



Examining the Relationship between Caring for Family Unity and Levels of Tolerance Tendencies of Primary School Students *

Halil İbrahim Sağlam ¹, Tuğba Tunar ²

Abstract

This research was conducted to investigate the relationship between family unity and tolerance tendencies of primary school fourth graders. In addition, whether the level of students' attention to family unity and tolerance tendency differed according to some demographic variables was also examined. To this end, to gather raw data for the study, two scales were used: an 18-item Tolerance Tendency Scale with three sub-dimensions (value, acceptance, and empathy) and a 22-item caring For Family Unity with four sub-dimensions (love, respect, communication, and loyalty), as well as to collect demographic data by a Personal Information Form. The relational screening model was used in this study. The participants (N = 1101) were conveniently selected from a primary school (fourth grades) in Sakarya. Of the participants, 531 (49%) were girls, while 565 (51%) were boys. Pearson correlation coefficient was used for the relationship between variables, while parametric T test was used for the analysis of demographic data such as gender, parental cohabitation, family type variables. As to non-parametric tests, Kruskal Wallis H test was also used to explore whether perceptions of the students change according to family income level. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine which groups were significantly different in the results of Kruskal-Wallis H test. The analyses showed a significant positive relationship between the level of students' attention to family unity and tolerance tendencies. Regarding gender in communication and loyalty dimension, students' level of caring for family unity changed for the favor of female students. In terms of whether student's parents live together, it differed for the favor of students whose parents are living together. It also differed for the favor of those living in nuclear families in love dimension in terms of family type and it differed significantly for the favor of upper-income level in terms of family income level as perceived by students. The level of tolerance tendency of students was found to be significantly different in favor of girls according to gender, in favor of parents living together according to their parents' cohabitation status, in favor of those living in nuclear families with values and acceptance dimensions according to family type.

Keywords

Value
Family
Family unity
Ignoring family unity
Tolerance
Tolerance tendency

Article Info

Received: 07.28.2017
Accepted: 05.10.2018
Online Published: 07.10.2018

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2018.7432

* This article is derived from Tuğba Tunar's master's thesis entitled "The relationship between family units and tolerance tendencies of 4th grade elementary school students", conducted under the supervision of Halil İbrahim Sağlam.

¹ İstanbul Medeniyet University, Faculty of Education Sciences, Department of Elementary Education, Turkey, halil.saglam@medeniyet.edu.tr

² Ministry of National Education, Akyazi Sehit Ahmet Çondul Primary School, Turkey, tugbabesen_@hotmail.com

Introduction

It is argued that the developments in the field of science and technology have affected social life and directed people to adapt to change (Parlar, Çavuş, Levent, & Ekşi, 2010). It is thought that rapid change causes some disturbances in the society, causing depression of value. This may have been influential in the re-importance of the values that lead the behavior, show the truth, and hold society together. Güngör (1998, p. 27) defines "value as a belief that something is desirable or not", and Erdem (2003, p. 56) defines it "as a tendency to prefer a particular situation to another". Kızılcelik and Erjem (1996, p. 128) argue that "a value for a social group or society is considered to be right and necessary by the majority of its members in order to provide and maintain its own existence, unity, functioning, and continuation; it is also described as moral principles or beliefs that reflect their common feelings, thoughts, goals and interests. It can be argued that as a social entity you need certain measures, such as value, that will direct human behavior". Because, as Yıldırım (2013, p. 1) stated, "Individuals generally adopt the values of the group they live in, society and culture values, and use them as a criterion in judgment and in their choices." Adopting, protecting and living values are necessary for a society to continue its existence in a healthy way. Values can be thought of as the cement of community. There is no doubt that values such as love, respect, responsibility, honesty, tolerance, and solidarity add value to the society as well as the individual. It may be considered that the most appropriate institution is the family that provides the internalization, retention, and transfer of these values to future generations. Therefore, giving importance to family unity can be regarded as a concrete indication of the survival of the values and the transfer to the children who grow up in the family.

Values can also be regarded as a sign of what people are doing in their lives, what they care about, and how much they place in their lives. People value people and objects in their surroundings in the sense they express themselves. Importance is also closely linked to value appraisal. Family is one of the most important elements that people value (Prime Ministry General Directorate of Family and Social Research [BASAGM], 2010). The family is said to be the primary institution responsible for the child's care and education in the first years of life (Oktay, 2000). "In life, many behaviors, good or bad movements are acquired in the family. People peripherally adopt many habits in the family" (Ulusoy & Dilmaç, 2015, p. 85). Individual begins to acquire values in family, a social institution in the early stages of development (Bal, 2004; Baloğlu & Balgamiş, 2005; Sağlam, 2017). Through the family, the child first gets to know the good and the bad, the right and the wrong and knows the world outside. "The conscience of the child begins to be shaped with the rules of parents and other family elders. Therefore, the family protects its place as the most effective resource in recognizing the good, the true, the beautiful, the sacred and learning and internalizing in a common life process" (Hökelekli, 2013, p. 289). The family environment that the individual grows shapes their behavior, as well as impacting their future behavior and playing an important role in the individual's personality development. "The first years of life are a critical period in terms of cognitive and social development. In this critical period, the family institution has an important influence on the child's life. Confidence of families, their knowledge about child development and education and their skills have an important influence on their children's healthy development" (Tezel Şahin, & Özbey, 2007, p. 11). One of the most important functions of the family is to protect and maintain the culture of society. "The family carries on the structure, culture, and values of the society it is in" (Özensel, 2004, p. 77).

Family can add value to society and society can add value to the family. The fact that the family is the core of the community makes mutual interaction inevitable. For this reason, the values that exist in the family are reflected on the society and the values that exist in society are reflected on the family. From this point of view, it can be maintained that making the society worthwhile is the way to make the family valuable. It can also be argued that when considering the family unity in the tolerance atmosphere, it may have positive reflections on the society. If the family environment is far from tolerance, it cannot be expected to continue its existence for a long time. It does not mean that everything in the family will be ignored. "In other words, it is being respectful to people and the idea that others can have different emotions, thinking, behavior, attitude and action" (Köknel, 1995, p. 72). Tolerance does not mean ignoring intentional mistakes. It is the ability to show patience to mistakes that people

do not know and do not become habitual. Families should have tolerance boundaries, and family members should be careful not to cross borders. If anyone in the family can do whatever they want, this leads to irresponsibility. Yet being a family means taking on new responsibilities at the same time. Attention to family unity requires tolerance within certain boundaries. Tolerance as an indispensable value for the family unity is to support each other's development, not to search for the mistakes of the family members in mutual respect. Tolerant individuals respect people, do not otherize, give value to an individual, family, and society. In the world, the existence of people who did not internalize tolerance value, who tend to otherize others who are not like them, who apply violence, and who do not respect people can be considered. Tolerance is an important value that must be gained from the early ages. The family has an important role in acquiring this value, and the family unit needs tolerant environments. There are some studies on family unity in the literature (BASAGM, 2010; Fitzpatrick, 1988; Sağlam, 2014; Sağlam & Özdemir, 2017). BASAGM (2010) that examined family values in Turkey; Fitzpatrick (1988) explored communication in marriage; Sağlam (2014) examined students' level of giving importance to family unity; Sağlam and Özdemir (2017) discussed the role of values in protecting family unity. There are also studies on tolerance (Aslan, 2017; Boyacı & Ersever, 2017; Çalışkan & Sağlam, 2012; Ersoy, 2016; Kalın & Nalçacı, 2017; Tahiroğlu, 2014; Türe & Ersoy, 2015; Yeşilkayalı & Yıldız Demirtaş, 2013). Aslan (2017) studied students' tolerance tendencies and helpfulness; Boyacı and Ersever (2017) studied fifth grade students' tolerance tendencies; Çalışkan and Sağlam (2012) indicated the level of tolerance of primary school students; Ersoy (2016) studied students' perception of tolerance; Kalın and Nalçacı (2017) studied fifth grade students' tolerance tendencies; Tahiroğlu (2014) emphasized tolerant and democratic classroom practice; Türe and Ersoy (2015) found that teachers of social studies looked at tolerance education and their practices in tolerance education; Yeşilkayalı and Yıldız Demirtaş (2013) discussed the relationship between parents' attitudes towards children's rights and the tendency towards tolerance of primary school students. There is no doubt that the protection of the family unity is crucial for tolerance and that it is necessary for the family unity to be respected in ensuring tolerance. It is considered that family unity is important for the development of these values to the students from early ages. When the results of these studies are examined, it can be suggested that the studies were not interested in examining the relationship between the level of caring family unity and tolerance tendency levels. It has come to the conclusion that the continuation of the family union, which is a value and which has many values within it, may be closely related to the atmosphere of tolerance. It is thought that such a study is needed from this point of view and that this study differs in purpose and content from the mentioned studies. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between primary school students' levels of caring for family unity and tolerance. Also; it was aimed to determine whether the level of the family unity and tolerance tendency of the fourth-grade students of primary school differ in terms of their genders, whether their parents are living together, family type and the level of family income perceived by the students.

Method

The relational screening model was used in this study. This model is one of research models aiming to describe a past or current situation as it exists (Karasar, 2009).

Population and Sample

The population of this study consists of primary school fourth grade students studying in the Adapazarı province of Sakarya. The research sample, which was chosen by a convenience sampling method from this population, includes 1101 primary school fourth grade students. Convenience sampling is defined as sampling of individuals that are immediate vicinity, easy to access, and want to participate in the study voluntarily (Ekiz, 2009). The schools were grouped as lower, middle and upper socioeconomic level according to their proximity to the center and the study group was randomly determined from these three groups.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants

Variable	Type	f	%
Gender	Girl	536	49
	Male	565	51
Marital Status of Parents	Together	1014	92
	Separate	87	8
Family Type	Large	271	25
	Nuclear	830	75
Income Rate	Low	26	2
	Middle	754	69
	Upper	321	29

Table 1 shows the distribution of students participating the survey in terms of their gender, whether their parents are together or not, types of families and income levels. When Table 1 was examined, it was found that 49% of the students who participated in the survey were girls and 51% of the students were boys; 92% of the parents lived together, 8% of the parents lived separately; 25% lived in large families, 75% lived in nuclear families. What is more, according to the perceptions of the students, it was seen that 2% of them were in the lower, 69% of them were in the middle, and 29% were in the upper family income levels.

Data Collection Tools

Data for the survey were collected using Personal Information Form (PIF) Scale of Caring for Family Unity (SCFU) and Tolerance Tendency Scale (TTS).

Personal Information Form (PIF)

The survey included questions such as the gender of students participating the survey, whether their parents were living together or not, types of families, and income level in term of students' perception. The family type is defined as elementary family, if there are only mothers, fathers and children. It is defined as an extended family type, if there are grandparents, grandmothers, and uncles.

Tolerance Tendency Scale (TTS)

Tolerance Tendency Scale is an 18-item likert-type scale developed by Çalışkan and Sağlam (2012) so as to measure primary school students' tolerance tendencies. It is a three-dimensional measuring instrument that accounts for 47.97% of the total variance as a result of the exploratory factor analysis. In the overall scale, internal consistency coefficient was found as .89, "value" sub-dimension as .86, "acceptance" sub-dimension as .70, "empathy" sub-dimension as .63. The two halves correlation coefficient was found as .85; test-retest reliability was .84;.83 for the first dimension;.73 for the second dimension; and .82 for the third dimension, respectively. In the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for the construct validity of the scale, the fit index of the hand model was examined, and it was found that the Chi-square value ($\chi^2 = 549.39$, $N = 889$, $df = 128$, $p = .00$) was found significant. The fit index values were found as RMSEA= .061, NFI= .98, CFI= .98, IFI= .98, RFI= .97, GFI= .94, AGFI= .91, and SRMR= .04. When the common factor variances of the 18 items of the Tolerance Tendency Scale were examined, it was found that the values were between .35 and .61. The scale including 18 items gave the respondent the opportunity to give a quintile ("1" was never appropriate, "2" was not appropriate, "3" was somewhat appropriate, "4" was appropriate, "5" was completely appropriate). In addition, all the items in the measure were scored positively. The minimum score that could be taken from the scale was 18 and the maximum score was 90. The higher the score, the higher the tendency towards tolerance. Substance analysis showed that the item-total score corrections adjusted for the scale ranged from .43 to .63. In addition, *t* test results between 27% of upper and lower group scores revealed a significant difference for all items and subscales. All findings from the study showed that the scale could be used as a valid and reliable instrument in studies designed to determine students' tolerance tendencies.

The Scale of Caring for Family Unity (SCFU)

The Scale of Caring for Family Unity developed by Sağlam (2014) is a 22 item Likert-type scale which can measure primary school students' level of caring for Family Unity. Explanatory factor analysis is a four-dimensional measuring instrument that accounts for 54.64% of the total variance. In the overall scale, internal consistency coefficient was found as .90; "respect" sub-dimension as .86; "love" sub-dimension .81; "communication" sub-dimension as .70; and "loyalty" sub-dimension as .68. The two half-test correlation coefficients of the scale were .83, and the test-retest reliability coefficient was .85. In the confirmatory factor analysis (DFA) for the construct validity of the scale, the fit index of the hand model was examined, and it was found that the Chi-square value ($\chi^2 = 650.28$, $N = 528$, $df = 200$, $p = .000$) was significant. RMSEA was found to be .065. The compliance index values were found as .065 for RMSEA, CFI= .90, IFI= .90, GFI= .90, $\chi^2/df=3.25$, SRMR= .05, and all t values were found to be significant. These compliance index values showed that the model fit well. When the common factor variances of 22 items belonging to the Family Unity Scale were examined, it was seen that values were between .34 and .71. The scale gave the respondent the opportunity to give a quintile ("1" was never appropriate, "2" was not appropriate, "3" was somewhat appropriate, "4" was appropriate, "5" was completely appropriate). In addition, all the items in the measure were scored positively. The minimum score that could be taken from the scale was 22 and the maximum score was 110. The high score indicates a high tendency to give importance to Family Unity. In addition, *t* test results between 27% of upper and lower group scores revealed a significant difference for all items and subscales. All findings from the study showed that the scale could be used as a valid and reliable instrument in studies designed to determine the tendency of students to care for Family Unity.

Data Analysis

With permission from the provincial directorate of national education, data collection tools were brought to total 15 primary schools in Sakarya province, 12 of which were state schools and 3 were private schools. After consulting with the school management, the data collection tools were delivered to the class teachers after making explanations. After they were conducted, scales were submitted to the school administration by class teachers. Then the researchers took data collection tools from school management. 1200 of the distributed questionnaires returned, of which 99 were excluded from the assessment because it was noticed that they were left blank or not filled in properly. As a result, total number of questionnaires for the raw data was 1101. Prior to the analysis of the data, the data collection tools were individually checked and sorted, the data obtained through the data collection tools were defined and entered into the SPSS 20 program. The data were analyzed in accordance with the sub problems of the study. In order to determine the relationship between the students' caring for Family Unity tolerance tendency levels, firstly correlation analysis was done to reveal the relation level and the direction of the relationship between the variables. According to results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, gender, whether parents live together or not, variables of types families were conducted *t* test from parametric tests as statistical technique; income level variables according to students' perception were conducted Kruskal Wallis H test which is a nonparametric test. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine which groups had significant differences in the Kruskal-Wallis H test results. Arithmetic mean ranges (1.00-1.79 as never appropriate, 1.80-2.59 not appropriate, 2.60-3.39 slightly appropriate, 3.40-4.19 appropriate, 4.20-5.00 completely appropriate) were determined by using the range width of the scale, "array width/ number of groups to be made" (Tekin, 1996).

Results

In this section, the findings obtained in the research were handled in the light of sub problems of the research.

Findings Regarding the Relation Between Family Unity and Tolerance Tendency Levels

Table 2. Correlation Analysis Results Regarding Students' Between Family Unity and Tolerance Tendency Levels

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Family Unity	1								
Respect	.88**	1							
Love	.86**	.57**	1						
Communication	.78**	.67**	.51**	1					
Loyalty	.67**	.55**	.48**	.64**	1				
Tolerance	.60**	.58**	.46**	.50**	.44**	1			
Value	.57**	.55**	.43**	.48**	.41**	.88**	1		
Acceptance	.83**	.56**	.97**	.48**	.41**	.45**	.42**	1	**
Empathy	.45**	.43**	.33**	.38**	.34**	.87**	.60**	.35**	1
\bar{x}	102.49	37.29	31.71	19.02	14.48	81.52	41.97	22.50	17.43
SD	9.60	3.94	4.58	1.79	1.19	7.83	3.39	3.44	2.86

** $p < .01$

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that there is a positive relationship between caring for Family Unity and tolerance tendency levels. It was found that there was a positive relation between students' caring for Family Unity and tolerance tendency level ($r = .60$) and "value" ($r = .57$) which was a sub dimension of tolerance tendency scale "acceptance" ($r = .83$) and "empathy" ($r = .45$) levels. In addition, correlation analysis was found to be positively correlated with levels of tolerance tendency scale ($r = .58$), value ($r = .55$), acceptance ($r = .56$) and empathy ($r = .43$). Love level which is one of the sub dimensions of Family Unity Scale was found to be positively related with tendency ($r = .46$), value ($r = .43$), acceptance ($r = .97$) and empathy ($r = .33$). Communication level which is one of the sub dimensions of caring for Parent'-Teacher's Association was found to be positively correlated with communication level and tolerance tendency ($r = .50$), value ($r = .48$), acceptance ($r = .48$) and empathy ($r = .38$) levels. Loyalty level which is one of the sub dimensions of caring for Parent'-Teacher's Association scale was found to be positively correlated with the level of tolerance ($r = .44$), value ($r = .41$), acceptance ($r = .41$) and empathy ($r = .34$). In table 2 in "Caring for Family Unity Scale", students had the scores in respect dimension 37.29, 31.71 in love dimension, 19.02 in communication dimension, 14.48 in loyalty dimension and 102.49 in total scale. Besides in "Tolerance Tendency Scale" they had the scores of 41.97 in value dimension, 22.50 in acceptance dimension, 17.43 in empathy dimension and 81.52 in overall scale. These scores of students were close to the maximum points that could be taken. According to these results, it can be said that the level of the students' *tendency to both caring for Family Unity and tolerance tendency levels* are sufficient.

Findings Related to Students' Gender

Table 3. T-Test Results Regarding Caring for Family Unity in Terms of Gender

Dimensions	Gender	N	\bar{x}	SD	DF	t	p
Respect	Girl	536	4.69	.468	1099	1.893	.059
	Boy	565	4.63	.513			
Love	Girl	536	4.53	.694	1099	.161	.872
	Boy	565	4.52	.615			

Table 3. Continued

Dimensions	Gender	N	\bar{x}	SD	DF	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Communication	Girl	536	4.78	.393	1099	2.337	.020*
	Boy	565	4.72	.494			
Loyalty	Girl	536	4.86	.355	1099	3.006	.003**
	Boy	565	4.79	.430			
Total	Girl	536	4.68	.422	1099	1.662	.097
	Boy	565	4.63	.449			

p*< .05, *p*< .01

When Table 3 was examined, it was seen that the levels of the students' caring for Family Unity in terms of their genders did not differ in respect ($t_{(1099)}=1.893, p>.05$), *love* ($t_{(1099)}=.161, p>.05$) dimensions and overall scale. However it differed significantly for the favor of girls in the dimensions of communication ($t_{(1099)}=2.337, p<.05$) and *loyalty* ($t_{(1099)}=3.006, p<.01$). This shows that girls are more concerned about Family Unity in terms of communication and loyalty dimensions.

Table 4. T-Test Results Regarding Tolerance Tendency Levels in Terms of Gender

Dimensions	Gender	N	\bar{x}	SD	DF	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Value	Girl	536	4.70	.357	1099	3.554	.000**
	Boy	565	4.62	.392			
Acceptance	Girl	536	4.49	.744	1099	-.229	.819
	Boy	565	4.50	.634			
Empathy	Girl	536	4.46	.639	1099	4.898	.000**
	Boy	565	4.25	.767			
Total	Girl	536	4.59	.407	1099	4.844	.000**
	Boy	565	4.46	.451			

***p*< .01

When Table 4 was examined, it was seen that the levels of the students' Tolerance Tendency levels in terms of their genders differed in value ($t_{(1099)}=3.554, p<.01$), *empathy* ($t_{(1099)}=4.898, p<.01$) and overall scale for the favor of female students ($t_{(1099)}=4.898, p<.01$). However, it did not differ significantly in acceptance dimension ($t_{(1099)}=.819, p>.05$). This result shows that girls are more tolerant.

Findings Regarding Students' Parental Cohabitation

Table 5. T-Test Results Regarding Student's Caring For Family Unity In Terms of Whether Students' Parents Live Together

Dimensions	F-M together	N	\bar{x}	SD	DF	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Respect	Together	1014	4.66	.491	1099	1.108	.268
	Separate	87	4.60	.509			
Love	Together	1014	4.58	.543	1099	10.317	.000**
	Separate	87	3.86	1.23			
Communication	Together	1014	4.75	.448	1099	.145	.885
	Separate	87	4.74	.459			
Loyalty	Together	1014	4.82	.401	1099	.638	.523
	Separate	87	4.80	.342			
Total	Together	1014	4.67	.419	1099	5.330	.000**
	Separate	87	4.42	.551			

***p*< .01

When Table 5 was examined, it was seen that the levels of the students' caring for Family Unity in terms of their whether their parents were living together or not differed in love ($t_{(1099)}=10.317, p<.01$) dimension and overall scale ($t_{(1099)}=5.330, p<.01$). However, it did not differ in respect ($t_{(1099)}=1.108, p>.05$), communication ($t_{(1099)}=1.45, p<.05$) and loyalty ($t_{(1099)}=6.38, p<.05$) dimensions. This shows that students whose parents live together give more importance to Family Unity than students whose parents are divorced do.

Table 6. T -Test Results Regarding Tolerance Tendency Levels in Terms of Marital Status of Parents

Dimensions	F-M together	N	\bar{x}	SD	DF	t	p
Value	Together	1014	4.67	.372	1099	2.387	.017*
	Separate	87	4.57	.427			
Acceptance	Together	1014	4.56	.574	1099	10.422	.000**
	Separate	87	3.79	1.28			
Empathy	Together	1014	4.36	.717	1099	1.307	.192
	Separate	87	4.26	.690			
Total	Together	1014	4.53	.432	1099	2.357	.019*
	Separate	87	4.42	.449			

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$

When Table 6 was examined, it was seen that the students' tolerance tendency levels in terms of their whether their parents were living together or not differed in value ($t_{(1099)}=2.387, p<.05$), acceptance($t_{(1099)}=10.422, p<.01$) and overall scale ($t_{(1099)}=2.357, p<.05$) for the favor of students whose parents live together. However, it did not differ significantly in empathy dimension ($t_{(1099)}=1.307, p>.05$). This shows that the students whose parents are not divorced and living together have more tolerance tendency.

Findings Related to Family Types of Students

Table 7. T-Test Results of Students' Caring for Family Unity in Terms of Their Family Types

Dimensions	Family Type	N	\bar{x}	SD	DF	t	p
Respect	Large	271	4.66	.468	1099	.032	.975
	Nuclear	830	4.66	.500			
Love	Large	271	4.42	.769	1099	-3.134	.002**
	Nuclear	830	4.56	.609			
Communication	Large	271	4.74	.483	1099	-.403	.687
	Nuclear	830	4.75	.437			
Loyalty	Large	271	4.82	.407	1099	.032	.975
	Nuclear	830	4.82	.393			
Total	Large	271	4.62	.456	1099	-1.549	.122
	Nuclear	830	4.67	.429			

* $p<.01$

When Table 7 was examined, it was seen that the students' caring for Family Unity in terms of their family types did not differ significantly in respect ($t_{(1099)}=.032, p>.05$), communication ($t_{(1099)}=-.403, p>.05$), loyalty($t_{(1099)}=.032, p>.05$) levels. However, it differed significantly in love dimension ($t_{(1099)}=-3.134, p<.01$) for the favor of students living with in the nuclear family. This result shows that the students who live in the nuclear families are more concerned about Family Unity.

Table 8. T-Test Results of Students' Tolerance Tendency Levels in Terms of Family Types

Dimensions	Family Type	N	\bar{x}	SD	DF	t	p
Value	Large	271	4.62	.419	1099	-1.986	.047*
	Nuclear	830	4.67	.362			
Acceptance	Large	271	4.39	.806	1099	-2.908	.004**
	Nuclear	830	4.53	.644			
Empathy	Large	271	4.29	.728	1099	-1.655	.098
	Nuclear	830	4.38	.710			
Total	Large	271	4.48	.464	1099	-1.823	.069
	Nuclear	830	4.54	.424			

*p< .05, **p< .01

When Table 8 was examined, it was seen that the students' tolerance tendency types in terms of their family types differed significantly in value ($t_{(1099)} = -1.986$; $p < .05$), acceptance ($t_{(1099)} = -2.908$; $p < .01$) dimensions for the favor of those living in nuclear families. However, it did not differ significantly in empathy ($t_{(1099)} = -1.655$; $p > .05$) dimension and overall scale ($t_{(1099)} = -1.823$; $p > .05$). This result shows that the tolerance tendencies in the value and acceptance dimensions of the students living in the nuclear family are higher than those living in the large family.

Findings of Family Income Levels As Perceived by Students

Table 9. Kruskal Wallis H Test Results Regarding the Family Unity by the Level of Family Income Perceived by the Students

Dimensions	Income Level	N	R. Average	DF	χ^2	p	Difference
Respect	Low	26	315.06	2	32.320	.000**	1-2
	Middle	754	531.78				1-3
	Upper	321	615.27				2-3
Love	Low	26	398.27	2	28.169	.000**	1-2
	Middle	754	525.59				1-3
	Upper	321	623.05				2-3
Communication	Low	26	375.40	2	14.116	.001**	1-2
	Middle	754	544.87				1-3
	Upper	321	579.62				2-3
Loyalty	Low	26	416.60	2	12.522	.002**	1-2
	Middle	754	543.55				1-3
	Upper	321	579.39				2-3
Total	Low	26	357.69	2	27.589	.000**	1-2
	Middle	754	529.24				1-3
	Upper	321	617.77				2-3

**p< .01

In Table 9, when the level of importance of family unity according to the level of family income perceived by the students who participated in the survey was examined, respect ($\chi^2 = 32.320$, $p < .01$), love ($\chi^2 = 28.169$; $p < .01$), communication ($\chi^2 = 14.116$; $p < .01$), loyalty ($\chi^2 = 12.522$, $p < .01$), and overall scale ($\chi^2 = 27.589$, $p < .01$) differed for the favor of lower family income level. When the lower income level and the middle-income level were compared in each of the four dimensions and the scale, it is seen that the middle-income level differed significantly. When the middle-income level and the upper-

income level were compared, upper-income level differed significantly. When lower income level and upper-income level were compared, upper-income level differed significantly. As the level of family income of the students increases, it is seen that the level of the importance of the Family Unity increases, therefore, the level of the importance of family unity and the level of the family income are positively related.

Table 10. Kruskal Wallis H Test Results Regarding Tolerance Tendency Levels In Terms of Family Income Levels As Perceived by Students

Dimensions	Income Level	N	R. Average	DF	χ^2	<i>p</i>	Difference
Value	Low	26	308.44	2	27.712	.000**	1-2
	Middle	754	535.52				1-3
	Upper	321	607.01				2-3
Acceptance	Low	26	391.19	2	21.753	.000**	1-2
	Middle	754	531.15				1-3
	Upper	321	610.58				2-3
Empathy	Low	26	265.98	2	32.975	.000**	1-2
	Middle	754	537.58				1-3
	Upper	321	605.60				2-3
Total	Low	26	276.94	2	31.912	.000**	1-2
	Middle	754	535.71				1-3
	Upper	321	609.12				2-3

***p* < .01

When the levels of tolerance according to the level of family income perceived by the students who participated in the survey were examined in Table 10, values ($\chi^2 = 27.712, p < .01$), acceptance ($\chi^2 = 21.753, p < .01$), empathy ($\chi^2 = 32.975, p < .01$) and the sum of the scale ($\chi^2 = 31.912; p < .01$) differed. When the lower income level and the middle-income level were compared in each of the three dimensions and the scale, it was seen that the middle-income level differed significantly. When the middle-income level and the upper-income level were compared, the upper-income differed significantly. When lower income level and the upper-income level were compared, it differed for the favor of upper-income level. As the income level of the students increases, the level of tolerance tendency increases, and there appears to be a positive relationship between tolerance tendencies and income levels.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study reported in the present article revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between the level of family unity and the levels of tolerance tendency and the students had scores close to the maximum of both scales. This shows that students' caring for family unity and tolerance tendency levels are at the desirable level. This result is similar to the result of Gömleksiz and Cüro's (2011) study that primary school students pay more attention to family unity which is one of the cultural values. In Tay and Yıldırım's (2009) study, conducted on the parents of primary school 4th and 5th graders, asked students' parents to rank the values in Social Sciences Program, and they placed caring for family unity among the highest ranks. In the study conducted by Kolaç and Karadağ (2012), caring for family unity was identified as one of the national values regarded as important by prospective teachers. Deveci, Belet, and Türe (2013) stated that the stories of Dede Korkut include values as family unity and tolerance to be able to organize human relations and to influence individuals' decisions in a positive way. When these values are taken into account in primary education programs, it shows how important these values from past to present. Palancı (2018) found that according to the kind of families' handicap,

belonging to them resistance and personal resources will have influence in which conditions and levels. In the research conducted by Sağlam (2014), it was found that elementary school students regard family unity as important. Research results that are similar to giving importance to family unity have also appeared in the tendency of tolerance. An example of this is the research conducted by Baysal and Samancı (2010), which found out that fifth graders correctly define the value of tolerance and that students have sufficient level of tolerance. Boyacı and Ersever (2017) argued that there is intolerance on the basis of bullying made on the differences and powerless individuals. In this context, they may reach the conclusion that the tendency of tolerance has a positive effect on the reduction of the bullying. Erdem Zengin (2014) found that drama activities increased the students' tolerance tendency; similar results emerged in applied research aimed at improving the tendency towards tolerance (Campbell, 2011; Cetron, 2011; Lister, 2013; Pascale, 2011). Moreover, research conducted by Çalışkan and Sağlam (2012) also concluded that students' tolerance tendency level was sufficient. The positive relationship between levels of caring for family unity and tolerance tendencies support Meydan's (2014) argument that family is the most important institution children's education of values and ethics. These results show that caring for family unity has a positive reflection on tolerance tendency; and the higher the tolerance education is, the more importance is given to family unity. This means that family is very important for the community as the smallest building block of society that continues its existence in an environment of tolerance.

The opinions of the students participating in the survey on the importance of family unity according to their gender did not differ significantly in respect dimension and the overall scale. However, communication and loyalty dimensions differed for the favor of female students. This result has shown that female students regard family unity as more important in communication and loyalty dimensions. Family communication is one of the basic conditions of being a healthy family. Zorbaz and Owen (2013) argue that family members' open and direct communication with each other affects the communication pattern on the ground and lays the groundwork for the formation of the warm family atmosphere. Altıntaş (2006) found that the average level of communication skills of female students was higher than the average scores of male students in their research on high school adolescents. In the study conducted by Eser (2012), it was determined that the level of human values of female students was higher than male students. Yüksel (2009) concluded that the level of family functioning of girls is healthier than boys. The results obtained are similar to the findings of Sağlam (2014). In the study, it was found that the level of giving importance to family unity by gender of students was favored by girls in terms of communication, loyalty dimensions and overall scale. The level of the students' tendency to tolerance according to gender differed significantly in favor of female students in empathy dimension and overall scale. However, it did not differ significantly in acceptance dimension. This result shows that girls are more tolerant. Research conducted by Çalışkan and Sağlam (2012), Öztaşkın and İçen (2015), Yüksel, Bağcı, and Vatansever (2013) also found that female students had higher levels of tolerance than male students. Akbaş (2004) reached similar conclusion that female students have higher democratic values and basic values more than male students. It is thought that differences in the ways in which boys and girls are raised may have affected these outcomes. Özyürek and Tezel Şahin (2008) found that mother's attitudes towards their children were more democratic than their father; in Oruç, Tecim, and Özyürek (2011), it was concluded that most mothers of female students and most fathers of male students were modeled by students as a result.

According to the co-existence of the parents of the students participating in the research, the levels of importance of family unity were found to be in favor of the students with whom the parents were together in love dimension and overall scale. The healthiest environment for the child's personal, social and effective development is a happy family environment where both parents are together. This result is consistent with other studies (Akyüz, 1978; Çivitci, Çivitci, & Fiyakalı, 2009; Feyzioğlu &

Kuşçuoğlu, 2011; Karakuş, 2003; Öngider, 2013; Öztürk, 2006; Türkarlan, 2007). Hatun (2012) in his research on primary school second level students found that students whose parents divorced perceive family functions as unhealthy in terms of communication and emotional responsiveness. The level of tolerance tendency according to the coexistence of the parents of the pupils differed significantly in favor of the cohabiting parents in the value, acceptance dimension and scale sum, but it has not been significantly differed in empathy dimension. This shows that the children whose parents are not divorced and live together have higher levels of tolerance tendency. Şentürk (2006) argues that the existence of a relationship based on love and respect between parents have positive results and negative situations which can destroy this relationship such as the divorce, death, and living separately deeply harms the child's emotions. Likewise, Avcı (2006) points out that in the families in which the divorce is concerned, children are injured by the tensions of the divorce; Erdim and Ergün (2016) argue that divorce causes children to feel guilty, which in turn causes negative personality traits such as aggression and anger. Studies conducted by Türkarlan (2007), Fiyakalı (2008), Aral and Başar (1998), and Pırtık (2013) reveal that divorce negatively affects children's personality development and causes anger and aggression in children. Anger, aggression and bullying are unwanted problems that can be seen in schools. These problems can be decreased by systematic practices, but the resulting effect becomes permanent depends on the continuity of the work done, on school-family co-operation, on the institutional culture and educational policies (Hymel & Swearer, 2015; Türktan, 2013). Boyacı and Ersever (2017) found that the Tolerance Tendency Improvement Program reduced the bullying; however, the effect of this reduction cannot maintain its permanence. They emphasize that the ability to continue this activity should be supported by stakeholders, such as school and family, who have an important place in the development of the child.

In terms of the family types of the students participating the study, it was found that it did not differ significantly in respect, communication, loyalty dimensions and overall scale. However, it differed in love dimension for the favor of students living in a nuclear family. The reason for this can be that children can have closer relationship with their parents in nuclear families. The Prime Minister's Family Research Institute (BAAK, 1998) reported that the number of people living with family members increased significantly as the number of people living in the family increased, leading to relatively more frequent violence by children under 14 and over 65 years old living in the family. Vahip and Doğanayşargil (2002) concluded that sharing the same house with mother-in-law was associated with physical violence in marriage. This research confirms that children living in nuclear families are more advantageous in terms of love. Students' level of tolerance according to family type significantly differed in value and acceptance dimension in favor of students living in nuclear families; Empathy dimension and overall scale have not reached a meaningful difference. In the large families, the oldest family member in the family is the leader and carries the responsibility of managing the family. The most important thing is family and persons are secondary. The behaviors of the person are under the control of the group (Gökçe, 1976). This statement shows that the democratic attitudes and behaviors are not sufficiently exhibited in the large family, that the schemes are the frontrunners. In the nuclear families, it can be said that decisions are made more jointly (Çimen, 2012) and a democratic and egalitarian family structure is a prerequisite for children's acquisition of tolerance values. "In some large families, exaggerated love for the grandsons of family grandfathers sometimes exceeds tolerance limits, and may leave the father in a difficult situation" Strengthening Vocational Education and Training System (MEGEP, 2007). In this case, it can be argued that students who live in the nuclear family tend to have higher tolerance tendencies. However, when the results of the research are examined, it is seen that the total tolerance scores of the students do not differ according to the family types. This result overlaps with the study conducted by Tatar (2009).

According to the level of family income perceived by the students, the levels of importance of family unity differed in all dimensions and in the overall scale against the lower income level. In other words, as the income levels of the families increased, the level of importance of the family unity increased. The social class in which person and his family are placed and the social environment they possess can be a decisive factor for the quality of life of the individual. Research conducted by Eskicumalı and Eroğlu (2001), Tomul (2007), Çiftçi and Çağlar (2014), and Önür (2013) found that middle and upper social class families were more interested in their children and put more emphasis on their children's education. If families have social possibilities, they can spend qualified time with their children. This also may contribute to the child's affective development and helps to develop an effective system of values. Şama (2003) found that students who were in the middle and near income group developed a more positive attitude towards environmental problems when compared to children from low-income levels. Erkenekli (2009) found that social values differed significantly in terms of socioeconomic levels. In the survey, the averages of highest and lowest social values except for conservatism value in terms of socioeconomic levels differed for the favor of those whose socioeconomic levels are higher. Hatunoğlu, Halmatov, and Hatunoğlu (2012) found that children with higher socioeconomic levels had higher moral and social knowledge levels than children with lower socioeconomic levels. All these results coincide with the results of the research. On the other hand, in the study conducted by BASAGM (2010), there was no significant difference in the importance of family unity according to socioeconomic status of the families, and the rate of giving importance to family unity at all socioeconomic levels was found around 97%. The result of the research in question may be related to the fact that the study group is 18 years of age or older.

Tolerance levels based on family income levels perceived by students differed in value, acceptance, and empathy dimensions and overall scale for the detriment of lower income levels. As the family income levels of the students increased, the level of tolerance tendency increased, and there was a positive relationship between the tolerance tendencies and the family income levels. Economic problems can cause some unrest within the family and damage the tolerance atmosphere in the home. Avcı (2010) in his study of the family groups of students under the economic level of low and medium reached the conclusion that students in these levels are more exposed to violence. The socioeconomic level, the way of life, the habits, the beliefs and the values of the people are significantly influential. Acun, Yücel, Önder, and Tarman (2013) found that high-socioeconomic-level families regarded tolerance as more important than socioeconomic-level in middle and low-income families. In the researchers conducted by Tatar (2009) and Akbaş (2004), there was no significant difference between the scores of the students' tolerance according to their socioeconomic levels. This may be due to the level of the research groups and age differences.

In conclusion, this research shows that there is a significant and positive relationship between students' level of caring for family and tolerance tendencies. It also shows that the level of the students' caring for family unity and tolerance is high. Students' level of caring for family unity in terms of gender in communication and loyalty dimension differed for the favor of female students. In terms of whether student's parents live together, it differed for the favor of students whose parents are living together. It also differed for the favor of those living in nuclear families in love dimension in terms of family type and it differed significantly for the favor of upper-income level in terms of family income level as perceived by students. Students' level of tolerance tendency in terms of gender differed for the favor of female students. In terms of whether student's parents live together, it differed for the favor of students whose parents are living together. It also differed for the favor of those living in nuclear families in value and acceptance dimension in terms of family type and it differed significantly for the favor of upper-income level in terms of family income level as perceived by students.

Suggestions

1. At the end of the research, given that there is a relationship between the students' caring for family unity and their levels of tolerance tendency, training programs that foster empathy, tolerance and acceptance in students in order to protect family unity (it is important for the continuity of society) can be developed and its efficiency can be tested.
2. Teacher oriented in-service training activities can also be organized for showing teachers' role modality to students in order to create an awareness about caring for family unity and tolerance tendency.
3. As the level of importance of family unity and the level of tolerance tendency are higher among the students whose parents together, it is possible for the married couples to benefit from family counseling in order to protect the family unity and solve the problems. Support and counseling units for families can be established in the provincial organizations of the Ministry of Family and Social Policy to solve family problems.
4. Families can become aware of the fact that children can share more with their families and spend more time (cooking together, preparing a meal together, reading books together, playing together).

References

- Acun, İ., Yücel, C., Önder, A., & Tarman, B. (2013). Değerler: kim ne kadar değer veriyor?. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(1), 191-206.
- Akbaş, O. (2004). *Türk Milli Eğitim sisteminin duyuşsal amaçlarının ilköğretim II. kademedeki gerçekteleşme derecesinin değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Akyüz, E. (1978). Boşanmanın çocuk üzerindeki etkileri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(1), 1-6.
- Altıntaş, G. (2006). *Liseli ergenlerin kişiler arası iletişim becerileri ile akılcı olmayan inançları arasındaki ilişkinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Aral, N., & Başar, F. (1998). Çocukların kaygı düzeylerinin yaş, cinsiyet, sosyo ekonomik düzey ve ailenin parçalanma durumuna göre incelenmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 22(110), 7-11.
- Aslan, S. (2017). İlkokul 4. sınıf öğrencilerinin hoşgörü eğilimleri ile yardımseverlik tutumlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(1), 163-175. doi:10.17679/inuefd.306509
- Avcı, A. (2010). Aile yapısı ve atmosferinin okul şiddetine etkisi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 8(19), 7-52.
- Avcı, M. (2006). Ergenlikte toplumsal uyum sorunları. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7(1), 39-64.
- Bal, U. G. (2004). Çocuklar ve değerler eğitimi. *Çocuk Çocuk Dergisi*, 45, 18-20.
- Baloğlu, M., & Balgamiş, E. (2005). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim yöneticilerinin öz-değerlerinin betimlenmesi: Tokat ili örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 3(10), 19-31.
- Baysal, Z. N., & Samancı, O. (2010). İlköğretim beşinci sınıf öğrencileri ile değerler üzerine bir çalışma. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(34), 56-69.
- Boyacı, M., & Ersever, O. G. (2017). Hoşgörü eğilimi geliştirme programının 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin hoşgörü ve zorbalık düzeylerine etkisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 42(189), 167-182. doi:10.15390/EB.2017.6802
- Campbell, A. (2011). *A creative arts-based approach to using children's rights as a vehicle for tolerance education at the senior elementary school level* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Lakehead University, Faculty of Education, Ottawa.
- Cetron, K. (2011). *Beyond tolerance: fostering cross-cultural understanding* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.
- Çalışkan, H., & Sağlam, H. İ. (2012). Hoşgörü eğilim ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi ve ilköğretim öğrencilerinin hoşgörü eğilimlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(2), 1431-1446.
- Çiftçi, C., & Çağlar, A. (2014). Ailelerin sosyo-ekonomik özelliklerinin öğrenci başarısı üzerindeki etkisi: Fakirlik kader midir?. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 11(2), 155-175. doi:10.14687/ijhs.v11i2.2914
- Çimen, L. K. (2012). Bir faktör olarak eğitimin kadının aile içi kararlara katılımı üzerine etkisi. *International Journal of New Trends in Arts, Sports & Science Education*, 1(2), 78-90.
- Çivitci, N., Çivitci, A., & Fiyakalı, C. N. (2009). Anne-babası boşanmış ve boşanmamış olan ergenlerde yalnızlık ve yaşam doyumu. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(2), 493-525.
- Deveci, H., Belet, D., & Türe, H. (2013). Dede korkut hikâyelerinde yer alan değerler. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(46), 294-321.
- Ekiz, D. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Anı Publishing.

- Erdem Zengin, E. (2014). *Yöntem olarak yaratıcı drama kullanımının ilkokul 4. sınıf sosyal bilgiler öğretim programındaki değerlere etkisi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Niğde Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Niğde.
- Erdem, A. R. (2003). Üniversite kültüründe önemli bir unsur: Değerler. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(4), 55-72.
- Erdim, L., & Ergün, A. (2016). Boşanmanın ebeveyn ve çocuk üzerindeki etkileri. *Sağlık Bilimleri ve Meslekleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 78-84. doi: 10.17681/hsp.13621
- Erkenekli, M. (2009). *Türkiye’de sosyoekonomik statü (SES) gruplarına göre temel değerlerin farklılaşması* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Ersoy, A. F. (2016). Dördüncü sınıf öğrencilerinin hoşgörü algısı ve deneyimleri: Bir fenomenolojik araştırma. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(1), 454-473. doi: 10.17860/efd.31740
- Eser, A. (2012). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinin insani değer düzeyleri ile çevresel tutumları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master’s thesis). Yeditepe University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.
- Eskicumalı, A., & Eroğlu, E. (2001). Ailenin sosyo-ekonomik ve eğitim düzeyleri ile çocukların problem çözme yetenekleri arasındaki ilişki. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1, 165-189.
- Feyzioğlu, S., & Kuşçuoğlu, C. (2011). Tek ebeveynli aileler. *Aile ve Toplum Dergisi*, 12(7), 97-109.
- Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1988). *Between husbands and wives communication in marriage*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fiyakalı, N. C. (2008). *Anne-babası boşanmış ve boşanmamış lise öğrencilerinin sürekli öfke düzeyleri ve öfke ifade tarzlarının bazı değişkenler açısından karşılaştırılması* (Unpublished master’s thesis). Pamukkale University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Denizli.
- Gökçe, B. (1976). Aile ve aile tipleri üzerine bir inceleme. *Hacettepe Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, 8, 1-12.
- Gömleksiz, M. N., & Cüro, E. (2011). Sosyal bilgiler dersi öğretim programında yer alan değerlere ilişkin öğrenci tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8(1), 95-134.
- Güngör, E. (1998). *Değerler psikolojisi üzerine araştırmalar* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Ötüken Publishing.
- Hatun, O. (2012). *Anne babası boşanmış ilköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerinin algıladıkları aile işlevlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: İstanbul ili Fatih ilçesi örneği* (Unpublished master’s thesis). Yeditepe University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.
- Hatunoğlu, A., Halmatov, M., & Hatunoğlu, B. Y. (2012). Ailelerin sosyo ekonomik düzeylerine göre okul öncesi dönemdeki çocukların ahlaki ve sosyal kural bilgilerinin incelenmesi. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 32, 1-15.
- Hökelekli, H. (2013). *Ailede, okulda, toplumda değerler psikolojisi ve eğitimi* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Timaş Publishing.
- Hymel, S., & Swearer, S. M. (2015). Four decades of research on school bullying: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 70(4), 293.
- Kalın, Z. T., & Nalçacı, A. (2017). Ortaokul 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin hoşgörü eğilimlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(23), 293-304.
- Karakuş, S. (2003). *Anne babası boşanmış ve boşanmamış çocukların depresyon düzeylerinin incelenmesi ve okul başarısına yansımaları* (Unpublished master’s thesis). Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İzmir.
- Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kızılcılık, S., & Erjem, Y. (1996). *Açıklamalı sosyoloji terimler sözlüğü*. Ankara: Atilla Kitabevi.
- Kolaç, E., & Karadağ, R. (2012). Türkçe öğretmeni adaylarının değer kavramına yükledikleri anlamlar ve değer sıralamaları. *İlköğretim Online*, 11(3), 762-777.

- Köknel, Ö. (1995). Hoşgörünün ruhsal-toplumsal temelleri. In B. Onur (Ed.), *Hoşgörü ve eğitim* (pp. 63-78). Ankara: Türk Eğitim Derneği Yayınları.
- Lister, A. G. (2013). *Lessons of tolerance and equality: reasons for teaching adventures of huckleberry finn* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Illinois University Faculty of English and Journalism, Illinois.
- Meydan, H. (2014). Okulda değerler eğitiminin yeri ve değerler eğitimi yaklaşımları üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(1), 93-108.
- Oktay, A. (2000). *Yaşamın sihirli yılları: Okulöncesi dönem* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Epsilon Publishing.
- Oruç, C., Tecim, E., & Özyürek, H. (2011). Okul öncesi dönem çocuğunun kişilik gelişiminde rol modellik ve çizgi filmler. *Ekev Akademi Dergisi*, 15(48), 281-297.
- Öngider, N. (2013). Boşanmanın çocuk üzerindeki etkileri. *Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar*, 5(2), 140-161. doi:10.5455/cap.20130510
- Önür, H. (2013). Gelir düzeyinin eğitim imkânlarından yararlanma düzeyine etkisi: Süleyman Demirel fen lisesi ve Atatürk lisesi örneği. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(18), 259-277.
- Özensel, E. (2004). Türk toplumunda çocuğun yetiştirilmesinde annenin rolü: Konya ili örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 2(6), 77-96.
- Öztaşkın, Ö. B., & İçen, M. (2015). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin hoşgörü eğilimleri ile demokrasi algıları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1(1), 39-56.
- Öztürk, S. (2006). *Anne-babası boşanmış 9-13 yaşlarındaki çocuklar ile aynı yaş grubundaki anne-babası boşanmamış çocukların benlik kavramı ve kaygı düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Educational Sciences, İzmir.
- Özyürek, A., & Tezel Şahin, F. (2008). 5-6 yaş grubunda çocuğu olan ebeveynlerin tutumlarının incelenmesi. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(2), 19-34.
- Palancı, M. (2018). Engelli çocuğa sahip anne babaların aile yılmazlığı, öznel iyi oluş ve evlilik uyumlarının psiko-sosyal yeterlikler ile yordanması. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 43(193), 217-236.
- Parlar, H., Çavuş, M., Levent, F., & Ekşi, H. (2010). Yöneticilerin karakter eğitimi yeterlik inancı ölçeğinin Türkçe geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 8(19), 177-205.
- Pascale, L. M. (2011). Sharing songs: A powerful tool for teaching tolerance and honoring culture. *General Music Today*, 25(1), 4-7.
- Pırtık, Ş. (2013). *Boşanmış ve tam aileden gelen okul öncesi çocukların sosyal beceri ve akran tepkilerinin karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Selçuk University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Konya.
- Prime Minister's Family Research Institute. (1998). *Aile içinde ve toplumsal alanda şiddet*. Ankara: Başbakanlık Aile Araştırmaları Kurumu Başkanlığı Yayınları.
- Prime Ministry General Directorate of Family and Social Research. (2010). *Türkiye'de aile değerleri araştırması*. Ankara: Başbakanlık Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları.
- Sağlam, H. İ. (2014). Aile birliğini önemseme ölçeğinin (ABÖÖ) geliştirilmesi ve öğrencilerin aile birliğini önemseme düzeylerinin incelenmesi. In *Çağın Sorunları Karşısında Eğitim Sempozyumu, Bayburt* (pp. 363-388). Bayburt: Bayburt University Publishing.
- Sağlam, H. İ. (2017). *Bir değer ve eğitim merkezi olarak aile*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Publishing.
- Sağlam, H. İ., & Özdemir, D. (2017). Öğretmenlerin görüşleri ışığında aile birliğini korumada değerlerin rolüne fenemolojik bir bakış. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, 7(1), 78-90. doi:10.19126/suje.303231
- Strengthening Vocational Education and Training System. (2007). *Çocuk gelişimi ve eğitimi, aile ve çocuk*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.

- Şama, E. (2003). Öğretmen adaylarının çevre sorunlarına yönelik tutumları. *Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(2), 99-110.
- Şentürk, Ü. (2006). *Parçalanmış aile çocuk ilişkisinin sebep olduğu sosyal problemler* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). İnönü University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Malatya.
- Tahiroğlu, M. (2014). Hoşgörülü ve demokratik bir sınıf toplumu uygulaması. *Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(17), 87-110.
- Tatar, F. A. (2009). *Okul öncesi eğitimde (5-6 yaş) hoşgörü eğitimi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Tay, B., & Yıldırım, K. (2009). Sosyal bilgiler dersinde kazandırılması amaçlanan değerlere ilişkin veli görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 9(3), 1499-1542.
- Tekin, H. (1996). *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme* (9th ed.). Ankara: Yargı Publishing.
- Tezel Şahin, F., & Özbey, S. (2007). Aile eğitim programlarına niçin gereksinim duyulmuştur? Aile eğitim programları neden önemlidir?. *Aile ve Toplum*, 3(12), 7-12.
- Tomul, E. (2007). Türkiye'de eğitime katılım üzerinde gelirin etkisi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(22), 122-131.
- Türe, H., & Ersoy, A. F. (2015). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin hoşgörü eğitimine bakışı ve hoşgörü eğitimine ilişkin uygulamaları. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 5(1), 57-87.
- Türkarlan, N. (2007). Boşanmanın çocuklar üzerine olumsuz etkileri ve bunlarla başetme yolları. *Aile ve Toplum Dergisi*, 3(11), 99-108.
- Türktan, Ş. (2013). *Zorbalıkla baş etmeye yönelik akran destek programının ortaokul 6. ve 7. sınıf öğrencilerinin zorbalıkla baş etme becerilerine etkileri* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir.
- Ulusoy, K., & Dilmaç, B. (2015). *Değerler eğitimi* (3rd ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Vahip, I., & Doğanavşargil, Ö. (2006). Aile içi fiziksel şiddet ve kadın hastalarımız. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 17(2), 107-114.
- Yeşilkayalı, E., & Yıldız Demirtaş, V. (2013). Ebeveynlerin çocuk haklarına ilişkin tutumları ile ilköğretim öğrencilerinin hoşgörü eğilimleri arasındaki ilişki. *Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 36, 12-25.
- Yıldırım, E. (2013). *Dış göçler sebebiyle parçalanmış aile çocuklarının değer algularının incelenmesi*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Aksaray University, Institute of Social Sciences, Aksaray.
- Yüksel, A. (2009). İlköğretim 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin empatik becerileriyle aile işlevleri ve benlik kavramları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(25), 153-165.
- Yüksel, İ., Bağcı, Ş., & Vatansver, E. (2013). İlköğretim son sınıf öğrencilerinin demokratik değerlere sahip olma düzeylerinin belirlenmesi. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(22), 311-334.
- Zorbaz, D. S., & Owen, K. F. (2013). Çocuklar için aile ilişkileri ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 4(39), 58-67.