difference does not occur in the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Universalism**" and "**Tradition**" value orientations in the research by Dilmaç, Deniz and Deniz (2009). Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012) indicated that there is not a significant difference in the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Power**" and "**Benevolence**" value orientations. It can be deduced from the findings of the above-mentioned studies that a significant difference, in general sense, does not happen in the teachers and pre-service teachers' perceptions concerning "Power", "Universalism", "Benevolence" and "Tradition" with regard to gender variable. Based on these findings, it can be asserted that the male and female teachers and pre-service teachers have similar thoughts concerning these value orientations.

In the current research, the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Achievement**" value orientation with regard *gender* variable do not differentiate. On the other hand, there is a significant difference in favor of the females with regard to "**Achievement**" value in both the quantitative and qualitative data (Akın, 2018). Likewise, Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012) revealed a finding in favor of the female teachers with regard to gender variable. However, a significant difference is not observed in pre-service teachers' perceptions for "Achievement" value orientation with regard to gender variable in the studies conducted by Oğuz (2012a), Sarıcı Bulut (2012), Dilmaç, Deniz and Deniz (2009), Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli and Çakılı (2008). It is seen that these studies have inconsistent findings for the participants' perceptions for "Achievement" value with regard to gender variable. It can be justified for the significant differences in favor of the female pre-service teachers that they prefer "Achievement" value at a higher rate compared with their counterparts, feel obliged to prove themselves ontologically, want to acquire a social statue or need to meet changing social expectations.

In our research, a significant difference does not occur in the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "*Stimulation*" value orientation with regard to *gender* variable. It is indicated in the study conducted by Akın (2018) that there is a significant difference in favor of the females concerning "*Stimulation*" value in the quantitative data, whereas this difference does not occur in the qualitative data. Sarıcı Bulut (2012) found a significant difference in favor of the female pre-service teachers. However, a significant difference is not found in the studies implemented by Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012), Oğuz (2012a), Dilmaç, Deniz and Deniz (2009) and Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli and Çakılı (2008). These findings support our research. It can be deduced from these findings that teachers and pre-service teachers' preferences show differentiations for stimulation value with regard to gender variable. This result can stem from teachers and pre-service teachers' perceived differences for stimulation value.

It was revealed in our research that the male and female teachers' perceptions for "*Security*" value orientation do not show differences with regard to *gender* variable. Akın (2018) found that there is a significant difference in favor of the females for "Security" value orientation in relation to gender variable in the quantitative and qualitative data. Besides, a significant difference is revealed between the male and female teachers and pre-service teachers in the studies conducted by Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012), Oğuz (2012a), Sarıcı Bulut (2012) and Dilmaç, Deniz and Deniz (2009). However, the significant difference does not occur in the study by Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli and Çakılı (2008). In the light of the findings of the above-mentioned studies apart from one study finding, it is seen that the significant difference happens in favor of the female teachers and pre-service teachers for "Security" value with regard to gender variable. The reason why the differences occur in favor of the female participants can be accounted for motherhood, affection and compassion psychology based on the notion "Women make houses".

Our research indicates that male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "*Conformity*" value orientation with regard to *gender* variable do not show differentiations. It was derived from the study conducted by Akın (2018) that a significant difference in terms of gender variable occurs in "*Conformity*" value in the quantitative data as opposed to the finding in the qualitative data. A significant difference is observed in favor of the female teachers in the studies implemented by Sarıcı Bulut (2012), Oğuz (2012a), Dilmaç, Deniz and Deniz (2009). On the other hand, this difference is not found between the male and female pre-service teachers in the results of the studies implemented by Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012) and Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli and Çakılı (2008). Based on these findings, it can be stated that teachers and pre-service teachers' preferences differentiate according to "Conformity" value orientation. This result can be originated from the different meanings teachers and pre-service teachers attribute to conformity value.

It was found in our research that the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Power**" value with regard to "**Subject Area**" variable significantly differentiate. The significant difference between Turkish Literature and Philosophy Group is favor of those pre-teachers who study in Turkish Literature. Akin (2018) found that there is not any significant difference in the pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Power**" value with regard to subject area variable. On the other hand, Yapıcı, Kutlu and Bilican (2012) revealed that subject area factor makes a significant difference in preference for "**Power**" value. However, it was indicated in the studies conducted by Oğuz (2012a) and Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012) that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas do not differentiate with regard to power value. It can be concluded that the findings, as a whole, are inconsistent. This inconsistent result can stem from the different objectives, acquisitions and/or activities included in the subject areas.

In the current research, it was revealed that the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Achievement**" value in relation to "**Subject Area**" variable show significant differences. This significant difference occurs in pre-service teachers' subject areas including "**History-Literature**", "**Philosophy-Literature**", "**Theology-Literature**" and "**Health-Literature**". It was found in the study by Akin (2018) that the significant difference occurs in Turkish Literature-Theology, History-Theology and Philosophy Group-Theology in the quantitative data, whereas the difference happens in Turkish Literature-Theology and Philosophy Group-Theology subject areas in the qualitative data. Yapıcı, Kutlu and Bilican (2012) and Dönmez and Cömert (2007) indicated that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas differentiate value systems. However, according to Oğuz (2012a), different subject areas do not make significant differences in power value orientations. When these findings are, as a whole, evaluated, it is seen that there is a significant difference between teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas and their value orientations apart from one study finding. Although teachers have similar qualities, their attribution to achievement value may differ owing to the objectives, acquisitions and activities of the subject areas.

It was found in our research that the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Hedonism**" value with regard to "**Subject Area**" variable do not significantly differ. It was revealed in the study conducted by Akin (2018) that there are significant differences in "**Hedonism**" value with regard to Health-Theology, Turkish Literature-Theology and History-Theology subjects areas in the quantitative data and Health-Theology, Turkish Literature-Theology and History-Theology subject areas in the qualitative data. It was indicated in the studies conducted by Hofmann-Towfigh (2007) and Emre and Yapıcı (2015) that there is a negative relationship between hedonism and religiousness. Besides, Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012), Yapıcı, Kutlu and Bilican (2012) and Dönmez and Cömert (2007) found that teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas differentiate their value systems. When the findings are, as a whole, evaluated, it is seen that there is a significant difference in the

teachers and pre-service teachers' perceptions for hedonism value. However, these findings are not supported with the current research finding. Although teachers share similar qualities, their attribution to achievement value may differ owing to the objectives, acquisitions and activities of the subject areas.

In our research, it was revealed that the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "*Stimulation*" value orientation with regard to "*Subject Area*" do not significantly differentiate. On the other hand, Akın (2018) found that there are significant differences with regard to "*Stimulation*" among Health-Theology and Turkish Literature-Theology subject areas in the quantitative data and Health-Theology and Turkish Literature-Theology subject areas in the qualitative data. Likewise, it is revealed in the studies conducted by Oğuz (2012a), Yapıcı, Kutlu and Bilican (2012) and Dönmez ve Cömert (2007) that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas differentiate their value orientations. These results indicate that the above-mentioned studies confirm that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas have a significant impact on their stimulation value, which is not supported with our research finding. Based on this result, it can be deduced that these results can originate from the differences concerning teachers and pre-service teachers' knowledge, skills, comprehension and understanding and making sense of life though they have common qualities.

It was found in our research that the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "*Self-direction*" with regard to "*Subject Area*" variable do not significantly differentiate. Akın (2018) indicated in his study that there are significant differences concerning "*Self-direction*" value in Health-Theology and Turkish Literature-Health pre-service teachers in the quantitative data and Health-Theology and Turkish Literature-Health pre-service teachers in the qualitative data. It was derived from the studies conducted by Oğuz (2012a) and Dönmez and Cömert (2007) that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas make different their value systems. However, Yapıcı, Kutlu and Bilican (2012) revealed in their studies that the different subject areas do not have a significant difference on their perceived Self-direction value. When the findings are, as a whole, taken into account, it is understood that the studies have inconsistent findings. Based on these results, it can be claimed that the differences can stem from the differences concerning teachers and pre-service teachers' knowledge, skills, comprehension and understanding and making sense of life.

Our research indicated that there is no significant difference in the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "*Universalism*" with regard to "*Subject Area*". Likewise, this finding is in parallel with the finding derived from Akın's study (2018). On the other hand, Oğuz (2012a), Yapıcı, Kutlu ve Bilican (2012) ile Dönmez ve Cömert (2007) found in their studies that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas have an impact on their value systems. It is seen that the findings of the above-mentioned studies do not overlap concerning Universalism value. Based on

this result, it can be deduced that these different results can stem from the differences in socio-economic variables though all teachers and pre-service teachers should embrace universalism as a central value.

It was revealed in the current research that there is no difference in the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Benevolence**" with regard to "**Subject Area**" variable. The quantitative and qualitative data in Akın's study (2018) showed that there is only significant difference among Turkish Literature and Philosophy Group pre-service teachers concerning "**Benevolence**" value. It was found in the studies conducted by Oğuz (2012a), Yapıcı, Kutlu and Bilican (2012), Dönmez and Cömert (2007) that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas significantly differentiate their value systems. Excluding the current research finding, it is seen based on the above-mentioned findings of different studies that there is a significant difference in the teachers and pre-service teachers' perceptions for benevolence value. This result indicates that the differences can stem from the differences concerning teachers and pre-service teachers' knowledge, skills, comprehension and understanding and making sense of life, though they have similar qualities.

Our research indicated that there is no significant difference in the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Tradition**" with regard to "**Subject Area**". In the research conducted by Akın (2018), it was found that there are significant differences among Health-Turkish Literature, Turkish Literature-Philosophy Group and History-Philosophy Group pre-service teachers with regard to "**Tradition**" value in the quantitative data, whereas there is no significant difference among the subject areas in the qualitative data. Besides, Oğuz (2012a), Yapıcı, Kutlu and Bilican (2012), Şahin-Fırat and Açıkgöz (2012), Dönmez and Cömert (2007) revealed that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas significantly differentiate their value systems. According to these findings, it can be deduced that teachers and pre-service teachers' perceptions for tradition value orientation differ. It can be argued that the differences can stem from the differences in their subject areas including knowledge, skills, comprehension and understanding and making sense of life, though they have similar qualities.

It was revealed in the current research that there is no significant difference in the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "**Conformity**" with regard to "**Subject Area**" variable. The quantitative data in the study conducted by Akın (2018) indicate significant differences among Turkish Literature-Philosophy Group and History-Philosophy Group pre-service teachers with regard to "**Conformity**" value, while the qualitative data do not show such a significant difference among the pre-service teachers. It was found in the studies implemented by Oğuz (2012a), Yapıcı, Kutlu and Bilican (2012), and Dönmez and Cömert (2007) that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas significantly differentiate their value systems. According to the findings of the different studies,

there is a difference among the teachers and pre-service teachers in terms of their conformity value orientations. It can be argued that the differences can stem from the differences in their subject areas including knowledge, skills, comprehension and understanding and making sense of life in addition to socio-economic variables, though they have similar qualities.

It was derived from our research that there is no significant difference in the male and female pre-service teachers' perceptions for "*Security*" with regard to "*Subject Area*". Akın (2018) found significant difference among only Turkish Literature-Philosophy Group pre-service teachers with regard to *Security* value orientation in the quantitative and qualitative data in his study. Oğuz (2012a), Yapıcı, Kutlu and Bilican (2012) and Dönmez and Cömert (2007) revealed in their studies that the teachers and pre-service teachers' subject areas significantly differentiate their value systems. Excluding the current research finding, it is understood from the above-mentioned findings of different studies that there is a significant difference in the teachers and pre-service teachers' perceptions for security value orientation. It can be claimed that the differences can stem from the differences in their subject areas including knowledge, skills, comprehension and understanding and making sense of life, though they have similar qualities.

It was derived from the current research that there is a negative and low relationship between the pre-service teachers' value orientations and their empathic tendencies. This relationship is not statistically significant. Yeniçeri, Yıldız, Seydaoğulları, Güleç, Sakallı Çetin and Baldemir (2015) found in their studies that there is a positive relationship between the emotional intelligence scores for the medical faculty students and their empathic tendencies. This finding does not support the current research finding in relation to the direction of the relationship. When the relationship between the pre-service teachers' value orientations and their empathic tendencies is concerned, we find positive and low relationships among "*Power*", "*Universalism*", "*Benevolence*", and "*Tradition*" value orientations and negative and low relationships among "*Achievement*", "*Hedonism*", "*Stimulation*", "*Self-direction*", "*Conformity*" and "*Security*" value orientations.

It was found in the current research that there is a significant difference in the pre-service teachers' "Empathetic Tendencies" in favor of the female pre-service teachers with regard to "*Gender*" variable. Brightwell, Devenish, Hartley, McCall, McMullen, Munro, O'Meara and Webb (2012) revealed in their studies that there is a significant difference among the prospective nurses' empathic tendencies in favor of the female nurses in terms of gender variable. Likewise, it was derived from the studies conducted by Palavan and Agboyraz (2017), Elikesik (2013), Oğuz and Altun (2011), Ekinçi and Aybek (2010), Akbulut and Sağlam (2010), Kapıkıran (2009) that there is a significant difference in the teachers and pre-service teachers' empathic tendencies with regard to gender variable. On the other hand, a significant difference does not occur in the teachers and pre-service teachers'

empathic tendencies concerning gender variable in the studies implemented by Beyaz (2016), Engin and Genç (2015), Yaşar and Erol (2015), Çelikkaleli and Avcı (2015), Kay (2016), Maden and Durukan (2011), Genç and Kalafat (2010), Ekinçi (2009), Yılmaz and Akyel (2008) and Genç ve Kalafat (2008). Based on these findings, it seems that there is not a consensus for the teachers and pre-service teachers' empathic tendencies with regard to gender variable. It can be claimed that the differences occurring in the teachers and pre-service teachers' empathic tendencies in favor of the female ones can stem from their qualities of womanhood and sometimes their perceived teaching profession.

The current research indicated that the pre-service teachers' "Empathic Tendencies" with regard to "*Subject Area*" variable, show difference among Philosophy Group and Health pre-service teachers and the difference is in favor of Philosophy Group teachers. Besides, Pala (2008) found significant difference among the pre-service teachers in relation to their subject areas and this difference is among Social Sciences-Science and Social Sciences-Primary School pre-service teachers and in favor of Social Sciences subject area. This finding is in parallel with the current research one. A significant difference was found in the pre-service teachers' empathic levels in relation to their subject area. This difference is favor of the subject areas including Pre-school, Psychological Guidance and Counseling and German teaching. This difference is against the subject areas such as Social Sciences, Computer Education and Instructional Technologies, Philosophy Group and English teaching (Ekinçi & Aybek, 2010). These findings overlap with the current research findings in the sense that there is difference among the subject areas. However, the differences in the particular subject areas are not supported with the current research ones. Based on these findings, it can be deduced that subject area variable differentiate their empathic tendencies. It can be argued that the differences can stem from the content differences in the subject areas, teachers' personality, knowledge, skills, thoughts and so forth.

We derived from the current research that a significant difference happens in "Stimulation", "Self-direction", "Universalism", "Benevolence" and "Tradition" value orientations with regard to type of education variable and this difference is in favor of the pre-service teachers who graduated from non-formal education. Besides, there is not a significant difference in "Power", "Achievement", "Hedonism", "Conformity" and "Security" values. Other research findings have not been confronted on this issue. It can be claimed that type of education has a significant impact on some value orientations. Educators and teachers should think about the reason why some value orientations such as "Universalism" and "Benevolence" occur at a higher rate in the pre-service teachers who graduated from the non-formal education.

Results

Some results derived from the current research as follows:

- 1- The teachers and pre-service teachers mostly embraced "*Benevolence*", "*Universalism*", and "*Security*" values. They at the least embraced "*Hedonism*", "*Stimulation*" and "*Power*" values.
- 2- The teachers and pre-service teachers' preferences for "*Hedonism*", "*Self-direction*", "*Achievement*", "*Stimulation*" and "*Conformity*" values with regard to gender variable differed.
- 3- The teachers and pre-service teachers' preferences for "*Power*", "*Universalism*", "*Benevolence*", "*Tradition*" values with regard to gender variable did not differ.
- 4- A significant difference with regard to gender variable occurred in favor of the female teachers and pre-service teachers' preference for "*Security*" value.
- 5- There were significant differences in the teachers and pre-service teachers' preferences for "*Power*", "*Self-direction*" and "*Universalism*" with regard to subject area variable.
- 6- There was generally a significant difference in the teachers and pre-service teachers' perceptions for "*Achievement*", "*Hedonism*", "*Stimulation*", "*Benevolence*" and "*Security*" value orientations with regard to subject area variable, which is not supported with only one study finding.
- 7- The teachers and pre-service teachers' perceptions for "*Tradition*" and "*Conformity*" value orientations with regard to subject area generally differentiated.
- 8- There was a positive and low correlation between the pre-service teachers' value orientations including "*Power*", "*Universalism*", "*Benevolence*" and "*Tradition*" and their empathic tendencies. On the other hand, there was a negative and weak correlation in "*Achievement*", "*Hedonism*", "*Stimulation*", "*Self-direction*", "*Conformity*" and "*Security*" value orientations.
- 9- The teachers and pre-service teachers' perceptions for "*Empathic Tendency*" with regard to gender and subject area variables differentiated.
- 10- The empathy scores for the pre-service teachers, who graduated from non-formal education, in "*Stimulation*", "*Self-direction*", "*Universalism*", "*Benevolence*" and "*Tradition*" value orientations with regard to type of education variable turned out to be higher. Type of education did not have an impact on "*Power*", "*Achievement*", "*Hedonism*", "*Conformity*" and "*Security*" value orientations.

Suggestions

1- Different studies concerning pre-service teachers' value orientations and empathic tendencies could be conducted with different study groups.

2- Empathetic related courses could be included in teacher training programs to strengthen pre-service teachers' empathetic tendencies.

3- Studies could be conducted to identify the reasons why the empathic level of those pre-service teachers who graduated from non-formal education are higher than the level of those teachers who graduated from formal education.

Reference

- Acar, H., Akar, M. & Acar, B. (2016). Value Orientations of Social Workers, *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 24 (1).97-118.
- Akbulut, E. & Sağlam, H. İ. (2010). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin Empatik Eğilim Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi, *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, (7) 2, 1068- 1083.
- Akkoyun, F. (2001). *Gestalt Terapi: Büyüme ve Gelişme Gücümüzün Harekete Geçişi*, Ankara, s. 74-83
- Allport, G. W. (1968). *The person in psychology*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Akın, M. A. (2018). The pre-service teachers' value orientations, *Educational Research and Reviews*, Vol. 13(6), pp. 173-187, 23 March, 2018
- Asan, T., Ekşi, F., Doğan, A. & Ekşi, H. 2011, Bireysel Değerler Envanteri'nin Dilsel Eşdeğerlik Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması, *Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Vol. 27, pp. 15-38.
- Arslan, M. and Tunç, E. (2013). The Differences in Value Orientation of Students of Theology, *Value Education Journal*, 11 (26). 7-39.
- Aydın, A. R. (2009). *Din Bilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi*, IX, sayı: 4.
- Bacanlı, H. (2011). "Değer, Değer midir?" *Eğitime Bakış*, 7(19). 18-21.
- Bilgin, N. (2003). *Sosyal Psikoloji Sözlüğü*, İstanbul, s. 101-102.
- Brightwell, R., Devenish, S., Hartley, P., McCall, M., McMullen, M., Munro, G., O'Meara, P. & Webb, V. (2012). Paramedic empathy levels: results from seven Australian universities, *International Journal of Emergency Services* Vol. 1 No. 2, 2012, pp. 111-121.
- Bulut Sarıcı, B. (2012). International Turkish Literature Culture and Literature Journal, Vol. 1, No. 3, 212-238, Turkey.
- Beyaz, Ö. (2016). Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Bölümünde Öğrenim Gören Öğretmen Adaylarının Empatik Eğilim ve Empatik Beceri Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi, *Anadolu Üniversitesi Örneği (Yüksek Lisans Tezi)*, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı Eskişehir, Ağustos.

- Özcan, C. T., Oflaz, F. & Türkbay, T. (2003) Dikkat Eksikliği Aşırı Hareketlilik Bozukluğu ve Binişik Karşıt Olma-Karşı Gelme Bozukluğu Olan Çocukların Anne-Babalarının Empati Düzeylerinin Karşılaştırılması, *Çocuk ve Gençlik Ruh Sağlığı Dergisi*, 10 (3), 2003, s. 108.
- Demirutku, K. (2004). "Turkish Adaptation of the Portrait Values Questionnaire", Unpublished Manuscript, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Demirutku K. & Sümer, N. (2010). *Turkish Psychology Articles*, June 13 (25), 17-25.
- Dilmaç, B.,Bozgeyikli, H. and Çakıllı, Y.(2008).Examination of Teacher Candidates' Value Perceptions in Terms of Different Variables,*Value Education Journal*, Vol. 16, 69-91.
- Dilmaç, B., Deniz M. &Deniz M.E. (2009). "Investigation of Value Preference and Valuation Preferences of University Students", *Values Education Journal*, Volume 7, No. 18, 9-24, December.
- Doğan, B. (2007). *Örgüt Kültürü*, İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
- Doğan, M. (2016). Lise Öğrencilerinde Değer Yönelimi ve İnternet Bağımlılığı İlişkisi, *Uluslararası Gençlik ve Ahlak Sempozyumu*, I, Sinop.
- Dökmen, Ü. (1998). Empatinin Yeni Bir Modele Dayanılarak Ölçülmesi ve Psikodrama ile Geliştirilmesi, *A.Ü.E.B.F.D.*, C. 21, Ankara-1988, S. 1-2, s. 155-190;
- Dökmen, Ü. (2002). *İletişim Çatışmaları ve Empati*, Sistem Yayıncılık, 20. Baskı. İstanbul.
- Dönmez, B. and Cömert, M. (2007). "Value systems of primary school teachers", *Journal of Values Education*, Turkey, 5(14), 29-59.
- Dündar, H. (2013). The Relationship Between the Values of Teacher Candidates and Their Democratic Attitudes, *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 6 (2). 367-381.
- Elikesik, M. (2013). Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretiminde Empati ve Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenlerinin empatik Becerilerinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi, Doktora Tezi Atatürk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
- Emre, Y. &Yapıcı, A. (2015)."Value Orientations of Turkish Cypriot Citizens" *Turkish Studies International Periodical for Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* 10 (2). 1308-2140, Ankara.
- Ekinci, Ö. ve Aybek, B. (2010). Analysis of the empathy and the critical thinking disposition of the teacher candidates, *Elementary Education Online*, 9(2), 816-827, 2010.
- Ekinci, Ö. (2009). Öğretmen Adaylarını Empatik ve Eleştirel Düşünme Eğilimlerinin İncelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.
- Genç, S. Z. & Eryaman, M. Y. (2008). Changing values and new education paradigm. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(1), 89-102
- Genç, S. Z. & Kalafat, T. (2008). Öğretmen Adaylarının Demokratik Tutumları İle Empatik Becerilerinin Değerlendirilmesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19, 213.
- Genç, S., Z. v& Kalafat, T. (2010). Öğretmen Adaylarının Empatik Becerileri İle Problem Çözme Becerileri, *Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim*, 3 (2), 135-147.
- Güngör, E. (1998). *Değerler Psikolojisi Üzerine Araştırmalar*, Ötüken Yayınları, İstanbul.

- Güney, S. 2011, *Davranış Bilimleri*, 6.Basım, Nobel Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Hançerlioğlu, O. (1976). “Değer”, Felsefe Ansiklopedisi, 1. Baskı, Remzi Kitapevi, İstanbul.
- Palavan, Ö. &Agboyraz, Ç. (2017). TheSurvey of EmphaticTendencyandDemocraticValues of Primary School Teachers, *İnönü University, Journal of theFaculty of Education*, Vol 18, No 1, 2017 pp. 134-150.
- Kapıkıran, N. A. (2009). Öğretmen Adaylarının Empatik Eğilim ve Kendini Ayarlama Açısından İncelenmesi, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Sayı 26, 81-91.
- Karasar, N. (1998). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*, 8. Basım, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- Kızılcelik, S. &Erjem, Y. (1996). *Açıklamalı Sosyoloji Sözlüğü*. Konya: Saray Kitabevleri.
- Kızılgöçit, M., Acuner, H. Y. &Toklu, G. (2015).Value Orientations and Religiosity-Value Relationship of the Students of the Faculty of Theology, *RecepTayyipErdoğan University Journal of Theology*, 8, 43-84.
- Kuşdil, M., E. &Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000).Value Orientations of Turkish Teachers and Schwartz Value Theory, *Journal of Turkish Psychology*, 15(45), 59-76.
- Maden, S. & Durukan, E. (2011). Türkçe Öğretmeni Adaylarının Empatik Eğilim Düzeyleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Cilt: 03, No:40, 19-25.
- Oğuz,E. (2012). Teacher Candidates' Views on Values and Values Education, *Theory and Practice in Educational Science, Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice* [Ad. Special / Supplementary Special Issue], Vol. 12, No. 2, 1309-1325, Spring.
- Oğuz, A. &Altun, E. (2011). Öğretmen Adaylarının Yaratıcı Dramaya Yönelik Tutumları ile Empatik Eğilim Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi,*International Conference on New Trends in EducationandTheirImplications 27-29 April, Antalya-Turkey* www.iconte.org, Siyasal Kitabevi,Ankara.
- Özcan, Z. &Erol, H. K. (2017).Value Orientations and Religiosity-Value Relationship of University Students (Karabük Example), *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, Vol. 6, No. 4, September.
- Pala, A. (2008). Öğretmen Adaylarının Empati Kurma Düzeyleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Yıl 2008 (1) 23. Sayı.
- Püsküllüoğlu, A. (2003). *Türkçe Sözlük*, Ankara: Arkadaş-Angora Yayınları.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: TheFreePress.
- Robbins, P. S. &Judge, T.A. 2013, *OrganizationalBehaviour*, 14. Baskı, (Çeviri Editörü: İnci Erdem, Çeviren: Belgin Aydıntan), Nobel Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Schwartz, S.H ve W. Bilsky (1994); Valuesandpersonality, *European Journal of Personality*, Cilt 8, s.163-181.
- Schwartz, H. S. 2017, A ProposalforMeasuring Value OrientationsAcross Nations, <https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/docs/methodology/coreessquestionnaire/ESScorequestionnairehumanvalues.pdf>, Erişim Tarihi: 02.04.2017.

- Şahin-Fırat, Ş. & Açıkgöz, K. (2012). Teachers' Value Systems in terms of Some Variables, *H.U. Journal fo Education*, 43: 422-435.
- Şişman, M. 2002, *Örgütler ve Kültürler*, Ankara: Pegema Yayıncılık.
- Turkish Language Society. *Turkish Dictionary* (2005). Ankara: Turkish Language Association Publication.
- Yapıcı, A., Kutlu, M. O. & Bilican, F. I. (2012). Teacher Candidates' Value Orientations, *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 11 (42). 9-151.
- Yeniçeri, E. N., Yıldız, E., Seydaoğulları, A., Güleç, S., Çetin, E. S. ve Baldemir, E. (2015). Relation of emotional intelligence and empathy among medical students in Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, *Türk Aile Hekimleri Dergisi*; 19 (2): 99-107.
- Yıldız, M., Dilmaç, B. & Deniz, M.E. (2013). Öğretmen Adaylarının Sahip Oldukları Değerler ile Benlik Saygıları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, *Elementary Education Online*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 740-748.
- Yılmaz, İ. ve Akyel, Y. (2008). Beden Eğitimi Öğretmen Adaylarının Empatik Eğilim Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi, *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* (KEFAD), Cilt 9, Sayı 3, 27-33.
- Yüksel, A. (2004). Empati Eğitim Programının İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin Empatik Becerilerine Etkisi, *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17 (2), 2004, s. 342; Dökmen, İletişim Çatışmaları ve Empati, s. 158-159.
- Zevalis S. (2014). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Değer Algısı (Karabük Üniversitesi Örneği, *Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 9(2). 1739-1762, Ankara.