Effect of Gender on Humanistic Values[i]

Cagla Girgin Buyukbayraktar[1], H. Irem Ozteke[2], Sahin Kesici[3], Bulent Dilmac[4], S. Barbaros Yalcin[5] and Halil Eksi [6]

[1]*Occupational Education Faculty, Selcuk University, 42003 Konya, Turkey*
[2,3,4,5]*Ahmet Kelesoglu Educational Faculty, Necmettin Erbakan University, 42090 Konya /Turkey*
[6]*Atatürk Educational Faculty, Marmara University, 34722 Istanbul/Turkey*
E-mail: [1]<cagla.girgin@hotmail.com>, [2]<iromozt_1907@hotmail>, [3]<sahinkesici@konya.edu.tr>, [4]<bulentdilmac@gmail.com>, [5]<barbarosyalcin@konya.edu.tr>, [6]<halileksi@marmara.edu.tr>

KEYWORDS Adolescents. Gender Roles. Gender-appropriate Belief Patterns. Cohen's Technique

ABSTRACT The aim of this paper is to determine the effect of gender on humanistic values. The study group is composed of 256 high school students. The "Humanistic Values Scale" was used to determine humanistic values. Humanistic values in the scale are measured with 42 items in six dimensions. This study was conducted in "Relational Screening Model". Screening models are research approaches that aim to describe a past or current situation as it was or as it is. Quantitative data obtained as a result of the study were analyzed using the independent t-test, which is used to determine the relation between dependent variable and independent variable and Cohen's technique. According to the findings of the paper, while the effect of gender on responsibility, honesty and tolerance as sub-dimensions of humanistic values was small, its effect on friendship was medium and its effect on being peaceful was great. Discussions and suggestions are made in line with the results.

INTRODUCTION

Individual differences affect human behaviours. One of the variables that affect human behaviour is gender. Gender differences are a key area of functional teenagers and constant changes need to be revised (Perry and Pauletti 2011). Clarifying gender roles, especially that of males and females, is important. Gender leads to several differences in human life such that women have better academic performance (Butler 2014), teaching is related to gender and women engage in teaching more than men (Uygun 2014), stress levels are different between men and women (Pourrajab et al. 2014), men and women have more self-efficacy and well-being than men (Ma et al. 2015), men and women have different needs in different career phases, women need more support to maintain their personal motivation (Duncan 2013), there are significant differences between men and women in anxiety levels (Erkek and Isiksal-Bostan 2015).

Through males and females, individuals learn about gender-appropriate belief patterns, personal preferences, abilities, personality traits and ego (Wade and Tavris 1990). By means of social learning, individuals learn about gender-related stereo types, gender roles, behaviours, and attitudes (Uzzell and Natalie 2006). According to cultural belief patterns, males are more competent, independent, decisive and rational. On the contrary, females are less competent, competitive, ambitious, independent and active (Broverman et al. 1972). When interviewed on gender-related beliefs and roles, in their responses college students attributed the following abilities to males – athletically and mechanically gifted, good at grasping economics, good observers and possess intellectual excellence, a good grasp of science, theoretical understanding, common sense, expertise, and professional skills. For females they attributed these qualities – possess social skills, an understanding of interpersonal relationships, appreciation of art, domestic skills, satire appreciation, and physical appearance (Center 1971 cited by Bruess and Greenberg 2004).

Gender roles affect human values as they influence individuals' behaviours. Rosario and colleagues (2014) state that individuals from different occupations and educational environments may develop different value systems that affect their behaviours and choices. Longest and colleagues (2013) specify that education and gender variables have complex associations when individual values are examined as part of a coherent system rather than in isolation. Hence, values provide life guidelines that affect our daily decisions and lay the foundation for us to

have meaning and purpose (Ferssizidis et al. 2010). According to Davidov and colleagues (2008) values are deeply-established attitudes, norms, ideas and actions that guide, arrange or explain abstract motives. Values are permanent beliefs with certain behavioural patterns (Rokeach 1973). Values are permanent beliefs by which a behavioural pattern or phenomenon is individually or socially preferred in contrast to another behaviour or phenomenon (Rokeach 1973). Values are important for personal identity, cognitive processing styles and personal differences (Claxton et al. 1997). Values can also be defined as orientations for constructive guidelines or experiences (Silcock and Duncan 2001). Values do not represent assessment of certain behaviours or objects but they rather represent normative criteria used to make such assessments (Rokeach 1973; Williams 1979).

Values are abstractions like honour and desire. People use humanistic values in various situations (Hansson et al. 2010). Conceptually humanistic values are to be distinguished from personal characteristics. As characteristics are more basic and genetically affected, values are seen as secondary characteristics conceptualized according to occasions or culture (McAdams and Pals 2006).

When the capacity of an individual as a human being is considered, it is difficult to deny that each one of us believes some sort of universal values. As Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) point out, the attractiveness of universal values include our references to beauty, justice and truthfulness. People have a unique ability to define their personalities, choose their values and create their beliefs. Human beings behave according to their own personal values which they think are important. According to Naagarazan (2006), there are five main humanistic values: 1) proper behaviour, 2) peace, 3) truthfulness, 4) love, 5) not resorting to violence. Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) determined five characteristics for conceptual definitions of values: values are a) beliefs or concepts b) motivational constructs that provide guidance and criteria or standards for assessing or choosing events, people or plans c) abstractions that take precedence over certain actions or situations d) more personal and fewer than attitudes e) ordered in a significant hierarchy.

The field of values as a research topic in social sciences might have limited individuals' beliefs about what truth, good or desired things are and the attitudes and behaviours that correspond to them (Kitwood 1980). Individuals in a values system – within groups or communities – have a hierarchical organization of values in sub-systems (Rokeach 1979). Values determine individuals' personal beliefs about how a woman or man should behave in their social environments (Meglino and Ravlin 1998). Commonly used values like traditions, customs, practices, objectives, desires, ideals, fidelity, intention, and prejudice have a place in human relations. Values seem to be completely appropriate for reasonable assessment; therefore, opinions and preferences express subjective situations. Perhaps as Aristotle states it is more helpful to regard values as something subjective rather than as objective realities (Carr and Landon 1999).

Values education requires learning critical thinking skills related with ethics both in psychology and in education and can be related with personal values (Halstead and Taylor 2000; Nucci and Weber 1991). Researchers have shown interest in humanistic values for a long period of time. According to Vernon and Allport (1931), humanistic values are "the most fruitful elements for scientific discovery".

It can be generally accepted that values are hierarchically ordered in terms of individual importance level, which helps individuals to solve conflicts about a particular issue in the case that values conflict, and enable individuals to rank values according to their priorities in conflicting situations. The main principle of values theory is that it is accepted both by the individual and in the social environment (Roe and Ester 1999). Social values are acquired not only individually but also socially. People who grow up in the same framework are influenced by the same common value judgements and thus they are expected to share the same values. According to Rokeach's (1973) assumption, as a result of constructive experiences, people who share similarities like gender, age, race, religion and social class exhibit similar value judgements. These value judgements make them a component of the concept of culture and support Mannheim's (1952) theory with regard to the emergence of generations.

Besides contributing to humanistic values theory, Rokeach (1973) also developed RVS (Rokeach Value Scale). RVS had been the main measure for values and measured people's ranking of values from the 1970s to the 1980s by many

value rankings. RVS includes 36 values and they are separated into two categories in line with Rokeach's values typology. Some are the values that constitute people's ultimate purpose of existence; others are instrumental values that involve behavioural patterns (for example, courtesy). Although subsequent researchers questioned instrumental/ultimate distinctions (Schwartz 1992), they continued to use RVS and it laid the foundation for the value scales developed later.

In recent years, the most interesting theory with regard to values has been that of Schwartz and colleagues (Schwartz and Bilsky 1987; Schwartz and Sagiv 1995). Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) proposed the first and most comprehensive model of humanistic values. They maintained that the conscious reactions of people to three simple needs (psychological needs, need for social relation and need for social institution that enable people to conduct their lives) represent values. They assumed that values are conscious reactions to basic needs. In their initial values model, Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) proposed 8 different types of values: the results of this study support their basic models but some theoretical changes are necessary. Later on, Schwartz (1992) presented a revised model composed of 10 different types of values based on the findings of the study by Schwartz and Bilsky (1987). This model confirmed the assumption that 20 value types are related to each other through a variety of complementary and conflicting relations. These 10 basic humanistic value types are: power, success, hedonism, motive, self-direction, universality, benevolence, tradition, convenience and safety. This theory defines a series of 10 different and comprehensive values as intercultural. Furthermore, it specified conflicts and compliance between these values within a consistent structure. More than 200 samples from more than 60 nations in each area of the world were analyzed and this analysis supported the differences between 10 values and the circular structure of the relation between them (Fontaine and Schwartz 1996; Schwartz and Sagiv 1995).

Keats (1982) proposed a theory with regard to the development of values. This theory is composed of four levels, which correspond to Piaget's four stages. According to this model, reaching adolescence corresponds to concrete operations stage when values are internalized and developed. If this model is conceptually correct, values become relatively permanent in adolescence.

Developmental psychologists generally divide human life into various stages: infancy (age 0-2), early childhood (age 2-7), middle childhood (age 7-12), adolescence (age 12-18), young adulthood (age 18-40), middle adulthood (age 40-65) and old age adulthood (over 65) (Bjorklund and Bee 2008). Adolescence is a developmental stage in human life. Some aspects of adolescence are characterized by biochemical processes, which are common to all human beings (Wolman 1998). In adolescence, sexual functions are stimulated; the young virtually experience a rebirth and real social life starts. Soul, mind and sense are involved, and goodness, beauty and truthfulness are acquired as personal values (Fleming 2005). Adolescence is a stage when externalization, internalization and addiction problems are on the rise. Some studies focus on the concept of adolescence as a developmental stage rather than on emotional and behavioural characteristics unique to a certain age group (Steinberg 2002). Ideational changes in adolescence enable them to understand social problems and participate in adults' social relations. Thanks to development in their cognitive processing, adolescents can critically analyze social roles in family and society at large and the differences between nominal justice and justice in practice (Lerner and Shea 1982).

Values are of special significance during adolescence because it is the key period for formulization and discovery of personality. Development of cognitive abilities enables them to think abstractly, allow for imaginative situations, express themselves and raise their awareness (Harter 1990). Youths commence to internalize values during their first interaction with their personal groups (Wasserman 1971).

Most of the time adolescence groups develop their own values rather differently from their parents. These values which can emerge as a sub-culture can present two stages in social development: the first is independence, the second is adolescents' desire for independence and the third is adulthood stage, which is reciprocal solidarity (Wolman 1998). In some cases, school and peer groups do not affect adolescents' determination of values. Unlike their parents and teachers, most male adolescences, prefer to strive for personal pleasure, expecting good things to happen, seeking adventure, enthusiasm and the

fulfilment of desires. Most female adolescents do not reject parents' and teachers' values, but are less interested in righteousness and truthfulness and prefer to wait for good things happen in challenging jobs. In general, adolescent females and males tend to comply with their peer groups rather than their parents and teachers (Lerner and Foch 1987; Steinberg 1981).

McKinney and colleagues (1977) examined the achievement values and moral values of adolescents. They compared the answers to the questions they asked to adolescents in 1969 and 1975; "….I feel proud when it happens" and "….I would feel ashamed if it had happened". While the answers given in 1969 underscored social-moral issues, the answers in 1975 are predominantly related to individual achievements. It seems that the available social atmosphere has an influence on adolescents' moral values and attitudes.

According to some researchers, the early years of adolescence are the years when gender roles are consolidated. In this period, females and males will tend to adopt more excessive differences in their interests, dominant values and activities (Hill and Lynch 1983; Parsons and Bryan 1978). Gender plays a crucial role in shaping self (especially through interactions with others). The individual operates in a field which is significant for autonomy or free will and for the development of value or self (Amzat and Grandi 2011). Gender socialization teaches each gender what society expects from a particular gender through certain social occasions and interactional point of view. In short, gender is what society makes it, and gender, which is applicable to every situation, is the upper identity of the individual (Wentworth 2011). Culture is a particularly important factor for the socialization of women and men and embodiment of differences between people (Kaifi and Mujtaba 2010; Mujtaba 2010).

The construct of gender socialization involves psychoanalytic (Chodorow 1978), social learning (Mischel 1966) and cognitive theories in gender development (Bern 1981). All these theories argue that gender identity, which develops through socialization in the early period, is a stable characteristic of personal identity in adulthood (Kimmel 2000). Gender functions are traditionally divided into two as feminine and masculine gender roles and they can vary along societies (Yeganeh and May 2011). The socialization theory of Gilligan (1982) propounds that women typically acquire feminine values like showing interest in others, being selfish, and integration with others in a short time. On the contrary, males are socialized through masculine values and identities created with individualization. It is accepted that gender role expectations have a substantial effect on issues like who we will be, how we will behave and how we will regard other people.

Objectives

Gender is a significant variable that determines to which values students will attach priority. This paper aims to identify students' relations with other students and which value affects their daily lives more.

This paper aims to investigate variation and the scale of influence of gender on human values. In this respect, the following question was answered in this paper: Are the human values of male students significantly different from those of female students?

METHODOLOGY

Research Model

In this paper, the researcher used a quantitative method. A quantitative approach also allowed the researcher to include a large number of subjects. These quantitative data enabled the researcher to determine whether significant associations between independent variables (gender) and dependent variables (human values and their dimensions) exist, using statistical techniques such as independent t-test and Cohen's d (Cooligan 1996; Kerlinger 1986).

Study Group

The study group was composed of 256 high school students: 130 females and 126 males. The principle of voluntarism was a precondition for participation in this study. Instructional information was prepared about the implementation of this study. The goal of this research and how the study would be carried out were clearly stated. In addition, it was emphasized that the identities of the participants would remain confidential. Participants in this study were randomly selected among high school students. The research was conducted in the 2013-2014 academic year.

A total of 356 high school students, 130 female and 126 male, studying at high schools in the province of Konya were the participants.

Means of Data Collection

Humanistic Values Scale (SHV)

In the study, the "Humanistic Values Scale", developed by Dilmac (2007), was used to determine the humanistic values of students. Humanistic values in the scale are measured with 42 items in six dimensions: a. Responsibility (7 items) b. Friendship/Companionship (7 items) c. Peacefulness (7 items) d. Respect (7 items) e. Tolerance (7 items) f. Truthfulness (7 items). This is a Likert-type scale which can be applied individually or in groups. The items in the scale are expressed as a five-point Likert-type graded scale (A: Never, B: Rarely, C: Sometimes, D: Frequently, E: Always). Items were scored as follows: A:1- B:2- C:3- D:4- E:5. Higher scores indicate that a certain individual has higher humanistic values and lower scores indicate that the individual has lower humanistic values.

For reliability of the HVS, inner consistency coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) were calculated. The inner consistency of the "Responsibility" sub-scale was calculated to be .73. The inner consistency of the "Friendship/Companionship" sub-scale was calculated to be .69. The inner consistency of the "Peacefulness" sub-scale was calculated to be .65. The inner consistency of the "Truthfulness" sub-scale was calculated to be .69. The inner consistency of the "Tolerance" sub-scale was calculated to be .69, and the inner consistency of the 42-item whole scale was calculated to be .92. The stability factors were .73 for "Responsibility", .91 for "Friendship/Com-panionship", .80 for "Peacefulness", .88 for "Respect", .75 "Truthfulness" and .79 for "Tolerance". The stability factor for the whole scale was found to be .87.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data obtained as a result of the study were analyzed using the independent t-test, which is used to determine the relation between dependent variables (humanistic values) and the independent variable (gender) and Cohen's technique. Regarding the effects of effect size on gender, Cohen's technique has been used to examine the effect size of individual differences such as: the effect size of gender on democratic values (Kesici 2006; 2008a); the effect of gender on metacognitive learning and computer attitudes (Kesici et al. 2009); the effect size of achievement motivation and social comparison (Erdogan et al. 2011; Kesici et al. 2010; Kesici and Erdogan 2010); the effect of gender differences on geometry and mathematics success and geometry self-sufficiency beliefs (Baloglu et al. 2011); the effect of gender on statistics anxiety (Baloglu et al. 2011); social comparison and success motivation (Baloglu et al. 2011); control focuses (Kesici 2008a); and size of sex differences in values: effects of gender equality (Schwartz and Rubel 2005; Schwartz and Rubel-Lifschitz 2009). In this paper, Cohen's Method was employed to determine the statistical effects that the variables of high school students' gender have on their human values.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to the data obtained from Table 1, the values of female students with regard to

Table 1: Humanistic values in terms of gender

Humanistic values	Gender	N	Mean	S.S.	-t-	Cohen's d
Responsibility	Female	130	26.77	4.16	1.92	.28
	Male	126	25.78	4.05		
Friendship	Female	130	29.68	3.92	3.76*	.55
	Male	126	27.57	5.0		
Peacefulness	Female	130	25.94	3.92	4.78*	.70
	Male	126	23.29	4.9		
Respect	Female	130	26.83	3.92	1.54	.22
	Male	126	25.92	4.9		
Truthfulness	Female	130	25.38	3.19	.83	.12
	Male	126	25.03	3.59		
Tolerance	Female	130	23.18	4.08	.39	.05
	Male	126	22.98	4.11		

friendship are significantly higher compared to male students (t = 3.768, p =.00). Furthermore, the scores of female students with regard to peacefulness are significantly higher compared to male students (t = 4.784; p =.00).

Data obtained from Cohen's technique reveal the effect of gender on humanistic values. While this value was moderate for friendship, it was found to be high for peacefulness.

In a study where behavioural differences were analyzed between the genders it was found that men and women react differently in certain situations, for example men reveal more challenging behaviours (Hou 2013). Gender has a significant impact on value judgement. There have been hardly any studies that directly examine the effect of gender on humanistic values (Dirilen-Gumus and Buyuksahin-Sunal 2012; Knafo and Spinath 2011; Longest et al. 2013; Schwartz and Rubel 2005; Schwartz and Rubel-Lifschitz 2009). For example, relationship values are determinants of the spouses' basic points of views and future orientation (Rossi 2014). While women's attitudes towards marriage are negative, men have more positive attitudes to marriage (Huang and Lin 2014). In another study, empathy is associated with femininity (Ivtzan et al. 2012). Even in humour male stereotypes are more common (Eisend et al. 2014), and males prefer aggression and comedy more than females (Yoon and Kim 2014).

According to the findings of the study, while the effect of gender on responsibility, honesty and tolerance as sub-dimensions of humanistic values was small, its effect on friendship was medium and its effect on being peaceful was great. As is seen, the gender variable has small, medium and great effects on humanistic values. The research findings of Longest and colleagues (2013) further support the findings of the paper. It was found in their study that education and gender variables have complex associations when individual values are examined as part of a coherent system rather than in isolation. When Dirilen-Gumus and Buyuksahin-Sunal's (2012) findings surveying how humanistic values differentiate depending on gender were examined in detail, it was found that they have parellelism with the findings of the researchers' study. In Dirilen-Gumus and Buyuksahin-Sunal's (2012) studies, it was found that females had higher scores on universalism, benevolence and security than males; secondly, males had a higher

score on power than females. The results showed that females reported higher levels of hedonism, universalism, benevolence and security than males. As is seen, humanistic variables differentiate considerably depending on gender. Thereby, it is seen in this paper that gender influences humanistic values.

Schwartz and Rubel's (2005) study also supports this study on the effect of the gender variable on humanistic values and its differentiation. According to the findings of that study, men consistently attribute more importance than women to power, stimulation, hedonism, achievement and self-direction values; the reverse is true for benevolence and universalism values and less consistently for security values. The sexes do not differ on tradition and conformity values.

There is also one more study by Schwartz and Rubel-Lifschitz (2009) that supports the effect of gender on humanistic values. In their study, they seek an answer to the question "How does gender equality relate to men and women's value priorities?" and it is hypothesized that, for both sexes, the importance of the values of benevolence, universalism, stimulation, hedonism and self-direction increases with greater gender equality, whereas the importance of the values of power, achievement, security and tradition decreases. Thus, this study shows the effect of gender on humanistic values as well.

Gender plays a major role in deciding which values are important. While females attach greater importance to relationships compared to males, males value physical boldness and authority more than females (Murphy 2000). Rokeach (1973) states that while males attach greater importance to values like success and intellectual endeavour, females value love, sincere relationships and family more than males. In another study by Buyukkaragoz and Kesici (1996), it was found that female and male elementary school teachers differed in their attitudes to tolerance and democracy in favour of female teachers. Females attach more importance to universality compared to males (Lyons et al. 2005). Females are more universal, helpful and agreeable (Torres and Brites 2006). Females show more ethical sensitivity based on the occasion (Bebeau and Brabeck 1989).

In another study of American adolescents, it was found that females are more sensitive in taking on responsibility and expressing concern about the well-being of others, and show less

interest in materialistic issues and competitiveness. They attach more importance to finding purpose and meaning in their lives compared to males (Beutel and Marini 1995). Masculine values are hardiness, procuring money and property. Independence is the ideal and achieving targets of success is appreciated. Moreover, gender roles differ substantially: males are self-confident and females are maternal. Feminine values express life quality and characteristics like caring for others. Interdependency is the ideal and the source of motivation is based on help and care (Lamsa et al. 2000). In a study by Delkamoosh (2007) based on Schwartz's 10 values, it was found that women value such concepts as "modesty" and "spiritual life" more compared to males. According to Prince-Gibson and Schwartz (1998), women are more ready to care for others' needs. Women attach greater value to altruism, universality, safety and self-discipline compared to males.

Briefly, teachers with democratic values should create democratic classrooms and environments in order to help students acquire humanistic values based on the study findings such as: students' self-compassion (Deniz et al. 2008); human values as predictors of motivational beliefs in high school students (Kesici 2014); psychological needs as predictors of human values (Kesici 2015); predictive relations of elementary school counsellors' self-efficacy beliefs by social comparison and self-consciousness (Ozteke et al. 2015); romantic relationship perfectionism (Ozteke et al. 2015); the effect of gender on perfectionism and anger (Girgin-Buyukbayraktar and Ure 2014); the effect of teacher attitudes on student behaviours (Buyukkaragoz and Kesici 1988); teachers' beliefs about justice, equality, and freedom in accordance with gender and control focuses (Kesici 2008a); and which democratic and humanistic values are required for creating a democratic classroom for students (Kesici 2008b).

Teachers can make use of study results carried out with variables such as students' motivational beliefs, self-sufficiencies and psychological needs when helping students acquire humanistic values. The following studies may be relevant: the analysis by primary school teachers of the motivation level of their students and their basic psychological needs (Bozgeyikli et al. 2003); the guidance and counselling needs of sixth, seventh and eighth grade students according to their teachers' opinions (Kesici 2007a); middle

school students' guidance and counselling needs (Kesici 2007b); sixth, seventh and eighth grade students' guidance and counselling needs according to parents' opinions (Kesici 2008c); prediction of high school students' career decision making difficulties by their parental attitudes and guidance need (Kesici 2007c); and prediction of elementary school students' career decision making difficulties by their parental attitudes and guidance needs (Kesici et al. 2008). When the studies on these concepts are examined they were found to be needs. That is why, these basic human needs are required throughout life. This requirement stems from the fact that these needs have a cyclical order. That is, the need is felt first, then the individual takes action and he/she eases at the last stage.

Findings from the following studies may be beneficial for teachers and parents in teaching humanistic values, since the studies have been carried out on teenagers: an investigation of the relations between harmony level and perceived identity, value and needs (Erdogdu 2013); human values as predictors of motivational beliefs in high school students (Kesici 2014); predictive relations of elementary school counsellors' self-efficacy beliefs by social comparison and self-consciousness (Ozteke et al. 2015); the impact of teacher attitudes on student behaviours (Buyukkaragoz and Kesici 1988); teachers' beliefs about justice, equality and freedom depending on gender and control focuses (Kesici 2008a); the required democratic and human values for students to create a democratic classroom environment (Kesici 2008b), and the relations between teachers' democratic attitudes and tolerance value. Of especial interest are the development of gender roles in teenagers (Beutel and Marini 1995; Perry and Pauletti 2011); and the relation of developing roles with values and social interaction (Longest et al. 2013; Rosario et al. 2014); sex-specific relationships between attachment security, social values, and sensation seeking in early adolescence (Sarracino et al. 2011); the role of gender on the value transitions between the family and the child (Roest et al. 2010); gender-neutral values interaction with genetics and environment (Knafo and Spinath 2011); and gender differences seen in geometry and mathematics success in terms of success value (Baloglu et al. 2011).

Briefly, scientists should attach importance to the gender variable when providing humanis-

tic values education and planning their studies. Moreover, they should consider the information about gender roles when helping their students acquire humanistic values by making use of the findings of this study. Both teachers and families should pay attention to the importance of the gender variable especially when teaching teenagers humanistic values.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions indicate that the effect of gender on responsibility, honesty and tolerance as sub-dimensions of humanistic values was small, its effect on friendship was medium and its effect on being peaceful was great. These results show that the gender variable that is related to individual differences has small, medium, and high levels of effect size on humanistic values.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper examined the effect size of gender on human values. Both teachers and families should be aware of the fact that gender is a crucial variable if they are to provide their children with education related to humanistic values. Carrying out studies on high school students is not sufficient to raise the awareness of families and teachers. One of the most important limitations of this paper is that the study group comprised only high school students, and the examined data were obtained from the students. It is recommended that such studies are carried out with different variables and are based on family and teacher opinions as well. Furthermore, the study was carried out with six humanistic values; the number of these values may be increased with occupational values, universal and democratic values.

NOTE

[i] This paper was presented as oral presentation and published in abstract book in I. National Values Education Conferance in Konya- Turkey between 31th October-2th November 2013.S.Barbaros Yalcin has contributed the paper to development.

REFERENCES

Amzat J, Grandi G 2011. Gender context of personalism in bioethics. *Developing World Bioethics,* 11(3): 136-145.
Baloglu M, Deniz ME, Kesici S 2011. A descriptive study of individual and cross-cultural differences in statistics anxiety. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21(4): 387-391.
Baloglu M, Erdogan A, Kesici S 2011. Geometri ve matematik basarisi ile geometri öz-yeterlik inançlarindan cinsiyet farkliliklari. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 43: 91-106.
Bebeau MJ, Braseck M 1989. Ethical senstivity and moral reasoning among men and women in the professions. In: MM Brabeck (Eds.*): In Who Cares? Theory, Research, and Educational Implications of the Ethic of Care.* New York: Praeger, pp. 144-163.
Bern S 1981. Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex-typing. *Psychological Review,* 88: 354-364.
Beutel AM, Marini MM 1995. Gender and values. *American Sociological Review: ProQuest Central,* 60(3): 436-447.
Bjorklund BR, Bee HL 2008. *The Journey of Adulthood.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Beutel AM, Marini MM 1995. Gender and values. *American Sociological Review*, 436-448.
Bozgeyikli H, Sunbul AM, Kesici S, Ure O 2003. Ilkogretim Ogretmenlerinin, Ogrencileri Motive Etme Duzeyleri ile Temel Psikolojik Ihtiyaclarinin Iliskisel Analizi. *VII Ulusal PDR Kongresi Bildiri Özetleri Kitabi,* Malatya, 09-11 Temmuz.
Bruess CE, Greenber JS 2004. Sexuality education-changes or status quo? *American Journal of Health Education,* 35(6): 338-341.
Broverman IK, Vogel SR, Broverman DM, Clarkson FE, Rosenkrantz PS 1972. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues,* 28(2): 59-78.
Butler R 2014. Motivation in educational contexts: Does gender matter? *Ruth Butler. Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 47: 1-41.
Buyukkaragoz SS, Kesici S 1988. Egitimde ogretmenin rolu ve ogretmen tutumlarinin ogrenci davranislari uzerindeki etkisi. *Millî Egitim*, 137: 11.
Buyukkaragoz SS, Kesici S 1996. Ogretmenlerin hosgoru ve demokratik tutumlari. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Yonetimi Dergisi*, 2(3): 353-365.
Carr D, Landon J 1999. Teachers and schools as agencies of values education: Reflections on teachers' perceptions part two: the hidden curriculum. *Journal of Beliefs and Values,* 20(1): 21-29.
Chodorow N 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender.* Berkeley: University of Califomia Press.
Claxton RP, McIntyre RP, Clow KE, Zemanek JE Jr 1997. Cognitive style as a potential antecedent to value. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 11(2): 355-373.
Cooligan H 1996. *Introduction to Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology.* 2nd Edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
Davidov E, Schmidt P, Schwartz SH 2008. Bringing values back in: The adequacy of the European social survey to measure values in 20 countries. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72(3): 420-445.
Delkhamoush M 2007. *Basic Human Values: A General Review. In Approaches to Psychology: Essays in Honor of Professor Parirokh Dadsetan.* Tehran: SAMT Publications.

Deniz M, Kesici S, Sumer AS 2008. The validity and reliability of the Turkish version of the Self-Compassion Scale. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 36(9): 1151-1160.

Dilmac B 2007. *Bir Grup Fen Lisesi Ogrencisine Verilen Insani Degerler Egitiminin Insani Degerler Olcegi Ile Sinanmasi.* Yayinlanmamis Doktora Tezi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu. Selcuk Universitesi: Konya.

Dirilen-Gumus O, Buyuksahin-Sunal A 2012. Gender differences in Turkish undergraduate students' values. *Sex Roles*, 67(9-10): 559-570.

Duncan HE 2013. Exploring gender differences in US school principals' professional development needs at different career stages. *Professional Development in Education*, 39(3): 293–311.

Eisend M, Plagemann J, Sollwedel J 2014. Gender roles and humor in advertising: The occurrence of stereotyping in humorous and nonhumorous advertising and its consequences for advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, 43(3): 256–273.

Erdogan A, Kesici S, Sahin I 2011. Prediction of high school students' mathematics anxiety by their achievement motivation and social comparison. *Ilkogretim Online* 10(2): 646-652.

Erdogdu MY 2013. Investigating the prospective teachers' level of adjustment in terms of perceived identity, values, and needs. *Online Submission*, 3(5): 283-295.

Erkek O, Isiksal-Bostan M 2015. The role of spatial anxiety, geometry self-efficacy and gender in predicting geometry achievement. *Elementary Education Online*, 14(1): 164 180.

Ferssizidis P, Adams LM, Kashdan TB, Plummer C, Mishra A, Ciarrochi J 2010. Motivation for and commitment to social values: The roles of age and gender. *Motiv Emot,* 34: 354–362.

Fleming CM 2005. *Adolescence its Social Psychology: With an Ýntroduction to Recent Findings from the Fields of Anthropology, Physiology, Medicine, Psychometrics and Sociometry.* 12 Volumes. Published in the Taylor and Francis e-Library.

Fontaine J, Schwartz SH 1996. Universality and Bias in the Structure of Psychological Questionnaire Data. *Paper presented at the XIII Congress of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 12-16 August, Montreal, Canada.

Gilligan C 1982. *In a Different Voice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Girgin-Buyukbayraktar C, Ure O 2014. The relationship between perfectionism and anger. *Anthropologist*, 18(3): 835-846.

Halstead JM, Taylor MJ 2000. Learning and teaching about values: A review of recent research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30: 169-202.

Hansson T, Carey G, Kjartansson R 2010. A multiple software approach to understanding values. *Journal of Beliefs and Values,* 31(3): 283-298.

Harter S 1990. Developmental differences in the nature of self-representations: Implications for the understanding, assessment and treatment of maladaptive behavior. *Cogn Ther Res,* 14: 113-142.

Hill JP, Lynch ME 1983. The intensification of gender-related role expectations during early adolescence. In: J Brooks-Gunn, AC Bstersen (Eds.): *Girls at Puberty.* New York: Plenum, pp. 201-228.

Hou HT 2013. Analyzing the behavioral differences between students of different genders, prior knowledge and learning performance with an educational MMORPG: A longitudinal case study in an elementary school. *British Journal of Educational Technology,* 44(3):85-89.

Huang YC, Lin SH 2014. Attitudes of Taiwanese college students toward marriage: A comparative study of different family types and gender. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies,* XLV(3) :425-438.

Ivtzan I, Redman E, Gardner HE 2012. Gender role and empathy within different orientations of counselling psychology. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 25 (4): 377-388.

Kaifi BA, Mujtaba BG 2010. Transformational leadership of Afghans and Americans: A study of culture, age and gender. *Journal of Service Science and Management,* 3(1): 151-158.

Keats DM 1982. The development of values: A cross-cultural approach. In: P Sukontrasarp, N Yonsiri, P Intasuwan, N Jotiban, C Suvannathat (Eds.): *Proceedings of the Second Asian Workshop on Child and Adolescent Development.* Bangkok: Sri Nakharinwirot University, pp. 203-215.

Kerlinger FN 1986. *Foundations of Behavioral Research.* New York: CBS College Publishing.

Kesici S 2006. Demokratik olmayan ogretmen inanc olceginin Turkce formunun gecerlik ve guvenirlik calismasi. *Egitim Arastirmalari Dergisi*, 6(24): 143-152.

Kesici S 2007a. Sube rehber ögretmenlerinin goruslerine gore 6. 7. ve 8. sinif ogrencilerinin rehberlik ve danisma ihtiyaclari. *Selcuk Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi,* 17: 365-383.

Kesici S 2007b. Middle school students' guidance and counseling needs. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice,* 7(3): 1301-1349.

Kesici S 2007c. Ortaogretim ogrencilerinin anne baba tutumlarinin ve rehberlik ihtiyaclarinin mesleki karar verme zorluklarini yordamasi. *Selcuk Universitesi Enstitusu Dergisi*, 18: 329-339.

Kesici S 2008a. Democratic teacher beliefs according to the teacher's gender and locus of control. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35(1): 62.

Kesici S 2008b. Teachers' opinions about building a democratic classroom. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35(2): 192.

Kesici S 2008c. Sixth, seventh and eight grade students' guidance and counseling needs according to parents' views. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 32: 101-116.

Kesici S 2014. Human values as predictors of motivational beliefs in high school students. *Anthropologist*, 18(3): 869-875.

Kesici S 2015. Psychological needs as predictors of human values in high school students. *Anthropologist,* 19(2): 499-506.

Kesici S, Erdogan A 2010. Mathematics anxiety according to middle school students' achievement motivation and social comparison. *Education,* 131(1): 54.

Kesici S, Erdogan A, Sahin I 2010. Prediction of 8th grade students' mathematics self-efficacy by their achievement motivation and social comparison. *Selcuk Universitesi Ahmet Kelesoglu Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi,* 30: 143-156.

Kesici S, Hamarta E, Arslan C 2008. Prediction of elementary school student's career decision making difficulties by their parental attitudes and guidance needs. *Elementary Education Online,* 7(2): 361-367.

Kesici S, Sahin I, Akturk AO 2009. Analysis of cognitive learning strategies and computer attitudes, according to college students' gender and locus of control. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25(2): 529-534.

Kimmel MS 2000. *The Gendered Society.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kitwood T 1980. *Disclosures to a Stranger: Adolescent Values in an Advanced Industrial Society*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Knafo A, Spinath FM 2011. Genetic and environmental influences on girls' and boys' gender-typed and gender-neutral values. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(3): 726.

Lamsa AM, Sakkinen A, Turjanmaa P 2000. Values and their change during the business education-A gender perspective. *ProQuest Central, International Journal of Value-Based Management,* 13(3): 203-213.

Lerner RM, Foch TT (Eds.) 1987. *Biological-Psychosocial Interaction in Early Adolescence: A Life-Span Perspective.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lerner RM, Shea J 1982. Social behavior in adolescence. In: Benjamin Wolman (Ed.): *Handbook of Developmental Psychology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp.503-525.

Longest KC, Hitlin S, Vaisey S 2013. Position and disposition: The contextual development of human values. *Social Forces*, 91(4): 1499-1528.

Lyons S, Duxbury L, Higgins C 2005. Are gender differences in basic human values a generational phenomenon? *Sex Roles,* 53(9-10): 763-778.

Ma ZW, Zeng WN, Ye KY 2015. Gender differences in Chinese adolescents' subjective well-being: the mediating role of self-efficacy. *Psychological Reports: Sociocultural Issues in Psychology*, 116(1): 311-321.

Mannheim K 1952. *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge.* London: Routeledge and Kegan Paul.

McAdams DP, Pals J 2006. A new big five: Fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality. *American Psychologist,* 61: 204-217.

McKinney JP, Hotch DF, Truhon SA 1977. The organization of behavioral values during late adolescence: Change and stability across two eras. *Developmental Psychology,* 13: 83-89.

Meglino BM, Ravlin EC 1998. Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies and research. *J Management,* 24: 351-389.

Mischel W 1966. A social leaming view of sex differences in behavior. In: EE Maccoby (Ed.): *The Development of Sex Differences.* Stanford, CA: Standford Universtiy Press, pp. 56-81.

Mujtaba BG 2010. *Workplace Diversity Management: Challenges, Competencies and Strategies.* 2nd Edition. I Davie, Florida, United States: LEAD Academy Publications.

Murphy SA 2000. *A Study of Career Values by Generation and Gender.* PhD Thesis, Philosophy in Human and Organizational Systems, Faculty of the Fielding Institute. Ann Arbor USA.

Naagarazan RS 2006. *A Textbook on Professional Ethics and Human Values.* New Delhi: New Age International Limited, Publisher.

Nucci L, Weber EK 1991. The domain approach to values education: from theory to practice. In: WM Kurtines, JL Gewirtz (Eds.): *Handbook of Moral Behavior and Development.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 251-266

Ozteke HI, Girgin-Buyukbayraktar C, Kesici S 2015. The adaptation of romantic relationship perfectionism scale into Turkish culture. *Anthropologist,* 19(2): 387-395.

Ozkete HI, Ure O, Kesici S 2015. The prediction of elementary school counselors' self-efficacy beliefs by social comparison and self-consciousness. *The Online Journal of Counseling and Education*, 4(1): 34-45.

Parsons JS, Bryan J 1978. *Adolescence: Gateway to Androgyny.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, pp. 8.

Perelman C, Olbrechts-Tyteca L 1969. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation* (J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver, Trans.). Notre Dame, Ind: University of Notre Dame Press.

Prince-Gibson E, Schwartz SH 1998. Value priorities and gender. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 61: 49-67.

Perry DG, Pauletti RE 2011. Gender and adolescent development. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(1): 61-74.

Pourrajab M, Rabbani M, Kasmaienezhadfard S 2014. Different effects of stress on male and female students. *The Online Journal of Counseling and Education,* 3(3): 31-39.

Roe RA, Ester P 1999. Values and work: Empirical findings and theoretical perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 48: 1-21.

Roest AM, Dubas JS, Gerris JR 2010. Value transmissions between parents and children: Gender and developmental phase as transmission belts. *Journal of Adolescence*, 33(1): 21-31.

Rokeach M 1973. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Rokeach M 1979. From individual to institutional values: With special reference to the values of science. In: M Rokeach (Ed.): *Understanding Human Values: Individual and Societal.* New York: Free Press, pp. 47-70.

Rosario GRM, Carmen DFM, Biagio S 2014. Values and corporate social initiative: An approach through Schwartz Theory. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 15(1): 19-48.

Rossi G 2014. The complex relationship between values and couple patterns. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies,* XLV(1): 173-199.

Sarracino D, Presaghi F, Degni S, Innamorati M 2011. Sex-specific relationships among attachment security, social values, and sensation seeking in early adolescence: Implications for adolescents' externalizing problem behaviour. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34(3): 541-554.

Schwartz SH 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*. Volume 25. Orlando, FL: Academic Press, pp. 1-65.

Schwartz SH, Bilsky W 1987. Toward a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 53: 550-562.

Schwartz SH, Rubel T 2005. Sex differences in value priorities: cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 89(6): 1010.

Schwartz SH, Rubel-Lifschitz T 2009. Cross-national variation in the size of sex differences in values: effects of gender equality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 97(1): 171.

Schwartz SH, Sagiv L 1995. Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 26: 92-116.

Silcock P, Duncan D 2001. Values acquisition and values education. *Some British Journal of Educational Studies,* 49(3): 242-259.

Steinberg LD 1981. Transformation in family relations at puberty. *Developmental Psychology,* 1: 833-840.

Steinberg L 2002. Clinical adolescent psychology: What it is, and what it needs to be. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 70: 124-128.

Torres A, Brites R 2006. European attitudes and values: The perspective of gender in a transverse analysis. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science,* 5(3): 179-214.

Uygun S 2014. The gender-related role of teaching profession in Turkey. *International Journal of Progressive Education,* 10(1): 46-58.

Uzzell D, Nathalie H 2006. The influence of biological sex, sexuality and gender role on interpersonal distance. *British Journal of Social Psychology,* 45(3): 579-597.

Vernon PE, Allport GW 1931. A test for personal values. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 26(3): 231-248.

Wade C, Tavris C 1990. *Psychology.* New York: Harper and Row Publishing.

Wasserman SA 1971. Values of Mexican-American, Negro, and Anglo blue-collar and white-collar children. *Child Development,* 42(5): 1624-1628.

Wentworth WW 2011. *Gender Now Historical Origins, Eight Core Myths, Facts of Change.* Cambridge, MA: Sci-Arts Publishing.

Williams RM 1979. Change and stability in values and value systems: A sociological perspective. In: M Rokeach (Ed.): *Understanding Human Values: Individual and Societal.* New York: Free Press, pp. 15-46.

Wolman BB 1998. *Adolescence Biological and Psychosocial Perspectives.* London: Greenwood Press.

Yeganeh H, May D 2011. Cultural values and gender gap: A cross-national analysis. *Gender in Management: An International Journal,* 26(2): 106-121.

Yoon HJ, Kim Y 2014. The moderating role of gender identity in responses to comedic violence advertising. *Journal of Advertising,* 43(4): 382-396.