



EVALUATION OF TEACHER CANDIDATES' LEVEL OF ALTRUISM ACCORDING TO SOME VARIABLES

*Mustafa Can Koç

Istanbul Gelisim University Vocational School

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 22nd May, 2017
Received in revised form
17th June, 2017
Accepted 23rd July, 2017
Published online 30th August, 2017

Key Words:

Teacher Candidates,
Altruism,
University.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the altruism levels of the students of the School of Physical Education and Sports. For this purpose, Dumlupınar University and Erciyes University were the target population of the study and volunteer participants (n = 401) were randomly selected from the students of the School of Physical Education and Sports. The data collection tools are the personal information form (age, gender, university, income level, education status of mother and father, and place of residence), and altruism scale developed by London and Bower (1968) was applied to determine the altruism level of participants. Adapted to Turkish by Akbaba (2001). The obtained data was recorded in the IBM SPSS packet program. Parametric and non-parametric distributions of the statistical data are examined. Parametric and nonparametric curves, skewness-kurtosis values show a parametric distribution of the data. Mann Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis test were applied for statistics. As a result, a significant relationship was found between altruism and gender, university and living place. It is thought that the altruistic level of teacher candidates is influenced by the social environment they born and raised, peer relations at school or out of school, happiness in the family and intercultural interactions during their education.

*Corresponding author

Copyright ©2017, Mustafa Can Koç. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Mustafa Can Koç 2017. "Evaluation of Teacher Candidates' Level of Altruism According to Some Variables", *International Journal of Development Research*, 7, (08), 14558-14562.

INTRODUCTION

It is an accepted fact by everyone that teachers are the most important values to shed on future generations. Individuals who will perform this sacred profession will benefit themselves with their excesses when they go into their professional lives by developing themselves in every way during their education. The altruistic training with the all other training provided during their education to the students who are studying at the Physical Education and Sports Higher Schools will facilitate the information transfer and social interaction with the individual in their later life. The aim of our work in this context is to evaluate the altruism levels of the students in the School of Physical Education and Sports. The word altruism is derived from "alteri huic" which means "for someone else" in Latin (Gormley 1996). The Turkish Language Institution's Ecclesiastical Dictionary of Teaching Terms define altruism as "It is a moral attitude and view that considers self-sacrifice as a principle for the well-being of others without regard to the one's self-interests, and that the

real obligation of each person is based on the idea that they are devoting themselves to someone else using the foundation of A. Comte and H. Spencer Moral vision as a base"(TDK 2008). Altruism expressed in the Ottoman Empire as 'diğer-kâm' involves the concept of positive social behavior in which a person acts by considering the well-being of someone else, possesses the qualities of being useful to others, makes efforts for others, and puts himself in jeopardy for someone else. The diğer-kâm is described as "the one thinking about others" and the diğer-bin is described as "the one sacrificing for the well-being of others, living for others". The word "diğer-kâm" which we use as the counterpart of "altruiste" in French and "altruism" in English means to think and take care of others. In the Turkish Dictionary edited by the Turkish Language Association in 1982, the word "özgecil" was used for the same concept (TDK 1982, Source: Tevrüz 1989). Batson said that the feelings pushing the individual to help are related to the internal process, and therefore it is difficult to determine whether the act of help is truly altruistic.

Although it does not deny that the individual may have individual benefits that may lead them to help, he suggests that his intention to help is a basic criterion for altruism, and suggests that helpful behavior, which emerges only when his intentions are to help, may be regarded as altruistic behavior, even if the individual is in anticipation of a reward (Batson 1991). Yavuzer and his colleagues investigated what behaviors were addressed under the heading "altruistic behavior" and it was seen that altruistic behavior was generally evaluated as donation, helpfulness in emergency situations, helpfulness in everyday situations, volunteerism, equity and social responsibility and sacrifice (Yavuzer et al., 2006). It is stated in the literature that the presence of other people in the environment can affect the emergence of altruistic behavior. The tendency to help a person who needs help is emphasized when there is only one person in the environment while the tendency to help diminishes if there are too many people. On the other hand, having someone isn't helpful for the person who is in need of help or in the call for help also affects altruistic behavior. In such a case, the person to help can look at the other person and think that he does not need to help him either (Bilgin 1988, Freedman et al. 1993, Öz 1998, Cüceloğlu 2006). From here, altruistic behavior can also be defined as assisting someone else without rewarding expectation other than the happiness of knowingly and willingly doing something good.

METHODS

Dumlupınar University and Erciyes University were the target population of this research, and volunteer participants ($n = 401$) were randomly selected from the students of the School of Physical Education and Sports. The data collection tools are the personal information form (age, gender, university, income level, education status of mother and father, and place of residence), and altruism scale developed by London and Bower (1968) was applied to determine the altruism level of participants. Adapted to Turkish by Akbaba (2001). The scale consisting of 20 questions consists of four sub-dimensions. These are family, sociability, helpfulness, and responsibility.

The obtained data was recorded in the SPSS package program. Parametric and non-parametric distributions of the statistical data are examined. Parametric and nonparametric curves, skewness-kurtosis values show a parametric distribution of the data. Mann Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis test were applied for statistics.

RESULTS

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that 59.1% of the volunteers participating in the study are male, 40.9% are female, and 52.1% of the participants are from Dumlupınar University, 47.9% are from Erciyes University. 52.9% of them have 13330-2330 TL, 23.2% of them have 1431-2530, 12.5% of them have 2531-3530 and 11,5% of them have 3531 TL and over income levels. 46.9% of the mothers' education levels are the primary school, 19.2% is middle school, 25.4% is high school and 8.5% is the university, while 27.7% of fathers' education levels are the primary school, 20% 0, middle school, 33.2% high school and 19.2% university. When we look according to the places where they live, 39.4% were found to be the homestay, 33.7% of student houses and 26.9% to stay in the dormitory. When the results of the K-S test are examined in Table 2, it is observed that the deviations from normality in the altruism sub-dimensions and altruism total scores are significant.

When we look at the normal distribution curves, it is seen that there is an excessive deviation from normality. When the coefficients of skewness and kurtosis are taken into consideration, it is determined that all the scores are within ± 1.5 . It was decided to use nonparametric statistical techniques because the skewness-kurtosis values of the scores are at the end levels and excessive deviations are observed in the normal distribution curves. When Table 3 was examined, it was determined that the family size average in altruism scale of the participants was 15.51 ± 2.37 , sociability average of 15.95 ± 2.22 , helpfulness average of 15.69 ± 2.38 , responsibility average of 16.32 ± 2.37 , and altruism total point average of 63.47 ± 8.57 .

Table 1. Socio-demographic Characteristics of Participants

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender | Male | 237 | 59,1 |
| | Female | 164 | 40,9 |
| | Total | 401 | 100,0 |
| University | Dumlupınar University | 209 | 52,1 |
| | Erciyes University | 192 | 47,9 |
| | Total | 401 | 100,0 |
| Level of Income | 1330-2330 TL | 212 | 52,9 |
| | 1431-2530 TL | 93 | 23,2 |
| | 2531-3530 TL | 50 | 12,5 |
| | 3531 TL or above | 46 | 11,5 |
| | Total | 401 | 100,0 |
| Educational Level of the Mother | Elementary sc. | 188 | 46,9 |
| | Secondary sc. | 77 | 19,2 |
| | High school | 102 | 25,4 |
| | University | 34 | 8,5 |
| | Total | 401 | 100,0 |
| Educational Level of the Father | Elementary sc. | 111 | 27,7 |
| | Secondary sc. | 80 | 20,0 |
| | High school | 133 | 33,2 |
| | University | 77 | 19,2 |
| | Total | 401 | 100,0 |
| Living Place | Homestay | 158 | 39,4 |
| | Student House | 135 | 33,7 |
| | Dormitory | 108 | 26,9 |
| | Total | 401 | 100,0 |

Table 2. Skewness-Kurtosis Values of Scores and Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Significance Level Results

| | N | Skewness | Kurtosis | P |
|----------------|-----|----------|----------|------|
| Family Size | 401 | -1,82 | 1,52 | ,000 |
| Sociability | 401 | 1,57 | 1,68 | ,000 |
| Helpfulness | 401 | -,137 | 1,225 | ,000 |
| Responsibility | 401 | 1,81 | ,876 | ,000 |
| Total | 401 | 1,97 | -1,72 | ,000 |

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Participants' Answers to Scales

| | | N | Min | Max | X±Sd |
|----------|----------------|-----|-------|-------|-------------|
| Altruism | Family Size | 401 | 7,00 | 20,00 | 15,51± 2,37 |
| | Sociability | 401 | 8,00 | 20,00 | 15,95±2,22 |
| | Helpfulness | 401 | 7,00 | 20,00 | 15,69 ±2,38 |
| | Responsibility | 401 | 8,00 | 20,00 | 16,32 ±2,37 |
| | Total | 401 | 35,00 | 80,00 | 63,47±8,57 |

Table 4. Altruism Level Analysis by Gender

| | Gender | N | Median | Min | Max | Z | p |
|----------------|--------|-----|--------|-------|-------|--------|------|
| Family Size | Male | 237 | 16,00 | 7,00 | 20,00 | -2,882 | ,004 |
| | Female | 164 | 15,00 | 9,00 | 20,00 | | |
| Sociability | Male | 237 | 16,00 | 9,00 | 20,00 | -1,918 | ,027 |
| | Female | 164 | 15,00 | 8,00 | 20,00 | | |
| Helpfulness | Male | 237 | 16,00 | 7,00 | 20,00 | -2,262 | ,024 |
| | Female | 164 | 14,00 | 8,00 | 20,00 | | |
| Responsibility | Male | 237 | 16,00 | 8,00 | 20,00 | -4,080 | ,005 |
| | Female | 164 | 17,00 | 10,00 | 20,00 | | |
| Total | Male | 237 | 64,00 | 35,00 | 80,00 | -3,115 | ,002 |
| | Female | 164 | 61,00 | 38,00 | 80,00 | | |

Table 5. Altruism Level Analysis by University

| | University | n | Median | Min | Max | Z | p |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----|--------|-------|-------|--------|------|
| Family Size | Dumlupınar University | 209 | 18,00 | 7,00 | 20,00 | -,429 | ,041 |
| | Erciyes University | 192 | 15,00 | 9,00 | 20,00 | | |
| Sociability | Dumlupınar University | 209 | 15,00 | 8,00 | 20,00 | -1,413 | ,004 |
| | Erciyes University | 192 | 13,00 | 9,00 | 20,00 | | |
| Helpfulness | Dumlupınar University | 209 | 16,00 | 7,00 | 20,00 | -,810 | ,016 |
| | Erciyes University | 192 | 12,00 | 8,00 | 20,00 | | |
| Responsibility | Dumlupınar University | 209 | 17,00 | 8,00 | 20,00 | -,327 | ,027 |
| | Erciyes University | 192 | 16,00 | 10,00 | 20,00 | | |
| Total | Dumlupınar University | 209 | 69,00 | 35,00 | 38,00 | -,587 | ,047 |
| | Erciyes University | 192 | 65,00 | 38,00 | 80,00 | | |

Table 6. Altruism Level Analysis by Living Place

| | Living Place | N | X± Sd | f | p | Tukey HSD |
|----------------|----------------------------|-----|------------|-------|------|-----------|
| Family Size | Homestay ¹ | 158 | 15,81±2,23 | 7,806 | ,020 | 1-2 |
| | Dormitory ² | 108 | 14,94±2,45 | | | |
| | Student House ³ | 135 | 15,62±2,41 | | | |
| Sociability | Homestay ¹ | 158 | 16,22±2,09 | 5,607 | ,061 | - |
| | Dormitory ² | 108 | 15,56±2,31 | | | |
| | Student House ³ | 135 | 15,93±2,27 | | | |
| Helpfulness | Homestay ¹ | 158 | 15,94±2,30 | 4,404 | ,111 | - |
| | Dormitory ² | 108 | 15,29±2,29 | | | |
| | Student House ³ | 135 | 15,71±2,49 | | | |
| Responsibility | Homestay ¹ | 158 | 16,65±2,20 | 6,772 | ,034 | 1-2 |
| | Dormitory ² | 108 | 15,82±2,51 | | | |
| | Student House ³ | 135 | 16,35±2,39 | | | |
| Total | Homestay ¹ | 158 | 64,61±8,17 | 7,014 | ,030 | 1-2 |
| | Dormitory ² | 108 | 61,61±8,63 | | | |
| | Student House ³ | 135 | 63,61±8,79 | | | |

When Table 4 was examined, the family size score of males was 16 and the score of females was 15. In the sociability dimension, the score for males is 16 while for females it is 15. In the helpfulness dimension, the score of males was 16 while the number of females was 14.

In the dimension of responsibility, the score of the males is 16 and the score of the females is 17. The altruism total score was 64 in males and 61 in females. As a result of the statistical analyses, a significant difference was found in family dimension, social dimension, helpfulness dimension,

responsibility dimension and altruism total score. As table 5 shows, Dumlupınar University's score of family size is 18, Erciyes University's score is 15. In sociability dimension, Dumlupınar University's score is 15, Erciyes University's score is 13. In helpfulness dimension, Dumlupınar University's score is 16, Erciyes University's score is 12. In responsibility dimension, Dumlupınar University's score is 17, Erciyes University's score is 16. The total score of altruism was 69 for Dumlupınar University and 65 for Erciyes University. As a result of the statistical analyses, a significant difference was found in family dimension, social dimension, helpfulness dimension, responsibility dimension and altruism total score.

In table 6, it is seen that when the level of altruism according to participants' location variable is examined, the highest score in the family dimension belongs to the homestay with 15.81 ± 2.23 and the lowest score belongs to the dormitory with 14.94 ± 2.45 . In the sociability dimension, the highest score was 16.22 ± 2.09 with the homestay and the lowest score was 15.56 ± 2.31 with the dormitory and when the dimension of helpfulness was examined, the highest score was 15.94 ± 2.30 with the homestay, the lowest score was 15.29 ± 2.29 with the dormitory. The highest score in the responsibility dimension was 16.65 ± 2.20 with the homestay and the lowest score in the family was 15.82 ± 2.51 with the dormitory. The highest score in total altruism with a score of 64.61 ± 8.17 was the homestay and the lowest score in the family was 61.61 ± 8.63 belong to the dormitory. As a result of the statistical analysis, a significant difference was found between the homestay and the dormitory in the family size dimension, the responsibility dimension, and the altruism total score.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the study we conducted by evaluating the altruistic levels of teacher candidates according to some variables; Participants who participated in the study were found to have an average of 15.51 ± 2.37 in the dimension of family size, 15.95 ± 2.22 in sociability, 15.69 ± 2.38 in helpfulness, 16.32 ± 2.37 in responsibility, and 63.47 ± 8.57 total altruism score. When the literature was examined, it was determined that "altruism score" was 62.075 ± 6.830 level in the study conducted by Topuz to university students. Avcı et al. (1983) found the level of altruism to be 70.16 ± 9.94 . This study is similar to our findings. It is seen that the students have moderate altruism when they look at the range of the altruism scores. According to the gender of the volunteers, the family size score of males was 16, the females were 15, in the sociability dimension the males scored 16, the females scored 15, in helpfulness the males scored 16, the females scored 14, in responsibility the males scored 16, the females scored 17, and in the total altruism the males scored 64, the males scored 61. As a result of the statistical analyses, a significant difference was found in family dimension, sociability dimension, helpfulness dimension, responsibility dimension and altruism total score. When we looked at the studies conducted by Banbal (2010), Mutafçılar (2008), Onatr (2008), we found that they did not make a meaningful difference compared to the gender. These results are not parallel to the findings of our study. As a result of these findings, males' altruism seems to be better than females. This situation can be considered to be due to differences in socio-cultural relationship and sharing differentiation as well as identity status. It is believed that altruism in terms of gender differs or not due to the fact that studies are carried out in different cultures.

When we look at the levels of altruism according to the universities, Dumlupınar University's family size score is 18, Erciyes University is 15, in sociability dimension Dumlupınar University's score is 15, Erciyes University's score is 13, in helpfulness Dumlupınar University's score is 16, Erciyes University's score is 12, in responsibility Dumlupınar University's score is 17, Erciyes University's score is 16, and the total altruism score of Dumlupınar University is 69, Erciyes University's score is 65. As a result of the statistical analysis, a significant difference was found in the family size dimension, social dimension, helpfulness dimension, responsibility dimension and altruism total score compared to universities. Teacher candidates studying at Dumlupınar University seem to have higher altruism levels. When the literature was examined, no studies examining the levels of altruism according to universities were found.

When the level of altruism according to the variable of living place is examined, it is seen that the highest score in the family size dimension belongs to the homestay with 15.81 ± 2.23 and the lowest score belongs to the dormitory with 14.94 ± 2.45 . When the dimension of sociability was examined, the highest score was 16.22 ± 2.09 with the homestay, the lowest score was 15.56 ± 2.31 with the dormitory. In the dimension of helpfulness, the highest score was 15.94 ± 2.30 with the homestay, the lowest score was 15.29 ± 2.29 with the dormitory. In the responsibility dimension, the highest score was 16.65 ± 2.20 with the homestay and the lowest score was 15.82 ± 2.51 with the dormitory. It is seen that the highest score in altruism total score belongs to the homestay with 64.61 ± 8.17 and the lowest score is 61.61 ± 8.63 with the dormitory.

As a result of the statistical analysis, it was found that there was a significant difference between the homestay and the dormitory in dimensions of the family size, responsibility, and the total score of altruism. When the literature was examined, it was found that there was no study in which the altruism examined according to the living place. Teacher candidates living with their family seem to have better altruism levels. As a result, a significant relationship was found between altruism and gender, university, and living place. We see that the teacher candidates living with their family are more open to helping the others than the other candidates. The fact that students feel more comfortable and secure with their families, that they can move freely under their care without hesitation from their family members, the sincere feelings they receive from their family, and good/ effective communication between family members can be the reason for their self-developed helpfulness. As the candidates who don't live with their family do not experience the same amount of sincerity, the students are always more likely to exhibit prejudices against each other and shy behavior. It is thought that the altruistic level of teacher candidates is influenced by the social environment they born and raised, peer relations at school or out of school, happiness in the family and intercultural interactions during their education.

REFERENCES

- Akbaba, S. 2001. Özgeçilik Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye Uyarlanması Geçerlik Ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Erzurum Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(2), pp. 85-95.
- Avcı D, Adın D, Özbaşaran F. 2013. Hemşirelik Öğrencilerinde Empati-Özgeçilik İlişkisi Ve Özgeci

- Davranışın Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Balıkesir Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi. Balıkesir Sağlık Bil Derg. Cilt:2 Sayı:2* Ağustos. pp.108-112.
- Batson, C. D. 1991. "The altruism question: Toward a socialpsychological Answer". Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Bilgin, N. 1988. *Sosyal Psikolojiye Giriş*. İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Cüceloğlu, D. 1993. *İnsan Ve Davranışı*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Freedman, J. L., Sears, D. O., & Carlsmiht, J. M. 1993. *Sosyal Psikoloji*. A. Dönmez (Çev), Ankara: İmge Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Gormley, K. J. 1996. Altruism:A framework for caring and Providing Care. *Int.J. Nurs. Stud*, 33(6), 581-588.
- Kaçar-Banbal, G. 2010. Hemşirelik Öğrencilerinin Özgecilik Düzeyleri. *Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- London P.and R.K. Bower 1968.Altruism, Extraversion and Mental İllness. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. S.19-30
- Mutafçılar, I. 2008. Özgecilik Kavramının Tarihsel Gelişimi Ve Öğ Retmen Özgeciliği Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Onatır, M. 2008. Öğretmenlikte Özgecilik ile Değer Tercihleri Arasındaki İlişki. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, Yedi Tepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Öz, F. 1998. Hemşirelikte Özgecilik (Yardım Edicilik). *C. Ü. Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi*,2(1), pp.53-58.
- TDK. (2008). *Toplum Bilim Terimleri Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Tevrüz, S. 1989. "Davranışlarımızdan Seçmeler" Emek Ofset Matbaacılık Basım Yılı 1989 s: 154-172.
