



# A Validity and Reliability Study on the Development of the Values Scale in Turkey

Bülent DILMAC<sup>a</sup>

Necmettin Erbakan University

Osman Tolga ARICAK<sup>b</sup>

Hasan Kalyoncu University

Sevim CESUR<sup>c</sup>

Istanbul University

## Abstract

The purpose of the present study is to examine the initial psychometric properties of the Values Scale for adults. While developing the first stage of the Values Scale, open-ended data on the values held by 216 university students were obtained. During the second stage, the validity and reliability studies of the 60-item Values Scale obtained by the categorization of the data were conducted on a total of 616 adults who were studying at or who had graduated from the universities in the province of Konya, Turkey. A total 39 values falling under nine factors were obtained as a result of the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients of the Values Scale were calculated on a factor basis. As a result of the analyses, the Cronbach alpha values were calculated as .90 for "Social Values," .80 for "Career Values" .78 for "Intellectual Values," .81 for "Spirituality," .78 for "Materialistic Values," .61 for "Human Dignity," .66 for "Romantic Values," .65 for "Freedom," and .63 for "Futuwwa (Generosity and Courage)." Consequently, the first psychometric findings indicate that the Values Scale can be used as a valid and reliable measurement tool.

## Keywords

Value, Scale, Values Scale, Validity, Reliability.

In order for humans to feel convinced that their behaviors are both moral and correct, they are required to espouse values which thereby entails them both to construct and follow a values framework so as to serve as a criterion in evaluating their own behaviors and shaping the basis of their rightfulness. As a concept, the notion of what a value is has found itself to be a matter discussed in many disciplines with many theorists attempting to explain it through various means and examples, thereby

complicating this concept's definition (Dilmaç, Kulaksızoğlu & Ekşi, 2007). However, just as many studies have been conducted on the issue, so have many definitions been formulated and advanced. Just as Schwartz (1992) defines values as the criterion that people use to choose certain behaviors and by which they justify these behaviors, so does he hold that people use them to evaluate both other people and themselves. Therefore, values can be defined as the basic principles that lead our lives.

- a** Bülent DILMAC, Ph.D., is an associate professor of Educational Psychology. His fields of study are value, values education, and character and values psychology. *Correspondence:* Necmettin Erbakan University, Ahmet Keleşoğlu Education Faculty, Department of Educational Sciences, Psychological Counseling and Guidance, 42090, Meram, Konya, Turkey. Email: bulentdilmac@konya.edu.tr
- b** Osman Tolga ARICAK, Ph.D., is an associate professor of Educational Psychology. Contact: Hasan Kalyoncu University, Department of Psychology, Gaziantep, Turkey. Email: tolgaaricak@gmail.com
- c** Sevim CESUR, Ph.D., is an associate professor of Social Psychology. Contact: İstanbul University, Faculty of Letter, Department of Psychology, Ordu Cad. No: 196 34134 Laleli, İstanbul, Turkey. Email: cesur@istanbul.edu.tr

According to other definitions, people need values both to rationalize their actions and to evaluate them (Ruyter, 2002); values are the structures that shape such concepts as attitudes and beliefs (Hansson, Carey, & Kjartansson, 2010); values are the rules and principles that occur in any particular society (Morrow, 1989); they are the standards that decide the correctness or incorrectness of certain behaviors, opinions, and principles that lead our behaviors (Halstead & Taylor, 1996); they are thoughts that are not verified socially; but which are accepted by people as personal beliefs (Thomas, 1992); and values are beliefs held either individually or socially that guide our conscious or unconscious, verbal or symbolic choices; and which constitute a criterion for our cognitive, affective, and behavioral judgments (Shearman, 2008). According to Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966), behaviors and beliefs that individuals are proud to exhibit are defined as values. Values are related to the cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects of our behaviors (Powney et al., 1995). According to Birch and Rasmussen (1989), who approached the concept of value from a different point of view, norms and cultures are social rules that occur in certain societies. According to inter-communal point of view, values are beliefs or inter-cultural priorities that are related to aims and events generally in social situations (Gari, Mylonas, & Karagianni, 2005). Just as some of the above definitions emphasize the individual aspect of the values, others emphasize the social aspect of values, and even more others state that values are structures comprised of both individual and social components.

Winter, Newton, and Kirkpatrick (1998), who categorized values, mentioned three different value categories: Social values, individual values, and family values. Cohen (1985) approached values from a different perspective, presenting five different categories; these being, intrinsic, extrinsic, personal, moral, and knowledge-based values. Rokeach (1973), considered as a pioneer in the field of values studies, categorized values as either instrumental or terminal values. Rokeach further categorized instrumental values into two subsets; the first of these being "moral values," which includes values pertaining to inter-personal relationships, such as forgiveness and benevolence. The second category is dubbed "competence values," which involves values related to individuals themselves, such as being rational and imaginative. Similarly, Rokeach divided terminal values into two categories. The first category is "Personal values," and involves self-centered terminal purposes, such as self-esteem and internal harmony.

The second is "Social values" and involves social-based terminal values, such as equality and world peace.

In his theory developed based on the Rokeach's Values Theory; Schwartz (1992) mentions 10 value types: (1) universalism, (2) benevolence, (3) conformity, (4) tradition, (5) security, (6) power, (7) achievement, (8) hedonism, (9) stimulation, and (10) self-direction. Four main value groups constituted by these ten values exist on two main dimensions. Schwartz named the first of these dimensions as Openness to Change/Conservation. The Openness to Change end of this dimension involves the value types of "self-direction," "stimulation," and "hedonism" and constitutes the values that enable individuals to observe their emotional and intellectual interests in an unpredictable way. The conservation end of the dimension involves the value types of "security," "conformity," and "tradition" and includes values that enable individuals to maintain continuity and clearance in their relationships with institutions, traditions, and those with whom they have close relations. The second dimension is called Self-Transcendence/Self-Enhancement. The Self-Transcendence end of this dimension involves the value types of "universalism," and "benevolence" while the Self-Enhancement end involves the value types of "power," "achievement," and "hedonism." Values in the Self-Enhancement group enable individuals to act according to their own interests even though they may harm others in the process. The Self-Transcendence group, on the other hand, involves values that force individuals to forego their own selfish goals for the good of all people and nature.

Schwartz (2006) states that values are beliefs related to emotions and the desired purposes that motivate behaviors, that they cover a wide space and are not limited to certain behaviors or situations, that they are used as standards or criteria, that they are ordered according to their relative importance, and that multiple values guide behaviors according to this relative importance. According to Schwartz, awareness of which values are ordered in higher ranks in this values hierarchy, in other words knowing which values hold greater importance than others, will enable individuals to predict behaviors in a more accurate way.

Just as both the way an individual is raised and his/her personal characteristics play an important role in the formation of values, so do individual differences, and therefore their entailing personality types, show parallelism with value structures (Bilsky & Schwartz, 1994). However, it is not possible to consider the formation of values to be independent from society.

Thus, Smith and Schwartz (1997) emphasized that a number of factors, such as the existence of a dominant national language, educational system, army and political system, a shared media, and common national symbols (e.g. Flag, sports teams), contribute to a number of basic values being espoused by members of a particular nation. In this context, as values affect societies, societies have the power to affect individuals' values (Shearman, 2008). Values may not be expected to be either seen or perceived as values at the same rate and in the same way in any part of the world globally. Hence, according to Birch and Rasmussen (1989), norms and cultures are social rules that occur in certain societies. Therefore, values do not only differ from society to society, but are also defined as subjective perceptions (Zajda, 2009). Therefore, the rules held by one society cannot be expected to be valid in all other societies (Fataar & Solomons, 2011).

Although Schwartz (2006) claims that he has developed an almost universal Values Theory, in his study conducted with Bardi in 2001, even such values as social recognition, intelligence, self-respect, internal harmony, real friendship, a spiritual life, mature love, meaning of life, gaining independence, feeling of belonging and health, which were included in questionnaire forms, were not included in the final list while calculating the relative importance of values. This is because the researchers took into consideration the understanding that these values may not have the same meaning inter-culturally. To illustrate, in the same research, they conducted on participants from 13 different nations, both finding that even value hierarchies themselves from different samples had correlations at a significant extent and observing that in some African countries and other countries like Fiji, the value type of conformity was most valued whereas the value type of self-direction was least valued, a finding which was completely different from the hierarchies of other cultures. Similarly, Lee (1991) states that the implementation of the Rokeach Values List on eastern Asia countries revealed that while "respect to parents" is among the most important values in these countries, this value is not included in the final list, although it is a very distinctive finding.

As stated by Smith and Schwartz (1997), it is possible that individuals may have not developed a conscious awareness of an abstract values system. Therefore, researchers who conduct inter-cultural research may be required to deduce which values a culture holds from the behaviors or answers given to questions on certain subjects able to explain the underlying values or cultural products, such as literature or cinema. However, since the

interpretations of the researchers or situational factors may be involved, all these indirect deductions are problematic. In an attempt to overcome this difficulty, many researchers ask about basic values directly, just like in the method implemented while conducting the present research.

Values research has become an important subject matter of inter-cultural psychology. As summarized by Berry, Poortinga, Breugelmans, Chasiotis, and Sam (2013), inter-cultural psychology is a framework concept that involves various approaches. According to the "Culture Comparative" approach of inter-cultural psychology, cultural conditions arise independently from individuals. This approach is grounded on the idea that psychological functions are universalism and examines the variations in behaviors depending on socio-cultural factors. For instance, just like many behaviors, values and attitudes are themselves the results of these initial conditions. However, unlike the culture comparative approach within the context of inter-cultural psychology, in the "cultural psychology" approach, there is a mutual and transactional relationship between cultural and behavioral phenomena. The cultural psychology approach asserts that not only behaviors, but also the basic processes underlying behaviors can differ inter-culturally. Another approach called the "indigenous psychology," which claims that there should be a different psychology in all cultures, suggests that, unlike "western" style psychology, research that is more suitable and related to local contexts should be conducted. Culture specific concepts, such as the need to remain committed in Japan (*amae*) or nurturant-task leadership in India, can be listed as examples of concepts that are examined under this approach.

Smith and Schwartz (1997) state that meaning equity is one of the most important problems faced by researchers in cross-cultural studies. Even in the best translations, it remains to be completely sure as to whether values have been properly interpreted into different cultures and languages. In addition, they state that the meanings of values may have different meanings in different cultures, thereby resulting in different findings based on such different understandings. Furthermore, just as values are affected directly by both psychological variables and daily experiences in ecological and socio-political contexts, so are they shaped within a culture. Therefore, researching values within a cultural context and local specific manner is of utmost importance.

While the approach used by the present research is not as radical as indigenous psychology approach, it still asserts that some scales developed in the West

may lack certain values espoused by individuals in this society [Turkey]. For instance, Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı (2000) recommend that some local values such as hospitality, chastity of women, the dominance of men, and secularism are used in addition to the Schwartz Values Scale. The present research is interested in determining whether there are values specific to greater Turkish society (which is comprised of a multitude of non-Turkish ethnic groups, including, among others, Kurds, Arabs, Laz, and Circassians) that may be ignored or excluded by the commonly used scales.

In brief, imposing a scale constructed in one culture onto another culture may not yield healthy results. Similarly, Bond (1988) agrees with the opinion that a social science paradigm originating from a western based cultural structure may be lacking its ability to understand people living in other parts of the world. Bond held that Rokeach's Values Theory was not sufficient in understanding Chinese culture and therefore developed a scale based on Chinese values by participating in a project called Chinese Culture Connection. A number of values involved in his scale, based on the suggestions of Chinese academicians, such as being average (following the path taken by the average individual), arranging relationships in terms of status, benevolent authoritativeness, being conservative, and shame, are the prominent values apparent in Chinese culture. Although it is impossible to claim that these values do not exist in western cultures, it is possible to claim that these values are more important in the lives of eastern peoples (Matthews, 2000).

Many research projects have been conducted in Turkey using the Rokeach Values Inventory, Schwartz Values Survey, and Portrait Values Survey which have all been translated and adapted into Turkish (Akarslan, 2011; Çileli, 2000; Çileli & Tezer, 1998; Demirutku & Sümer, 2010; Gürşimsek & Göregenli, 2006; Karakitapoğlu Aygün & İmamoğlu, 2002; Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000; Sevgili, 2012; Şendil & Cesur, 2011). However, as mentioned above, although such scales developed based on western cultural norms can be used as important source of knowledge in hypothesis test oriented research, they may not provide inclusive information about the value tendencies of people who live within what is considered the Turkish geography. It is quite possible that there are values not included in the original scales but which are of social importance in greater Turkish society. The examination of hypotheses of theories claiming to be universal in greater Turkish culture, and the use of such scales based on these theories

provide very valuable information. However, in order to fully understand the value perceptions of greater Turkish culture, a value theory or measurement that is based on this culture is needed. The purpose of the present research is two-fold, the first being to examine how this society conceptualizes values and the second being to develop a values scale that can be used in future research.

### Method

The present study's purpose is an attempt to develop a scale to be used in future research. An examination of the first psychometric findings related to the validity and reliability of the measurement tool in question, the Values Scale, forms the main axis of the research.

### Participants

In the first stage of the Values Scale development study (2011 fall November-December), 206 university students (87 female, 119 male) studying at thirty five different departments of Selcuk University, Turkey formed the participant group ( $Mage=20.64$ ).

The second stage of the study, pertaining to the validity and reliability (February 2012) of the scale, was conducted with the participation of 616 adults (414 female, 202 male) who were studying at or who had graduated from any of the universities located in the province of Konya, Turkey. Of the total 616, 473 of the participants were university students (327 female, 146 male) whose average age was 20.54 whereas the remaining 143 participants were adults who had graduated from university in Konya (87 female, 56 male) whose average age was 27.29. Of the 473 students, 39% were studying in the department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, 14% in the department of Classroom Teaching, 11% in the department of Turkish Language Teaching, 8% in Mathematics Teaching, 7% in Social Sciences Teaching department, 7% in Biology Teaching department, 6% in the department of Literature Teaching, 4% in Geography Teaching department, and 3% in Science Teaching department. Of those who had already graduated, 58% were working as Psychological Counselors, 6% as science teachers, 6% Turkish Language teachers, 5% Geography teachers, 5% Social Sciences teachers, 5% Classroom teachers, 3% Literature teachers, 3% Biology teachers, 2% Mathematics teachers, 2% were civil servants, 2% belonged to various occupational groups (i.e. secretary, nurse), and 1% were research assistants or instructors in a university.

The present research is considered as the first step in developing a Turkish Values Scale. As it is not a norm study, no attention was paid to the representation of the whole of Turkish society. Specifically, 4.5% of the participants were from the Marmara Region, 8.1% from the Aegean Region, 15.9% from the Mediterranean Region, 5.3% from the Southeastern Anatolia Region, 3.5% from the Eastern Anatolia Region, 6.3% from the Eastern Black Sea Region, 2% from the Western Black Sea Region, and 54.4 from the Central Anatolia Region. In terms of the provinces, most of the participants (36%) were from the province of Konya.

While determining the quantitative size of the work group in accordance with scale development rules, the researchers aimed to implement the scale on a number of individuals 10 times greater than the number of the items contained in the scale (10:1) (see Kline, 2005, p. 111). Since the Values Scale consisted of 60 items at the beginning, it was decided that the work group should include at least 600 participants. Considering the possibility of incomplete or faulty answers, the researchers decided that the data collected should be a little over this number; therefore, 616 voluntary participants were reached. In this respect, it is possible to claim that the sample selection method was convenient sampling.

#### Data Collection Tools and Implementation Process

In order to ascertain participants' personal information, a questionnaire soliciting participants' gender, year of birth, whether they are students or graduates, their department, and place of birth was designed and placed at the beginning of the scale form.

During the development of the Values Scale, the first step was to conduct a literature review so as to determine which values are considered to be important for adults. After this step, 206 university students studying at thirty-five different departments were asked to answer open-ended questions about what values they held to be important, while also asking them to rank these values in order of importance. A total of 60 values were determined in accordance with the obtained data. The values determined via this process were presented to three academicians who had previously studied this subject matter after which the required adjustments were made in accordance with their opinions. After the scale was rearranged in such a way which enabled the values stated along with their items to be answered using a 10 point rating scale, it was presented to an academician specializing in the field of Turkish Language and Literature in order to

be controlled in terms of language and expression features. This resulting form was then presented to fifty university students before implementation who were asked what they understood from the items qualitatively. The 60-item form of the scale was implemented during the first week of February, 2012 with the scales being distributed personally by the first author of the present research in his own class periods to students who had agreed to volunteer in participating in the research. Graduates were reached in one of two ways: (1) Those volunteers who were currently working on their non-thesis master degree at the time and (2) the acquaintances of these people were presented scales.

After data were collected, validity and reliability analyses were conducted leading the scale to take its final form of 39-items. The items are rated on a scale ranging from 0 to 9. The participants marked statements across each item from (0) "Not important at all" to (9) "Very Important" in accordance with the importance that they attached to a specific concept with higher scores indicating that participants attached higher level of importance for that concept. Since the psychometric features of the scale were presented in the Findings section of this article, no more details are provided in this section.

#### Data Analysis

The data collected via the study were entered into SPSS 17 packaged software with both exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses being used to test the construct validity of the scale. The Cronbach alpha analysis was used to calculate the internal consistency coefficient and the confirmatory factor analysis was performed with the AMOS 16.0 program (Arbuckle, 2007)

#### Findings

First, an exploratory factor analysis was performed within the context of the principle components analysis for the 60 value statements obtained from participants. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sampling adequacy value was calculated as .93, and the Bartlett Sphericity Test approximate Chi-square value was calculated as 14543.11 ( $p < .001$ ). An examination of the rotation component matrix realized via components matrix and the Varimax method indicated that all values may be categorized under 13 factors, thereby explaining 65.37% of the total variance. Common variances, with the exception "time" (.43), were found to be over .50.

Moreover, 14 values in the rotated component matrix were found either to fall under more than one factor with a higher difference than .10 and a load value higher than .32 or to be the only value under a specific factor (Family, Time, and Personal Internal Integrity were those values having no related values in their respective category). For this reason, these 14 values were excluded from the scale and the same exploratory factor analyses were conducted under the same conditions to control for similar situations. Five more values were excluded after the third factor analysis and two further values were excluded after the fourth factor analysis. The remaining 39 values were observed to fall under nine factors in a non-problematic way, explaining 64.74% of the total variance. In the last factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sampling adequacy value was calculated as .91 and the Bartlett Sphericity Test approximate Chi-square value was calculated as 9133.26 ( $p < .001$ ). The common variance of all values, except Justice/Equity (.47), ranged between .50 and .80. The component matrix rotated via the Varimax method and factor loads is presented in Table 1.

As can be seen in Table 1, all factor loads range between .45 and .80, with the first factor being named as “Social Values,” the second as “Career Values,” the third as “Intellectual Values,” the fourth as “Spiritual Values,” the fifth as “Materialistic Values,” the sixth as “Human Dignity,” the seventh as “Romantic Values,” the eighth as “Freedom,” and the ninth as “Futuwwa/Generosity & Courage.”

In the following step, confirmatory factor analysis was made using the AMOS 16 (Arbuckle, 2007) program with these nine factors being placed into the model as latent variables and the values encompassed by these factors being put into model as observed variables. Covariances between all latent variables were also included in the model. While examining the model's goodness of fit, RMSEA (the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation), IFI (Incremental Fit Index), CFI (Comparative Fit Index), and  $\chi^2/df$  values were used as critical measures (Brown, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Weston & Gore, 2006). As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis performed using the Maximum Likelihood method,  $\chi^2/df$  was found to be 3.98, the RMSEA value at .070, and the CFI and IFI values at .81. Browne and Cudeck (1993) have stated that the RMSEA value should be under 0.08 and Hu and Bentler (1999) have stated that the IFI and CFI values should be over 0.90 for the model in order to be accepted as fit. According to Meydan and Şeşen (2011),  $\chi^2/df$  being under five is an acceptable value

for the fit of the model. In the present model, the IFI and CFI values indicate weak fit, whereas the RMSEA value, and especially  $\chi^2/df$ , indicate general fit of the model. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, all values under the factors were found to have factor loads between .48 and .85 ( $p < .001$ ).

Table 1  
*Rotated Components Matrix<sup>a</sup>*

|                            | Components |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                            | 1          | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    |
| Benevolence                | .817       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Modesty (Prudence)         | .756       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Social Peace               | .751       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Kindness                   | .724       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Respect                    | .707       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Right to life              | .688       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Responsibility             | .682       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Consistency (In behaviors) | .623       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Tolerance                  | .615       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Self-Discipline            | .570       |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Quality                    |            | .719 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Career                     |            | .716 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Dignity/Prestige           |            | .673 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Education                  |            | .560 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Outer Discipline           |            | .537 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Physical Health            |            |      | .785 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Mental Health              |            |      | .593 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Knowledge                  |            |      | .587 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Working                    |            |      | .540 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Success                    |            |      | .538 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Personal Development       |            |      | .451 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Worship                    |            |      |      | .754 |      |      |      |      |      |
| Religion/Faith             |            |      |      | .752 |      |      |      |      |      |
| Belief/Ideology            |            |      |      | .646 |      |      |      |      |      |
| Inner Peace                |            |      |      | .580 |      |      |      |      |      |
| Money                      |            |      |      |      | .865 |      |      |      |      |
| Property                   |            |      |      |      | .733 |      |      |      |      |
| Status                     |            |      |      |      | .691 |      |      |      |      |
| Virtue                     |            |      |      |      |      | .657 |      |      |      |
| Honor                      |            |      |      |      |      | .606 |      |      |      |
| Justice (Equity)           |            |      |      |      |      | .524 |      |      |      |
| Love                       |            |      |      |      |      |      | .804 |      |      |
| Partner/Lover              |            |      |      |      |      |      | .775 |      |      |
| Pleasure/Enjoyment         |            |      |      |      |      |      | .651 |      |      |
| Freedom/Independence       |            |      |      |      |      |      |      | .694 |      |
| Culture                    |            |      |      |      |      |      |      | .580 |      |
| Labor                      |            |      |      |      |      |      |      | .512 |      |
| Generosity                 |            |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | .858 |
| Courage                    |            |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | .678 |

Table 2  
Correlations between the Sub-dimensions of the Values Scale

|               |         | Social | Career | Intellectual | Spiritual | Materialistic | Human Dignity | Romantic | Freedom | Futuwwa |
|---------------|---------|--------|--------|--------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|----------|---------|---------|
| Social        | Pearson | 1      | ,525** | ,571**       | ,608**    | ,225**        | ,548**        | ,132**   | ,533**  | ,310**  |
|               | N       | 603    | 577    | 539          | 590       | 595           | 592           | 566      | 588     | 587     |
| Career        | Pearson |        | 1      | ,654**       | ,410**    | ,427**        | ,472**        | ,313**   | ,484**  | ,385**  |
|               | N       |        | 586    | 534          | 580       | 576           | 574           | 551      | 569     | 570     |
| Intellectual  | Pearson |        |        | 1            | ,461**    | ,342**        | ,459**        | ,277**   | ,478**  | ,387**  |
|               | N       |        |        | 551          | 546       | 540           | 537           | 517      | 533     | 537     |
| Spiritual     | Pearson |        |        |              | 1         | ,173**        | ,436**        | ,074     | ,382**  | ,220**  |
|               | N       |        |        |              | 601       | 591           | 588           | 564      | 583     | 586     |
| Materialistic | Pearson |        |        |              |           | 1             | ,138**        | ,347**   | ,192**  | ,128**  |
|               | N       |        |        |              |           | 605           | 595           | 568      | 589     | 588     |
| Human Dignity | Pearson |        |        |              |           |               | 1             | ,116**   | ,416**  | ,268**  |
|               | N       |        |        |              |           |               | 602           | 564      | 588     | 585     |
| Romantic      | Pearson |        |        |              |           |               |               | 1        | ,137**  | ,227**  |
|               | N       |        |        |              |           |               |               | 578      | 560     | 561     |
| Freedom       | Pearson |        |        |              |           |               |               |          | 1       | ,295**  |
|               | N       |        |        |              |           |               |               |          | 597     | 580     |
| Futuwwa       | Pearson |        |        |              |           |               |               |          |         | 1       |
|               | N       |        |        |              |           |               |               |          |         | 599     |

\*\*p < .01

The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients of the Values Scale were also calculated on a factor basis. As a result of the analysis, the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated to be .90 for “Social Values,” .80 for “Career Values,” .78 for “Intellectual Values,” .81 for “Spiritual Values,” .78 for “Materialistic Values,” .61 for “Human Dignity,” .66 for “Romantic Values,” .65 for “Freedom,” and .63 for “Futuwwa.”

Table 2 presents correlations between factors. Social values showed high correlations with spiritual values, intellectual values, human dignity, career values, and freedom, whereas career values showed high correlations with intellectual and social values. While materialistic values, on the other hand, showed high correlations with career values, freedom showed high correlations with social values.

Table 3 shows the hierarchical order of factors according to standard T scores. The reason for using T scores here is that the score ranges of each dimension are different. As this can cause complication in the average ordering made with the raw score, standard scores were used to simplify the comparisons. Even mean scores are close to each other, romantic values, Futuwwa, and equity appear in the upper ranks, whereas freedom, intellectual, and materialistic values materialize in the lower ranks.

Table 3  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Value Order of Values according to T Scores

|                  | N   | M      | SD     |
|------------------|-----|--------|--------|
| 1. Romantic      | 577 | 50,060 | 9,877  |
| 2. Futuwwa       | 599 | 50,012 | 10,011 |
| 3. Human Dignity | 602 | 50,011 | 9,998  |
| 4. Career        | 586 | 50,006 | 9,993  |
| 5. Spiritual     | 601 | 50,003 | 10,003 |
| 6. Social        | 603 | 49,998 | 9,995  |
| 7. Freedom       | 597 | 49,998 | 10,003 |
| 8. Intellectual  | 551 | 49,995 | 10,001 |
| 9. Materialistic | 608 | 49,826 | 10,286 |

**Discussion**

In the first stage of the present study, a four-stage exploratory factor analysis was conducted within the context of the principle components analysis for the 60 value statements obtained from participants. Thirty-nine (39) factors remained after the exclusion of 21 value statements which the researchers had decided exclude in accordance with the analyses results gathered under nine factors, explaining 64.74% of the total variance. The first factor is named “Social Values,” the second “Career Values,” the third “Intellectual Values,” the fourth “Spiritual Values,” the fifth “Materialistic Values,” the sixth “Human Dignity,” the seventh “Romantic Values,” the eighth “Freedom,” and the ninth “Futuwwa (Generosity & Courage).” The

confirmatory factor analysis conducted following this stage is an indicator of this models' goodness of fit. In addition, the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients were calculated with reliability coefficients found to range between .61 and .90. Considering both that reliability coefficients' having a score of .70 or higher (Büyükoztürk, 2009) and that the number of values under some of the factors is few, the present scale can be claimed to be reliable. As a result of the factor analyses, it was found that factors relating to social values, career values, intellectual values, spirituality, materialistic values, human dignity, romantic values, freedom, and futuwwa explain a significant part of the variance, with items under these factors presenting a consistent structure. Therefore, the present scale has both a simple and consistent composition.

Examination of the correlations between obtained factors reveal that social values is the value group presenting the highest correlations with other factors. Social values were found to be correlated with spiritual values, intellectual values, human dignity, career values, and freedom. Social values factors involving such values as benevolence, modesty, social peace, kindness, respect, right to life, responsibility, consistency, tolerance, and self-discipline seem to be of special importance in all aspects of life. The correlations found between career values, intellectual, and materialistic values were as expected.

Schwartz (2006) states that values not only have an order of importance, but that this order of importance both guides and determines behaviors. In the hierarchy of values, romantic values, futuwwa, and equity found themselves among higher ranks, whereas freedom, intellectual, and materialistic values appeared in lower ranks. In a study conducted by Schwartz and Bardi (2001), benevolence, self-direction, and universalism found themselves among the top ranks, whereas power, tradition, and stimulation were of lower importance. A similar ranking was found in Sevgili's (2012) study. It is remarkable that in these studies, values regulating relationships with others appeared in higher ranks, whereas more self-centered values were of less importance. These values have an adapting function that serves social order which can explain why this hierarchy is formed this way (Schwartz, 2006). This factor structure also indicates that both traditional values, such as human dignity, and more modern values, such as career or materialistic values, can coexist in

the same society (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005; İmamoğlu & Karakitapoğlu Aygün, 1999).

The factor of Human Dignity which includes such values as dignity, honor, and justice (equity) is an indicator of the importance of the concepts of virtue and honor in Turkey which had not been included in some value theories claiming to be universal. Gregg (2005) states that the "honor culture" in the Middle East and Mediterranean region, which includes Turkey, shapes the underlying system of values in these societies. According to Üskül et al. (2014), honor cultures are defined by the importance given to social image, prestige, evaluation made by other individuals, virtuous behavior, personality integrity, and good moral characteristics. Of course those societies which do not consider themselves as honor societies, such as Dutch, Swedish, or ethnically European North Americans, also have a perception of honor. However, honor in these cultures is defined as an individual value, changing from one person's perspectives or personal integrities to another's and is therefore considered to be a personal matter.

The appearance of values in honor culture societies, including Turkey, in a different way from Western societies is both an expected and previously observed phenomenon. In a research project conducted by Üskül, Cross, Sunbay, Gerçek-Swing, and Ataca (2012), American and Turkish participants (including various non-Turkish ethnic groups living within Turkey's borders who also speak Turkish; i.e. Kurds, Laz, etc.) were asked what situations can stain one's honor; with it being observed that American participants mentioned more personal situations, whereas Turkish participants described not only a wider variety of honor staining situations, but also stating that these situations generally involved people with whom they were in close relationships or which included outside observers. In addition, while American participants stated that honor staining situations revolved around their own emotions, Turkish participants stated that the emotions of people with whom they are in close relationship would also be affected. In another research project conducted by Üskül et al. (2013), it was observed that Turkish participants perceived situations related to honor in a more emotional way. All these findings suggest that honor has a dominant role in greater Turkish society. Moreover, as stated by Öner-Özkan and Gençöz (2006), values such as mutual social commitment, collective pride, and honor of both men and women are also among the features of honor cultures. Similarly, Kuşdil and Kağıtçıbaşı



(2000) conducted a study using the Schwartz Values Scale, choosing to add a number of local values, such as “the honor of women” and “the honor of men.”

In the present study, the value group entitled spirituality was formed via the data obtained from participants. In the Schwartz Values Scale, spirituality was considered as a value type at first. However, as per Schwartz’s research (1992) in which a sample of 17 different nations was included, since a single spirituality value set was unable to be found in inter-cultural comparisons and contradictory results were obtained, this value type was reduced to a single value called “a spiritual life.” This finding suggests that spirituality can be lived in different ways in different cultures. Therefore, Schwartz states that the spirituality value type should be examined in a more detailed way. In the present research, spirituality appeared as a separate factor

involving such values as worship, religion/faith, belief/ideology, and inner peace while also being valued or lived in a way that cannot be expressed simply under the term “a spiritual life.”

The findings obtained through this study support the hypothesis that culture-specific studies should be conducted in order to understand a concept related to culture, such as value groups and values. Moreover, the psychometric findings of the Values Scale indicate that this scale is a valid and reliable measurement tool. On the other hand, the implementation of this scale on various samples is important for the scale to become more practical. In addition, in further studies, both the factor analyses and reliability analyses should be reconducted and more consistent findings regarding the scale should be reached by conducting test-retest reliability or criterion related validity studies.

## References

- Akarlsan, M. (2011). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin ebeveynlik stillerini algılayışları ve bu algının ebeveyn-çocuk değer benzerliğine etkisi* (Master's thesis, İstanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2007). *Amos 16.0* [computer software]. Chicago, IL: Smallwaters.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Breugelmans, S. M., Chasiotis, A., & Sam, D. L. (2013). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* (3th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bilsky, W., & Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Values and personality. *European Journal of Personality*, 8, 163-181.
- Birch, B. C., & Rasmussen, L. (1989). *Bible & ethics in the Christian life*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Bond, M. H. (1988). Finding universal dimensions of individual variation in multicultural studies of values: The Rokeach and Chinese Value Surveys. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(6), 1009-1015.
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis: For applied research*. NY: Guilford Press.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds), *Testing structural models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Büyükköztürk, Ş. (2009). *Sosyal bilimlere için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Cohen, E. D. (1985). *Making value judgment: Principals of sound reasoning*. Malabar, Florida: Krieger Publishing.
- Çileli, M. (2000). Change in value orientation of Turkish youth from 1989 to 1995. *The Journal of Psychology*, 134(3), 297-306.
- Çileli, M., & Tezer, E. (1998). Life and value orientations of Turkish university students. *Adolescence*, 33(129), 219-228.
- Demirutku, K., & Sümer, N. (2010). Temel değerlerin ölçümü: Portre Değerler Anketi'nin Türkçe uyarlaması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 13(25), 17-25.
- Dılmaç, B., Kulaksızoğlu, A., & Ekşi, H. (2007). An examination of the humane values education program on a group of science high school students. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 7, 1221-1261.
- Fataar, A., & Solomons, I. (2011). A conceptual exploration of values education in the context of schooling in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 31(2), 224-232.
- Gari, A., Mylonas, K., & Karagianni, D. (2005). Political and religious group membership, value priorities and educational Values. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 26(3), 301-310.
- Gregg, G. S. (2005). *The Middle East: A cultural psychology*. Oxford University Press.
- Gürşimşek, I., & Göregenli, M. (2006). Humanistic attitudes, values, system justification, and control beliefs in a Turkish sample. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 34(7), 747-758.
- Halstead, J., & Taylor, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Values in education and education in values*. London: Falmer Press, Harper and Row.
- Hansson, T., Carey, G., & Kjartansson, R. (2010). A multiple software approach to understanding values. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 31(3), 283-298.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- İmamoğlu, E. O. ve Karakitapoğlu Aygün, Z. (1999). 1970'lerden 1990'lara değerler: Üniversite düzeyinde gözlenen zaman, kuşak ve cinsiyet farklılıkları. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14(44), 1-22.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context, implications for self and society. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 20(10), 1-20.
- Karakitapoğlu Aygün, Z., & İmamoğlu, E. O. (2002). Value domains of Turkish adults and university students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 124(3), 333-351.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). NY: The Guilford Press.
- Kuşdil, M. E., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz değer kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(45), 59-76.
- Lee, C. K. (1991). The problem of appropriateness of the Rokeach Value Survey in Korea. *International Journal of Psychology*, 26(3), 300-310.
- Meydan, C. H., & Şeşen, H. (2011). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesi: AMOS uygulamaları*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Matthews, B. A. (2000). The Chinese Value Survey: An interpretation of value scales and consideration of some preliminary results. *International Education Journal*, 1(2), 117-126.
- Morrow, W. (1989). *Chains of thought*. Johannesburg: Southern Book Publishers.
- Öner-Özkan, B., & Gençöz, T. (2006). Gurur toplumu bakış açısıyla Türk toplumunun incelenmesi. *Kriz Dergisi*, 14(3), 19-25.
- Powney, J., Cullen, M. A., Schlapp, U., Glissov, P., Johnstone, M., & Munn, P. (1995). *Understanding values education in the primary school*. Edinburgh: University of Glasgow, The Scottish Council for Research in Education.
- Raths, L. M. Harmin, & Simon, S. B. (1966). *Values and teaching*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Ruyter, D. J. (2002). The right to meaningful education: The role of values and beliefs. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 23(1), 33-42.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol 25, pp. 1-65). California: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2006). Les valeurs de base de la personne: Theorie, mesures et applications [Basic human values: Theory, measurement, and applications]. *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 42, 249-288.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bardi, A. (2001). Value hierarchies across cultures: Taking a similarities perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(3), 268-290.
- Sevgili, F. (2012). *Değerler-tüketim ilişkisinde materyalizm ve değer-eyşa temsilinin aracı rolü* (Master's thesis, İstanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi
- Shearman, S. M. (2008, May). *Culture, values, and cultural variability: Hofstede, Inglehart, and Schwartz's approach*. Paper presented at The Annual Convention of the International Communication Association, Montreal, QC, Canada.
- Smith, P. B., & Schwartz, S. H. (1997). Values. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 77-118). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Şendil, G., & Cesur, S. (2011). The relationships between parental attitudes and their personalities and values. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(38), 1-22.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). NY: Allyn and Bacon.
- Thomas, R. S. (1992). *Values education discourse: A classification of exemplars* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland, USA.
- Üskül, A. K., Cross, S. E., Alözkan, C., Gerçek-Swing, B., Ataca, B., Günsoy, C., & Sunbay, Z. (2014). Emotional responses to honour situations in Turkey and the northern USA. *Cognition and Emotion*, 28(6), 1-19.
- Üskül, A. K., Cross, S. E., Sunbay, Z., Gerçek-Swing, B., & Ataca, B. (2012). Honor bound: The cultural construction of honor in Turkey and the Northern US. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 43(7), 1131-1151.
- Weston, R., & Gore, Jr. P. A. (2006). A brief guide to structural equation modeling. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(5), 719-751.
- Winter, P. A., Newton, R. M., & Kirkpatrick, R. L. (1998). The influence of work values on teacher selection decisions: The effects of principal values, teacher values, and principal-teacher value interactions. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 14, 385-400.
- Zajda, J. (2009). *Values, education and multiculturalism in the global culture: Global values education*. New York: Springer.