Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice – 12 (2) [Supplementary Special Issue] • Spring • 1262-1270

www.edam.com.tr/estp

The Prediction of Empathetic Tendency and Characteristic Trait of Collaboration on Humane Values in Secondary Education Students and the examining to Those Characteristics*

Esra DERELİ[a]
Eskişehir Osmangazi University

Ayşe AYPAY
Eskişehir Osmangazi University

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among the empathic tendency, collaboration character trait, human values of student high school and whether high school students' empathic tendency, character trait of collaboration, human values differ based on qualifications of personnel (gender, class levels, mother and father education level, income level of family and number of siblings) was investigated. The study group was composed by 504 students attending in different high schools in Adana and Eskişehir. The data were collected using the Adolescent KA-Sİ Empathic Tendency Scale, Human Values Scale and Collaboration sub-dimension of Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI). Analysis of data was used descriptive statistics, t test for independent groups, One Way Anova, multiple regression analysis. Results indicated that students' empathic tendency, collaboration subdimension character trait, human values scores significantly differed based on gender and mother education level. Students' human values scores significantly differed based on class-level. Students' collaboration character trait, human values scores significantly differed based on father education-level and income- level of family. Also empathic tendency predicted responsibility, friendship, pacifism, respect, honesty and tolerance of human values; collaboration character trait predicted responsibility, friendship, pacifism, respect, honesty and tolerance.

Key Words

Empathic Tendency, Human Values, Collaboration Character Trait, High School.

Mutual understanding, listening and accepting of persons one another are among the most significant characteristics that regulate social life. Personality characteristics are among significant factors in sustaining interpersonal relations (Fitness & Curtis, 2005). Cloninger (1994) explains personality through normal and abnormal changes in two basic components namely temperament and character. The temperament dimension of personality reflects the individual differences in perception based tempers and skills. And character features of personality are rather created culturally. According to Cloninger, character features are composed of three dimensions namely self-management, collaboration and getting over oneself. However self-management and getting over oneself mostly related to individual himself, collaboration dimensions mostly rather related to interpersonal interactions. The character trait of collaboration is composed of social acceptance, empathy, helpfulness, compassionate and being virtuous/conscientious. In any communication where there is empathetic tendency the person feels that he/she is listened to and accepted without being judged and that he/she

* This study was presented at the Values Education Symposium, October 26–28, 2011, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Eskişehir, Turkey.

a **Esra DERELİ, PhD.**, is currently an assistant proffessor at Department of Preschool Education.Her research interests include psychosocial development in early childhood, conduct behaviour problem, social problem solving, social skills and value education. Correspondence: Asist. Prof. Esra DERELİ, Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Faculty of Education, Department of Preschool Education, Eskişehir/ Turkey. E-mail: esdereli@hotmail.com, derelie@ogu.edu.tr Phone: +90 222 339 3750/1645.

is important and valuable due to his/her existence as a human being (Ataşalar, 1996).

Although certain definitions of empathy is given by different theorists (Davis, 1980; Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987; Rogers, 1983; Worthington & Wade, 1999) which sometimes coincide and at other times complete one another; according to Rogers who defines empathy within a wide framework empathy is the process of any person understanding his/her addressee's feelings and thought about a given situation correctly, feeling what he/she feels and transmitting this case to him/her. Psychoanalytic theorists argue that the initial seeds of empathy are planted in early childhood period through child-parent relations. Social learning theorists argue that empathy would be gained within the context of social relations (Körükçü-Sarıyüce, 2004). The ability of empathy enables the individuals to "assess others' emotional reactions correctly and select correct social-fitting behaviors" (Fitness & Curtis, 2005). Empathetic tendency is the potential of persons to empathize in their everyday lives (Dökmen, 1987). Empathetic tendency is a multidimensional structure with cognitive and emotional components. Both emotional and cognitive components of empathy are significant in terms of developing the relationship between empathy and behavior precisely. Emotional empathy is generally defined as an effective characteristic that facilitates feeling any other person's feelings. In the emotional dimension of empathetic tendency, there is sharing a feeling of an individual or feeling sympathy for the individual. In this dimension the person enters in an emotional sharing with his/her addressee and feels the same way as his/her addressee does (Brems, 1989; Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoe, 2007; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006). And cognitive empathy is expressed as a cognitive ability that facilitates understanding others' feelings. In this dimension of empathy the ability to understand and define other people's viewpoints is reflected. While it is important to understand the situation of any person in the cognitive dimension of empathetic tendency, in emotional empathy it is important to feel the situation of that person (Zahn-Waxler & Radke-Yarrow, 1990).

Values are the internal components that affect the behaviors, decision making strategies and attitudes of the individuals as well as interpersonal relations as it is the case with personal characteristics. However value and personality are different from each other. While personality is permanent characteristic of an individual; value is the permanent target of that individual. While personality generally represents the behaviors that are perceived as the most natural by the individual; value represents the selections made in a given situation (Parks & Guay, 2011).

The values that an individual pays significance to and those which the society pays significance to may conflict with each other but they may be in harmony as well. Values are learnt later and the situation of the individual change depending on variables including education, age, physical strength, age group and culture (Schwartz, 2011). Schwartz (1992) defines value as the guiding motivations and purposes in the life of individual. Furthermore, Schwartz (1999) qualifies value as "*a social actor which generally assists with the selection of behaviors, assessment of events and persons, explanation of behaviors*". Values are relatively permanent characteristic of an individual that guides the behaviors and decisions of the individual and that reflects what is significant for the individual (Rokeach, 1968, 1973; Lewin, 1952, pp. 1-3 cited in De Raad & Van Oudenhoven, 2008). It is expected that relatively permanent personality characteristics including empathetic tendency and characteristic of collaboration have effect on what the individuals would deem significant as well as their behavior preferences (Dereboy, 1993). Furthermore, the puberty period is a period of development when individuals try to develop an adaptable, consistent, authentic and correct identity through answering the questions of "Who am I?" and "What do I value?" In this period value preferences begin to be clarified as well (Erikson, 1968, 1974). For this reason, The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among the empathic tendency, collaboration character trait, human values of student high school and whether high school students' empathic tendency, character trait of collaboration, human values differ based on qualifications of personnel (gender, class levels, mother and father education level, income level of family and number of siblings) was investigated.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among the empathic tendency, collaboration character trait, human values of student high school and whether high school students' empathic

tendency, character trait of collaboration, human values differ based on qualifications of personnel (gender, class levels, mother and father education level, income level of family and number of siblings) was investigated.

Method

This study is a quantitative and relational study aimed at examining the whether empathic tendency, collaboration subdimension of character trait predicts human values of student high school and whether high school students' empathic tendency, character trait of collaboration, human values differ based on qualifications of personnel (gender, class levels, mother and father education level, income level of family and number of siblings) (Büyüköztürk, 2005; Karasar, 2010). The data were collected by Adolescent KA-Sİ Empathic Tendency Scale developed by Kaya and Siyez (2010), Human Values Scale developed by Dilmaç (2007) and Collaboration sub-dimension of Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI).

Participants

In the study, the data were collected by randomly selected two 9 nt, two 10 th, two 11 th and 12 th grade class from two diffirent high schools in Adana and Eskişehir. The research was carried out with the data gathered from 281 (55.8 %) females and 219 (43.5 %) males high school students. The students were in 14-20 age range and, average age was 16.70. 22.2 % of the participants were 9 th grade students, 24.6 % of the participants were 10 th grade students, 24.4 % of the participants were 11 th grade students and 27.6 % of the participants were 12 grade students. 56.6 % of the participants were primary school graduates of mother, 33.3 % of the participants were high school graduates of mother and 7.3 % of the participants were university or master/ doctoral graduates of mother. %45.2% of the participants were primary school graduates of father, %38.5 % of the participants were high school graduates of father and 7.3 % of the participants were university or master/ doctoral graduates of father.

Instruments

KA-Sİ Empathic Tendency Scale for Children and Adolescents: Adolescent Form: This scale developed by Kaya and Siyez (2010) as a tool for empatic tendency among adolescents between the 9-12 th grade students. Exploratory factor analysis identified two factors accounting for 43.58% of the variance for adolescent form as Emotional Empathy and Cognitive Empathy. Emotional Empathy accounted for 33.23% of the variance and item loadings ranged from .49 to .66. Cognitive empathy accounted for 10.35%of the variance and item loadings ranged from .56 to .76. At the same time upper-lower group mean differences were conducted and for 17 items and upper-lower group mean differences were significantly all of the items. The goodness-of-fit statistics for the CFA of the items confirmed the view that two-factor model was a good fit to the data ($X2$=270.89, df=125, p>.001; $X2$/df=2.16; RMSEA=0.02, SRMR=0.03; GFI=0.96; CFI=0.96; AGFI=.95). Correlation between the two factors in the CFA was .65 suggesting considerable overlap between the two factors. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients were 0.87 (total scale), .82 (emotional empathy) and .82 (cognitive empathy). The correlations between the two subscales were computed and significant associations were obtained (r=.68, p<.001). Test-retest reliability of the KA-Sİ Adolescent Form was tested by giving the scale to the same students in a one week interval. The test-retest reliability coefficients for the full scale KA-SI, Emotional Empathy and Cognitive Empathy were .75, .73, and .69, respectively (Kaya & Siyez).

Humane Values Scales: Humane Values Scale developed by Dilmaç (2007) as a tool for human values among secondary level students. In the scale, the process of humane values was measured in six dimensions with 42 item. They are Responsibility, Friendship/Amity, Pacifism, Respect, Tolerance and Honesty. Exploratory factor indicated that accounted for the variance and item loadings are respectively: 77-.53, %16,09; .79-.51, %5,60; .74-.46, %3.87; .69-.36, %3.30; .83-.45, %2.99; .72-.36, %2.63. At the same time upper-lower group mean differences were conducted and for 42 items and upper-lower group mean differences were significantly all of the items. This scale is a Likert-type scale which can be used individually or in groups. This scale Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients were ranged 0. 92 (total scale), .73 (Responsibility), .69 (Friendship/Amity) .65(Pacifism) , 67. (Respect), .69 Tolerance and .70 (Honesty). Test-retest reliability of the Human Values Scale

was tested by giving the scale to the same students in a 20 day interval. The test-retest reliability coefficients for the full scale, Responsibility, Friendship/Amity, Pacifism, Respect, Tolerance and Honesty were .87 .73, .91, .80, .88, .75, .79., respectively. Whether the grades are high or low depends on the level of students' humane values (Dilmaç).

Temperament and Character Inventory: Cloninger's temperament and character of two major components of personality changes in normal and abnormal psychobiological model of personality developed based on a scale that describes (Köse et al., 2004). Temperament and Character Inventory adapted to Turkish by Köse et.al. Temperament and Character Inventory including that four temperaments (novelty seeking, harm avoidance, reward dependence, persistence) and three characters (self-directedness, collaboration, self-transcendence) which serves to measure the size of the seven basic personality. This scale validity and reliability studies was done by Köse et.al with no period of his life untreated mental illness administered to 683 volunteers. This scale Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients were ranged from .60 to .85 in temperament sub-dimensions and ranged from .82 to .83 in character sub-dimensions. They are social acceptance/ social intolerance, empathy /social apathy, helpfulness / unhelpfulness, compassion/ vengeful, virtuousness/ self-benefit.

Procedures

The data were gathered from selected two diffirent school and randomly selected classes by researcher. The data collection procedure was carried out by providing students with the appropriate environment and sufficient time for answering the questions in groups in the classroom.

Data Analysis

SPSS 15.0 was used in order to evaluate the data which were collected by the scales employed in the research. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine whether or not empathic tendency, collaboration subdimension of character trait predicts human values of student high school. In dependet t test and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to determine whether high school students' empathic tendency, character trait of collaboration, human values differ based on qualifications of personnel (gender, class levels, mother and father education level, income level of family and number of siblings).

Results

As a result of the analysis, it was seen that was significant difference emotional empathy [$t_{(427.28)}$=10.84, p<.01] and cognitive empathy [$t_{(403.30)}$= 5.54, p<.01] according to the gender of the students. Female students' emotional empathy scores ($\overline{X}$=31.82) was higher than that of males ($\overline{X}$=26.02). Female students' cognitive empathy scores ($\overline{X}$=23.34) was higher than that of males ($\overline{X}$=21.29).

There was also a significant difference on student based on gender regarding the social acceptance [$t_{(393.07)}$= 2.20, p<.05], compassion [$t_{(416.36)}$= 3.21, p<.01] and virtuousness [$t_{(353.88)}$=3.43, p<.01] subdimensions of collaboration of character traits. Female student social acceptance scores ($\overline{X}$=6.15), compassion scores ($\overline{X}$=6.30) and virtuousness scores ($\overline{X}$=6.90) was higher than that of male student social acceptance scores ($\overline{X}$=5.76), compassion scores ($\overline{X}$=5.41) and virtuousness scores ($\overline{X}$=6.35).

There was a significant difference on student based on gender regarding the friendship [$t_{(236.08)}$=3.22, p<.01], pacifism [$t_{(379.56)}$=6.62, p<.01], honesty [$t_{(413.01)}$=4.29, p<.01] and respect [$t_{(377.89)}$=3.83, p<.01] of human values. Female student friendship scores ($\overline{X}$=29.26), pacifism scores ($\overline{X}$=27.14), honesty scores (`X=27.34) and respect scores ($\overline{X}$=27.88) was higher than that of male student friendship scores ($\overline{X}$=27.90), pacifism scores ($\overline{X}$=24.42), honesty scores ($\overline{X}$=25.75) and respect scores ($\overline{X}$=26.18).

In order to test whether the students' empathic tendency, collaboration subdimension of character trait and human values based on class levels, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. As a result of the analysis, it was seen that was significant not difference empathy tendency and collaboration subdimension of character trait according to the class-level. There was a significant difference on student based on calss-level regarding the only be pacifism scores of human values [$F_{(3-444)}$=3,75, p<.01]. According to the results of LSD test, the higher class-level the increase scores pacifism of human values (9 nt grade class $\overline{X}$=25.18; 10 th grade class X=25. 47; 11 th grade class $\overline{X}$=26.85 and 12 th class $\overline{X}$=26. 55).

As a result of the ANOVA analysis, it was seen that was no difference empathy tendency according to the students' father education level. However, there

was a significant difference on based on father education regarding the social acceptance scores of collaboration character trait [$F_{(2-432)}$=4,61, p<.01] and pacifism of human values [$F_{(2-439)}$=5,09, p<.01]. According to the results of LSD test, fathers' high school graduates of students pacifism of human values scores ($\overline{X}$=6.21) was higher than that of fathers' primary school graduates and fathers' university graduates pacifism of human values scores. According to the results of LSD test, fathers' high school graduates of students scores ($\overline{X}$=26.77) and fathers' primary school graduates of students social acceptance scores ($\overline{X}$=25.53) higher than fathers' university graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=25.11).

As a result of the ANOVA analysis, it was seen that was difference emotional empathy scores [$F_{(3-466)}$=3,67, p<.01], virtuousness scores [$F_{(3-431)}$=3,18, p<.05], compassion score [$F_{(3-430)}$=5,84, p<.01] and social acceptance scores [$F_{(3-427)}$=4,12, p<.01] of collaboration character trait and responsibility of human values scores [$F_{(3-440)}$=3,14, p<.05] according to the students' mother education level. According to the results of LSD test, mothers' primary graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=29.86) and mothers' high school graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=29.13) emotional empathy score higher than mothers' university graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=26.11). According to LSD test, mothers' primary graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=6.89) virtuousness scores higher than mothers' high school graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=6.45) and mothers' university graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=6.25). According LSD test, mothers' primary graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=6.22) and mothers' high school graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=5.66) compassion score higher than mothers' university graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=4.33). According LSD test, mothers' primary graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=6.14) and mothers' high school graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=6.00) social acceptance score higher than mothers' university graduates of students (X=4.00). According LSD test, mothers' primary graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=25.82) and mothers' high school graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=26.19) responsibility of human values score higher than mothers' university graduates of students ($\overline{X}$=23.70).

As a result of the ANOVA analysis, it was seen that was not difference emotional empathy scores according to the level of family income. However, there was a significant difference on based on level of family income regarding the virtuousness [$F_{(5-410)}$=2,93, p<.01] and compassion [$F_{(5-408)}$=2,34, p<.05] scores of collaboration character trait, and responsibility [$F_{(5-420)}$=3,59, p<.01], friendship [$F_{(5-420)}$=2,27, p<.05] and tolerance [$F_{(5-417)}$=2,23, p<.05] scores of human values.

According LSD test, students' level of family income of less than 500 TL ($\overline{X}$=5.85) virtuousness score lower than level of family income of 500 TL between 2000 TL [500 between 900 TL ($\overline{X}$=6.90); 1000 between 1500 TL ($\overline{X}$=6.55); 1600 between 2000 TL (X=6.94)]. LSD test indicated that students' level of family income of less than 500 TL ($\overline{X}$=6.12); 500 TL between 900 TL ($\overline{X}$=6.41) and 1000 between 1500 TL ($\overline{X}$=5.75) compassion score higher than family income of more than 2600 TL ($\overline{X}$=4.63). LSD test indicated that students' level of family income of from 500 TL up to 2500 TL [500 between 900 TL (X=26.13); 1000 between 1500 TL($\overline{X}$=25.69); 1600 between 2000 TL ($\overline{X}$=26.50); 2100 between 2500 TL ($\overline{X}$=27.220)] responsibility of human values score higher than family income of more than 2600 TL ($\overline{X}$=23.41). LSD test indicated that students' level of family income of from 500 TL between 900 TL ($\overline{X}$=29.07), 1600 between 2000 TL ($\overline{X}$=29.53) and 2100 between 2500 TL ($\overline{X}$=30.00) friendship of human values score higher than family income of more than 2600 TL ($\overline{X}$=27.09). According LSD test, students' level of family income of 500 TL between 900 TL ($\overline{X}$=23.89), 1000 between 1500 TL ($\overline{X}$=23.19) and 1600 between 2000 TL ($\overline{X}$=23.86) tolerance of human values score higher than family income of more than 2600 TL ($\overline{X}$=21.72).

As a result of the ANOVA analysis, it was seen that was not difference emotional empathy scores, collaboration character trait and human values according to the level of numbaer of sibling.

A multiple regression analysis was performed to predict human values by empathic tendency, collaboration subdimension of character trait. Results indicates that empathy tendency (R^2=.10, F=25.09 p<.01) and collaboration character trait (R^2=.183, F=17.54 p<.01) are significant on responsibility of human values in a pozitive way. This results indicates that empathy tendency explain 10 % of total variance and collaboration character trait 18.3 % of total variance in responsibility of human values. According to the standardized regression coefficient, significance order of precusor variables on responsibility of human values in a pozitively is as follows: Cognitive empathy (β=.27; p<.01), helpfulness (β=.25; p<.01), compassion (β=.19; p<.01).

Results indicates that empathy tendency (R^2=.21, F=57.58, p<.01) and collaboration character trait (R^2=.16, F=14.99 p<.01) are significant on friendship of human values in a pozitive way. This results indicates that empathy tendency explain 21% of total variance and collaboration subdimension of character trait 16 % of total variance in friendship of human values. According to the standardized regression coefficient, significance order of precusor variables on friendship of human values in a pozitively is as follows cognitive empathy (β=.34; p<.01), helpfulness (β=.27; p<.01), emotional empathy (β=.17; p<.01), compassion (β=.15; p<.01) and virtuousness (β=.11; p<.05).

Results indicates that empathy tendency (R^2=.16, F=41.00, p<.01) and collaboration subdimension of character trait (R^2=.20, F=20.40, p<.01) are significant on pacifism of human values in a pozitive way. This results indicates that empathy tendency explain 16% of total variance and collaboration subdimension of character trait 20 % of total variance in pacifism of human values. According to the standardized regression coefficient, significance order of precusor variables on pacifism of human values in a pozitively is as follows emotional empathy (β=.34; p<.01), compassion (β=.24; p<.01), social acceptance (β=.14; p<.01), virtuousness (β=.13; p<.05) and helpfulness (β=.11; p<.05).

Results indicates that empathy tendency (R^2=.15, F=37.22 p<.01)and collaboration subdimension of character trait (R^2=.27, F=30.37 p<.01) are significant on of respect of human values in a pozitive way. This results indicates that empathy tendency explain 15 % of total variance and collaboration subdimension of character trait 27 % of total variance in be respect of human values. According to the standardized regression coefficient, significance order of precusor variables on be respect of human values in a pozitively is as follows: compassion (β=.24; p<.01), emotional empathy (β=.23; p<.01), cognitive empathy (β=.20; p<.01), helpfulness (β=.20; p<.01), virtuousness (β=.19; p<.01) and social acceptance (β=.11; p<.05).

Results indicates that empathy tendency (R^2=.09, F=20.99 p<.01) and collaboration subdimension of character trait (R^2=.10, F=9.03 p<.01) are significant on of honesty of human values in a pozitive way. This results indicates that empathy tendency explain 9 % of total variance and collaboration subdimension of character trait 10 % of total variance in honesty of human values. According to the standardized regression coefficient, significance order of precusor variables on honesty of human values in a pozitively is as follows: cognitive empathy (β=.230; p<.01), social acceptance (β=.16; p<.05), helpfulness (β=.15; p<.01).

Results indicates that empathy tendency (R^2 =.09, F=22.32 p<.01) and collaboration subdimension of character trait (R^2=.23, F=23.14 p<.01) are significant on of tolerance of human values in a pozitive way. This results indicates that empathy tendency explain 9 % of total variance and collaboration subdimension of character trait 23 % of total variance in tolerance of human values. According to the standardized regression coefficient, significance order of precusor variables on tolerance of human values in a pozitively is as follows: compassion (β=.29; p<.01), social acceptance (β=.22; p<.01), emotional empathy (β=.18; p<.01), cognitive empathy (β=.16; p<.01), helpfulness (β=.15; p<.01).

Discussion

The findings revealed the fact that female students are more advantageous that the male students in both emotional and cognitive dimensions of empathetic tendency; in social acceptance, compassion and virtuousness dimensions of characteristic of collaboration and friendship, pacifism, honesty and respect dimensions of the humane values. It is considered that those results may stem from the general differences in manners of raising the boys and girls. In the scale work of Dökmen (1999) on male and female roles; while the female roles may be represented by characteristics of being soft-polite, sensitive, merciful, smooth tongued, conciliative, eager to repair damaged feelings, not using an impolite language, being tolerant and honorable; male roles are represented by characteristics of being daring, acting as a leader, being pushful, self-confident, authoritarian, dominant effective, manly, not avoiding to take risks, being normative-strict and ambitious. Study findings of Dökmen (1999) supports the thought that gender roles and differences in manners of raising in the process of giving those roles may have played a role in female students being more empathetic, more deteriorated for collaboration, and more sensitive in terms of humane values in this study. In this study female are more advantageous that the male of empathetic tendency findings supported by about study (Alpay,

2009; Ekinci, 2009; Fittnes & Curtis, 2005; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006; Myyry & Helkama, 2001; Rehber, 2007; Seng, Sizng, & Wei, 1998; Whalen, 2010). In this study research the fact that female students show the characteristic of collaboration better than the male students and get higher scores in terms of humane values compared to the male students is supported by the study findings of Myyry and Helkama as well. And the study of Aydın (2005) has suggested that certain value preferences of the students may have meaningful differences depending on gender as well.

Empathetic tendencies and characteristics of collaboration of the students did not have meaningful difference depending on the class level. And only the value points of being pacifism among the humane values increased at a meaningful level in line with the increase in class level. Those findings make one think that the education received by the students from the 9th class to the 12th class was not of the nature that would change those characteristics. The study of Rehber (2007) also suggested that empathetic tendency did not demonstrate meaningful differences depending on class level.

The findings about the education levels of the parents indicate that the students whose parents are university graduates are disadvantageous in terms of gaining empathetic tendency, characteristic of collaboration and humane values compared to the students having parents with lower education levels. This case may either be related to the change in the values and personality characteristics that the parents prioritize depending on increasing level of education or the fact that depending on increasing level of education the significance paid by the parents to humane values decrease and attitudes for raising children more individually become dominant. And in the study of Aydın (2005) while the value of a peaceful world is in the 2nd rank for those whose mother never went to school, this ordering fell in line with the increase in the level of education of the mother and went to the 9th rank in students whose mothers are university graduates. This finding supports the findings in this study that make one think that in line with the increasing level of education of the parent certain values were given to the children less.

It has been determined that the empathetic tendencies of the students did not differ at a meaningful level depending on the income levels of their families. However, among the characteristics of collaboration the characteristics of virtuousness and compassion and among humane values responsibility, friendship and tolerance value points were generally higher in students the income levels of whose families are low or medium than the students the income levels of whose families are higher than 2600 TL. The research findings of Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli and Çıkılı (2008) support the findings acquired in this research. According to the findings of Dilmaç et. al. benevolence value preferences containing charity, responsibility and honesty were prioritized more by those students at lower socioeconomic level.

It attracts the attention that there is no meaningful difference between the virtuousness, compassion, responsibility, friendship and tolerance points of the students the income levels of whose families are lower than 500 TL and students the income levels of whose families are higher than 2600 TL. This case makes one think that the students from very poor families and those from families with high level of income resemble each other in terms of those characteristics. Very poor people may not develop such characteristics as virtuousness, compassion, responsibility, friendship and tolerance toward other people maybe because they partially keep other people responsible for the situation they are in. And the people whose level of income is high may lose their characteristics as virtuousness, compassion, responsibility, friendship and tolerance toward other people maybe because of increasing prosperity and decreasing worries. Dilmaç et al. (2008) determined that helpfulness value preferences containing charity, responsibility and honesty were prioritized more by those students at lower socioeconomic level.

Findings revealed the fact that the sub-dimensions of both empathetic tendency and the characteristic of collaboration routed all of the humane values within the scope of this research at a meaningful level. These findings point at the significance of giving the children emotional and cognitive empathetic tendency and characteristics of collaboration in terms of giving them values.

The family and environment characteristics of the individuals have an important influence on their empathetic tendencies, characteristics of collaboration and humane values. Examining the results of the research generally, one may see that the humane values of those individuals who have empathetic tendency and characteristics of collaboration are

at a better level. The following are suggested on the basis of those findings: Since the relationship between the family and the child and the relationship between the environment and the child are significant in terms of gaining empathetic tendency, characteristic of collaboration as humane values, those characteristics should be supported by the family and the environment from the early childhood period. Therefore education programs particularly for families, teachers, tutors and students may be implemented and the results thereof may be assessed. Furthermore considering the impact of empathetic tendency and characteristics of collaboration in terms of gaining humane values, course programs targeting at developing those characteristics of students may be reinforced. A comprehensive education program from the early childhood period to the puberty period may be prepared and the results thereof may be examined. The research conducted may be implemented on the parents and they may be compared to the situation of the children.

References/Kaynakça

Alpay, A. (2009). *Yakın ilişkilerde bağışlama: Bağışmalanın; bağlanma, benlik saygısı, empati ve kıskançlık değişkenleri yönünden incelenmesi*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Ataşalar, J. (1996). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin empatik eğilimlerine, cinsiyet ve yaşlarına göre kendini açma davranışları.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Aydın, A. (2005). *Dil-tarih ve Ccoğrafya Fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer hiyerarşileri ile ilahiyat fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer hiyerarşilerinin karşılaştırılması*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Brems, C. (1989). Dimensionality of empathy and its correlates. *Journal of Psychology*, *123* (4), 329-341.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2005). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı istatistik, araştırma deseni, spss uygulamaları ve yorum.* Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Cloninger, C. R. (1994) *The temperament and character Inventory (TCI). A guide to its development and use.* Washington University: St Louis: Center for Psychobiology of Personality.

Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10,* 85-107.

De Raad, B., & Van Oudenhoven, P. (2008). Factors of values in the Dutch language and their relationship to factors of personality. *European Journal of Personality*, *22,* 81–108.

Dereboy, İ. F. (1993). *Kimlik bocalaması, anlamak, tanımak, ele almak.* Malatya: Özmert Ofset.

Dilmaç, B. (2007). *Bir grup fen lisesi öğrencine verilen insani değerler eğitiminin insani değerler ölçeği ile sınanması.* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.

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

Dökmen, Ü. (1987). Empati kurma becerisi ile sosyometrik statü arasındaki ilişki. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, *20* (1-2), 183-207.

Dökmen, Z. Y. (1999). Bem cinsiyet rolü envanteri kadınsılık ve erkeksilik özellikleri Türkçe formunun psikometrik özellikleri. *Kriz Dergisi, 7* (1), 27-40.

Eisenberg, N., & Strayer, J. (1987). *Empathy and its development*. NewYork: Cambridge University Press.

Ekinci, Ö. (2009). *Öğretmen adaylarının empatik ve eleştirel düşünme eğilimlerinin incelenmesi.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Adana.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis.* NewYork: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1974). *Dimensions of a new identity.* New York: Norton.

Fittness, J., & Curtis, M. (2005). Emational intelligence an the trait meta-mood Scale: Relationship with empathy, attributional complexity, self-control, and responses to interpersonal conflict. *E-Journal of Applied Psychology: Social Section*, *1* (1), 50-62.

Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoe, G. (2007). Does empathy predict adolescents' bullying and defending Behavior? *Agressive Behavior, 33,* 467-476.

Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2006). Development and validation of the basic empathy scale. *Journal of Adolescence, 29*, 589-611.

Karasar, N. (2010). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kaya, A., & Siyez, D. M. (2010). KA-Sİ çocuk ve ergenler İçin empatik eğilim ölçeği: Geliştirilmesi geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 35* (156), 110-125.

Körükçü- Sarıyüce, Ö. (2004). *Altı yaş grubundaki çocukların özsaygı düzeyleri ile anne empatik becerilerinin incelenmesi.* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Köse, S., Sayar, K., Ak, İ., Aydın, N., Kalelioğlu, Ü., Kırpınar, İ. ve ark. (2004). Mizaç ve karakter envanteri (Türkçe TCI): Geçerlik, güvenirliği, faktör yapısı. *Klinik Psikofarmakoloji Bülteni*, *14*, 107-131.

Myyry, L., & Helkama, K. (2001). University students' value priorities and emotional empathy. *Educational Psychology, 21* (1), 25-40.

Parks, L., & Guay, R. P. (2011). Can personal values predict performance? Evidence in an academic setting. *Applied Psychology: An Internatıonal Review, 61* (1), 149-173.

Rehber, E. (2007). *İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerinin empatik eğilim düzeylerine göre çatışma çözme davranışlarının incelenmesi.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Rogers, C. R. (1983). Empatik olmak değeri anlaşılmamış bir varoluş şeklidir (çev. F. Akkoyun). *Ankara Üniversitesi EBF Dergisi*, *16,* 103-124

Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values.* New York: The Free Press.

Schwartz, S. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *25*, 1-65.

Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for Work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 48* (1), 23–47.

Schwartz, S. (2011). *Basic human values: Theory, methods, and applications.* Retrieved 10 January, 2011 from http://segr-did2.fmag.unict.it/Allegati/convegno%207-8-10-05/Schwartzpaper.pdf

Seng, S. H., Sizng, L. M., & Wei, T. T. (1998, November). Value orientation of Singapore adolescents towards truthfulness, justice and compassion. Paper presented at Annual Conference of The Educational Research Association, Singapore..

Whalen, L. M. (2010). *Empathy and reading of narrative fiction among community college students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Capella.

Worthington, E. L., & Wade, N. G. (1999). The psychology of unforgiveness and forgiveness and implications for clinical practice. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *18* (4), 385-418.

Zahn-Waxler, C., & Radke-Yarrow, M. (1990). The origins of empathic concern. *Motivation and Emotion, 14,* 107-130.