

THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN THE FORMATION OF VALUES AND VALUE ORIENTATIONS AMONG ADOLESCENTS

MSc Aneta Jovkovska, Orthodox Faculty of Theology, University St. Cyril and Methodius, Skopje,
Republic of Macedonia, E-mail: ajovkovska@yahoo.com
Dr. Aneta Barakoska, Faculty of Philosophy, University St. Cyril and Methodius, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia
E-mail: aneta@fzf.ukim.edu.mk

Received: November, 19.2014.

Accepted: December, 04.2014.

Original Research

UDK 159.922.8.075(497.7)

316.644-053.6:316.752(497.7)

Abstract. In this paper is discussed the concept of values and value orientations, as to the role of education in the process of their forming among adolescents from middle and late adolescence. Presented and discussed are the results of a larger research regarding the differences in values and value orientations in adolescents with different kind of education and: a) adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics b) adolescents learning ethics and c) adolescents learning neither religious subjects, nor ethics.

The findings obtained testify for the presence of differences in the system of values in adolescents with different educational type as regarding the following instrumental values: cooperation, honesty, determination, capability, assistance, clarity, generosity, logics and competing. There are also differences regarding the terminal values: an exciting life, peace in the world, self-respecting, peace of mind, equality, economic welfare, pleasure and social justice. As regarding to the examined life styles, differences are found between the examined groups of adolescents in the following value orientations: family, altruistic, utilitary, popular and individual, as to religious, hedonism and power.

Keywords: *Adolescents, Education, Values, Value orientations, Values preferred, Value profile.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Value orientations serve as a general indicator of the orientation of interests, needs, personal requirements, position in society and the level of spiritual development. The path and perspectives of development of a society depend on the values formed among adolescents today and their level of preparedness for the new changes in social relations. That's why the insight in the way of forming of values and

the profile of values of adolescent population can be of assistance for those who plan and realize the educational politics so as they can properly determine the goals of teaching and education and realize them successfully.

Values are an often example of exploring in different social sciences, a thing prescribed to their theoretical and practical contribution in interpreting and understanding of occurrences, as to a prognostic possibility deriving from their motivational embedding and relative stability (Pantic, 1995). They enable explaining and predicting of the behavior in individuals, getting insight in their value orientations and contribute for the expanding of the realizations for mechanisms of forming of values and effects they have on socialization. The insight in the way of forming of values and profile of value in adolescent population can be of assistance for those who plan and realize the educational politics so as they can properly determine the goals of teaching and education and realize them successfully. The data for value orientations in particular generations, gathered in different time periods enable bringing of conclusions for stability, respectively the changes in the profile of value in young, as to the influence of current social circumstances on individual value determinations (Joksimović and Janjetović, 2008).

The values are adopted through social learning, under the influence of different agents of socialization that consciously or unintentionally, spontaneously contribute certain values to be accepted and adopted. When talking about forming of values in individual life, the family sets the foundation, although the influences on peers, and mass communication media also have significance. In regard to the adopting of socially preferred values, school is an agent of socialization that directly mediates between society and young people

Corresponding Author

Dr. Aneta Barakoska, Faculty of Philosophy, University
St. Cyril and Methodius, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia
E-mail: aneta@fzf.ukim.edu.mk

participating in the teaching-educational process. This is, certainly, if the goals of society are set clearly enough and the educational curriculum predicts and gives consistent and systematic influence of school on the values of the student (Jokcimović and Maksić, 2006).

The values and value orientation in the empirical research are most often used as synonyms because their differences can hardly be operationalized. However, such differences exist.

The values do the function of all kinds of selective social behavior: social action, ideology, attitudes and moral reasoning, comparing with others, as to justifying yourselves and others (Koković and Lazar, 2004). Parsons and Shils assume that values are an element of an accepted symbolic system serving as a criteria or standard for choosing between orientation alternatives, because of this, they are necessary element of social acting and define the way of choosing and the proper obligation of such acting (Parsons and Shils, 1962).

The definition of Kluckhohn emphasizes the explicit and implicit character of values typical for an individual or group: "Values aren't only in wishes, but quite more in needs, respectively they aren't only in what we wish for, but also in what we feel as right and proper to want for ourselves and others. In fact, values are abstract standards that overcome impulses of the moment and transient situations" (Kluckhohn, 1965). According to this, values represent certain standards, concepts, criteria and believes for the desired goals of human existence; individual and joint ways of behavior and social relations. Even authors define values as lasting or relatively lasting dispositions of the individual so as to notice, interpret and evaluate certain objects in a way seemingly desirable and according to such experience behave to them. (Rayk and Edkok, 1978, Serpel, 1978).

The famous explorer of values Rokeach (Rokeach, 1973) has identified two important functions of values. One of these functions represents the standards managing our behavior, and the other, called motivational, regards to the components expressing our tendency for acquiring values (for example, we tend to be honest and solidary). In this regard, the tendency for fulfilling represents a human need. The implied determinations show that values contain three important components: cognitive (value as a concept), affective (value as something desirable) and conative (value as criteria for selection). Such provisions have shown to be fruitful and suitable for sociological

exploring, because they place the values in the interpretive frame of the concept of social acting, representing the basis for understanding social dynamics (Matić, 1990).

Values are most commonly divided into instrumental and targeted (terminal). Instrumental values can relate either to morality or authority (validity). An example of morality would be: to be honest, and an example of authority would be: logical behavior. For targeted or terminal, values are considered to be those values that represent desired goals of human existence, respectively goals indicating the purpose of life or universal tendencies of all people (because of this all values are called targeted-existential). For instrumental (respectively values – remedies) are considered to be those values that can serve as "remedies" for fulfilling of targeted (terminal) values.

Value orientations, however, represent individual hierarchical system of values determining the orientation of a person or the selectiveness of her conduct. (Широких, 2007). Rot and Havelka define value orientations as general principles of behavior and acting regarding certain goals we strive to fulfill (Rot and Havelka, 1973; Kuzmanović (1995) assumes that value orientations are wide, less articulated system of beliefs, respectively relatively consistent and enough coherently directed to certain categories of the goals.

Value orientations in adolescents are gradually formed in the process of his or her socialization by reaching through of social information in the individual - psychological world of the adolescent. Forming of a system of value orientations is a process of person building and such system shows up to be a remedy for conducting of certain social goals. In modern conditions, the process of forming of value orientations in young generations takes place in the context of reforms happening in society. These changes not only lead to changes in economic relations, but also directly affect the spiritual climate and interpersonal relations (Sogolub, 2003).

The Psychologist Bitinas (1971), while analyzing the mechanisms of forming of value orientations explains the role of free education, as to the unchangeable social attitudes and beliefs. Internationalization refers to a process of transforming of social ideas as a specific experience of mankind in stimulating towards positive acts and restraining from negative. Hence, internationalization is not only adopting of social norms, but also establishing of those ideas as dominant and regulators

of human life. Social ideas are considered to be internationalized when they rule man. This way, the process of forming of value orientations is a process of transferring of objective values in subjective with meaning for a certain individual. A problem appears with forming of unconscious thriving forces of pro social conduct in the adolescent and an internal "brake" forbidding negative behavior. The concept of free education is built based on this and it doesn't perform constraining, but only under the condition unconscious internal regulators of conduct of the adolescent are formed.

The development of value orientations is a sign of maturity of the person, an indicator of the degree of socialization of the individual. The stabile and consistent structure of value orientations causes development of such features of personality such as: integrity, confidence, loyalty towards certain principles and ideals and active life position. Instability, however, creates inconsistency in behavior. Underdevelopment of value orientations is a sign of infantilism (Golub, 2009:54).

Thanks to their power to serve as an example and orientation, the disturbances and upturns in the system of values pull back large disruptions in total society and culture, but also vice versa. However, full compatibility and harmony between the values are almost impossible. If people agree in all values and if harmonic relations prevail, such harmony would turn in tediousness very fast.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The problem subject of this research is if the kind of education affects the choice of values and value orientations in adolescents?

The research involves 370 adolescents males and female at ages in middle and late adolescence. Regarding the kind of educations involved are: a) high school students and such learning religious subjects and ethics during their education; b) high school students and such learning ethics during their education c) high school students and such learning neither religious subjects nor ethics during their educations.

The surveyed are high school students learning in Skopje in: the Macedonian Orthodox Theology School „St. Kliment Ohridski”, gymnasium „Nikola Karev”, gymnasium „Zdravko Cvetkovski”, high school for art „Lazar Licenovski”, high school for physical

culture „Metodija Mitevski – Brico, as to all students from the University „St. Cyril and Methodius”, respectively the following faculties: Orthodox Theology Faculty, Philosophical Faculty, Pedagogical Faculty, Faculty of Architecture and Faculty of Physical education, sport and health.

The field part of the research is realized in the period from September until November 2013th year. A proper sample was used composed of high school students and students present in the preferred high schools and faculties during the time of delivering of the instruments. An ex-post facto procedure was used during the research, determining the types of dominant values and value orientations in adolescents depending if they learn religious subjects, ethics in their teaching-educational process or such are missing in their lectures.

Instruments: The value preferences are measured with the help of a modified version of Rokeach's Questionnaire of Values (Rokeach, 1973). The surveyors were demanded to rank according to the significance for them of 16 terminal values (life goals) and 16 instrumental values (ways of behavior). The terminal values are represented by the following categories: social reputation, exciting life, true friendship, peace in the world, self-respecting, harmonic family life, spiritual peace, equity, wisdom, economic welfare, true love, making endeavors to be better, safety for loved ones, pleasure, social justice and a world of wonderfulness. The instrumental values are represented by the following categories: ambitiousness, cooperation, self-control, independence, honesty, decisiveness, resourcefulness, capability, helping, purity, generosity, logics, consciousness, politeness, competing and tactfulness.

The value orientations in the surveyed are determined with using of scale of life styles constructed by Popadic (Popadić, 1998). This scale consists of ten life styles, and: family-sentimental, altruistic, cognizant, utilitarian, popularity, egoistical-individualistic, Promethean activism, hedonistic, religious-traditional and power oriented.

3. RESULTS

According to the results gained from the descriptive statistics we can see that there are life styles highly ranked by all groups of surveyors. These are as follows: family

orientation, individualistic orientation and Promethean activity. Religiosity, however, is most highly ranked by adolescents teaching religious subjects and ethics, and the remaining two groups of surveyors rank it among the last life styles. Hedonism as a life style is highly ranked by the group of surveyors who didn't learn ethics, nor religious subjects, but this isn't the case with the other two groups of surveyors. Altruistic orientation is highly ranked by adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics and adolescents learning ethics, but not adolescents who aren't learning ethics, nor religious subjects. The utilitarian orientation is highly ranked by adolescents who learn ethics and those neither learning ethics, nor religious subjects, but this isn't the case with adolescents learning ethics and religious subjects. All groups of surveyors rank lowest popular orientation and power as a life style.

The differences regarding value orientations, instrumental and terminal values are identified with calculation of a singular Analysis of variant (ANOVA). The partial comparison among the groups of surveyors is made using the Bonferroni post-hoc test. It can be perceived that there are statistically significant differences on a level of 0.01 ($p < 0.01$) among the groups of surveyors in regard to the following value orientations: family, altruistic and utilitarian orientation, cooperation and individualistic orientation, statistically significant difference on a level 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) exist among adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics and adolescents who don't learn neither ethics, nor religious subjects (Table 1).

Table 1. Results of the differences among adolescents with different educational type regarding value orientation

| Value orientations | M | | | SD | | | F | p |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|------|--------|------|
| | AP | AE | AH | AP | AE | AH | | |
| Family orientation | **6.29 | **6.14 | **5.54 | 1.30 | 1.50 | 1.71 | 8.331 | .000 |
| Altruistic orientation | **5.37 | **4.72 | **4.11 | 1.67 | 1.68 | 1.66 | 17.029 | .000 |
| Cognitive orientation | 4.41 | 4.24 | 4.29 | 1.86 | 1.99 | 2.09 | .210 | .811 |
| Utilitarian orientation | **3.60 | **5.17 | **5.14 | 1.97 | 1.56 | 1.74 | 30.067 | .000 |
| Popular orientation | *2.41 | 2.73 | *3.03 | 1.89 | 1.88 | 1.99 | 3.132 | .045 |
| Individualistic orientation | *4.44 | 4.77 | *5.22 | 2.15 | 2.13 | 1.90 | 4.425 | .013 |
| Promethean activity | 4.70 | 4.55 | 4.34 | 1.71 | 1.87 | 1.72 | 1.325 | .267 |
| Hedonism | **2.87 | **4.42 | **4.49 | 1.86 | 2.03 | 2.07 | 24.155 | .000 |
| Religiosity | **6.81 | **4.42 | **3.78 | 0.58 | 2.22 | 2.41 | 75.770 | .000 |
| Power | **2.52 | **3.45 | **3.60 | 1.84 | 2.07 | 2.18 | 9.367 | .000 |

Note: AP – adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics; AE – adolescents learning ethics; AH – adolescents learning neither ethics, nor religious subjects; * - statistically significant differences among the groups on a level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) after using of Bonferroni post-hoc test; ** - statistically significant differences among the groups on a level 0.01 ($p < 0.01$) after using of Bonferroni post-hoc test. Higher arithmetic mean (M) means highly ranked instrumental value.

Adolescents learning religious subjects

and ethics rank honesty most highly from instrumental values. The group learning ethics ranks ambitiousness most highly, while, the group not learning ethics, nor religious subjects consider self-control as the most important value. All three groups of surveyors appreciate competing least from the instrumental values listed.

Statistically significant differences on a level 0.01 ($p < 0.01$) exist among the three groups of surveyors regarding the following instrumental values: cooperation, capability, helping, generosity and competing. Regarding the instrumental value honesty, there is a difference on a level 0.01 ($p < 0.01$) among adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics and adolescents learning neither ethics, nor religious subjects. There is a statistically significant difference among these two groups of surveyors on a level 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) regarding the instrumental value logics. Adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics and adolescents learning ethics differ regarding the instrumental value clean. This difference is statistically significant on a level 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Among adolescents learning ethics and adolescents neither learning ethics, nor religious subjects there is a statistically significant difference on a level 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) regarding the instrumental value: decisiveness (Table 2).

Table 2. Results of the differences among adolescents with different educational type regarding instrumental values

| Instrumental values | M | | | SD | | | F | p |
|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|------|------|------|--------|------|
| | AP | AE | AH | AP | AE | AH | | |
| Ambitiousness | 6.87 | 5.66 | 6.74 | 4.52 | 4.60 | 4.87 | 2.518 | .082 |
| Cooperation | *7.94 | *7.90 | *9.43 | 4.04 | 4.47 | 4.45 | 5.153 | .006 |
| Self-control | 6.80 | 5.70 | 6.40 | 4.77 | 4.13 | 4.78 | 1.756 | .174 |
| Independence | 8.01 | 6.97 | 6.69 | 5.39 | 4.58 | 5.18 | 2.212 | .111 |
| Honesty | **4.50 | 5.72 | **6.63 | 3.85 | 4.15 | 4.39 | 7.838 | .000 |
| Decisiveness | 7.22 | *7.79 | *6.40 | 3.93 | 4.15 | 3.59 | 4.256 | .015 |
| Resourcefulness | 7.74 | 7.07 | 7.37 | 3.92 | 3.97 | 3.99 | .837 | .434 |
| Capability | **9.00 | **7.34 | *7.78 | 3.73 | 3.68 | 3.89 | 6.012 | .003 |
| Helping | **6.92 | **9.06 | **9.40 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.17 | 12.318 | .000 |
| Pure | *9.21 | *10.59 | 9.81 | 4.02 | 3.85 | 4.23 | 3.485 | .032 |
| Generosity | **8.28 | **10.29 | **10.43 | 4.53 | 4.21 | 4.36 | 8.748 | .000 |
| Logics | *10.26 | 9.29 | *8.75 | 3.68 | 4.05 | 4.16 | 4.349 | .014 |
| Consciousness | 9.69 | 9.48 | 9.15 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.10 | .552 | .576 |
| Politeness | 9.16 | 10.31 | 9.72 | 4.29 | 3.81 | 3.96 | 2.442 | .088 |
| Competing | **13.77 | *12.15 | **11.55 | 3.33 | 4.67 | 4.66 | 8.226 | .000 |
| Tactfulness | 10.57 | 10.55 | 9.88 | 4.29 | 4.18 | 4.35 | 1.079 | .341 |

Note: AP – adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics; AE – adolescents learning ethics; AH – adolescents learning neither ethics, nor religious subjects; * - statistically significant differences among the groups on a level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) after using of Bonferroni post-hoc test; ** - statistically significant differences among the groups on a level 0.01 ($p < 0.01$) after using of Bonferroni post-hoc test. Lower arithmetic mean (M) means highly ranked terminal value.

Adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics rank most highly peace of mind from the terminal values. The group learning ethics ranks self-respecting most highly,

while, the group neither learning ethics, nor religious subjects consider as most important harmonic family life. Sincere love and true friendship is highly ranked by all three groups of surveyors, and they consider pleasure and the world of wonderfulness at least significant.

Statistically significant differences on a level 0.01 ($p < 0.01$) exist among the three groups of surveyors regarding the following terminal values: peace in the world, self-respecting, peace of mind, equity, economic welfare and pleasure. Regarding terminal values: exciting life and social justice, there is a statistically significant difference of a level 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) among adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics and adolescents neither learning ethics, nor religious subjects (Table 3).

Table 3. Results of the differences among adolescents with different educational type regarding terminal values

| Terminal values | M | | | SD | | | F | p |
|------------------------|---------|---------|---------|------|------|------|--------|------|
| | AP | AE | AH | AP | AE | AH | | |
| Social reputation | 9.28 | 8.89 | 9.60 | 4.56 | 4.90 | 4.79 | .721 | .487 |
| Exciting life | *9.30 | 8.61 | *7.58 | 4.48 | 4.89 | 4.47 | 4.250 | .015 |
| True friendship | 5.48 | 5.89 | 5.90 | 3.63 | 3.91 | 3.46 | .482 | .618 |
| Peace in the world | **6.46 | **8.44 | **9.30 | 4.23 | 4.56 | 4.88 | 11.748 | .000 |
| Self-respect | **9.57 | **5.87 | **6.84 | 4.40 | 4.14 | 4.12 | 24.002 | .000 |
| Harmonic family life | 5.68 | 6.19 | 5.43 | 4.03 | 4.39 | 4.17 | 1.085 | .339 |
| Peace of mind | **4.90 | **7.35 | **6.96 | 3.59 | 4.24 | 4.43 | 11.637 | .000 |
| Equity | **8.29 | **8.06 | **9.84 | 3.28 | 3.62 | 4.19 | 8.588 | .000 |
| Wisdom | 7.57 | 7.99 | 7.39 | 3.70 | 3.88 | 4.02 | .824 | .440 |
| Economic welfare | **11.44 | *10.65 | **9.36 | 3.96 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 7.380 | .001 |
| True love | 6.02 | 5.91 | 6.90 | 4.08 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 2.310 | .101 |
| Improving yourself | 7.91 | 8.80 | 7.82 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 2.216 | .111 |
| Safety for loved ones | 8.06 | 8.77 | 7.80 | 3.97 | 4.25 | 3.87 | 2.027 | .133 |
| Pleasure | **12.96 | **11.25 | **12.01 | 3.70 | 3.84 | 3.47 | 10.249 | .000 |
| Social justice | *10.73 | 11.23 | *12.01 | 3.70 | 3.84 | 3.47 | 3.802 | .023 |
| World of wonderfulness | 11.69 | 11.80 | 12.36 | 4.09 | 4.10 | 3.98 | 1.008 | .366 |

Note: AP – adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics; AE – adolescents learning ethics; AH – adolescents learning neither ethics, nor religious subjects; * - statistically significant differences among the groups on a level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) after using of Bonferroni post-hoc test; ** - statistically significant differences among the groups on a level 0.01 ($p < 0.01$) after using of Bonferroni post-hoc test. Lower arithmetic mean (M) means highly ranked terminal value.

3. DISCUSSIONS

According to the results gained we can conclude that there are life styles highly ranked by all groups of surveyors. Those are: family orientation, individualistic orientation and Promethean activity. Family is highly ranked by all of the surveyors because adolescents subjectively feel the need for creating and maintaining a family. Individualistic orientation isn't accidentally among the highly ranked by all of the surveyors because adolescence is a period when young people are aimed at themselves and personal independence and welfare. Such results are also accordance with the

results obtained from other researchers in the area (Rot and Havelka, 1973; Popadić, 1998; Mladenović and Knebl, 2000; Franc, Sakić and Ivčić, 2002; Frichand, 2007; Stojanova and Miloševa, 2009). The Promethean activity isn't often met highly ranked value orientation in other researches as in here. On the contrary, with some researchers it is among the lowest ranked (Joksimović, 1992; Mladenović and Knebl, 2000; Stojanova and Miloševa, 2009). This means that the persistent committing for creating of better and more equitable relations in the middle and society and the fight for long term goals and ideas was shown to be one of the priorities of the whole group of surveyors. Such results can be considered as news unlike the previous research of value orientations in adolescents in the area. The increased popularity of this style might be because of the latter changes implemented in the teaching-educational system in Macedonia and the increasing emphasizing of social importance for individuals and forming of long term goals.

Religiosity is most highly ranked by adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics, and the remaining two groups of surveyors rank it between the last by important life styles. Religiosity is also the lowest ranked in other research by the adolescents (Popadić, 1995; Franc, Sakić and Ivčić, 2002; Petrović and Zotović, 2012). Therefrom we can conclude that the high preference of religiosity by adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics is connected with their education type. Hedonism as a life style is highly ranked by the group of surveyors who neither learn ethics, nor religious subjects, but this isn't the case with the remaining two groups of surveyors. Hedonism is found as a preferred value orientation in many other researches (Mladenović and Knebl, 2000; Joksimović, 1992; Popadić, 1994; Frichand, 2007, Petrović and Zotović, 2012). In this case except for adolescents who neither learn ethics, nor religious subjects, other adolescents give advantage to other value orientations before social life and pleasure. For example, altruistic orientation is highly ranked by these two groups of surveyors, but not adolescents who neither learn ethics, nor religious subjects. Altruistic orientation is highly ranked by adolescents in the research of Rot and Havelka, 1973, but in the latter researches is ranked quite low (Popadić, 1995; Joksimović, 1992; Stojanova and Miloševa, 2009). Such results point to a repeated growing of popularity in life styles that imply committing for general interests and the wellbeing of others, especially in adolescents who learn

ethics and/or religious subjects.

The utilitarian orientation is highly ranked by adolescents learning ethics and those who neither learn ethics, nor religious subjects, but this isn't the case with adolescents learning ethics or religious subjects. Adolescents covered with the other researches of value orientations in the area also rank highly the utilitarian orientation (Lazarević, 1987; Lazarević and Janjetović, 2003; Popadić, 1995; Joksimović, 1992; Mladenović and Knebl, 2000; Stojanova and Miloševa, 2009), except in the research of Rot and Havelka, 1973 where utilitarian orientation is among the lowest ranked. In fact, the results have shown that adolescents appreciate quite highly well paid work, material safety and comforting life. This isn't the case uniquely with adolescents learning religious subjects who during their education are instructed to respect more spiritual, than material values. All groups of surveyors rank lowest popular orientation and power as a life style. This is also in accordance with other researches in the area where styles demanding higher social engagement are low ranked (Rot and Havelka, 1973; Vasović, 1988; Lazarević, 1987; Popadić, 1995; Mladenović and Knebl, 2000; Franc, Sakić and Ivčić, 2002; Petrović and Zotović, 2012).

From the ways of behaving: honesty, self-control and ambitiousness are ranked highly by all groups of surveyors, but still honesty is most important to adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics, ambitiousness to adolescents learning ethics, while, the group learning neither ethics, nor religious subjects considers self-control as most important value. All three groups of surveyors prefer least competing out of the instrumental values listed.

From life goals, adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics rank most highly peace of mind. The group learning ethics ranks most highly self-respect, while, the group neither learning ethics, nor religious subjects considers as most important the harmonic family life. Sincere love and true friendship are highly ranked by all three groups of surveyors, and least important for them are pleasure and the world of wonderfulness.

Based on the results presented above we can conclude that popular among adolescents are human values such as family, friendship and love. They are quite more oriented towards spiritual, then material values. Regarding the education type, of course it is most emphasized in adolescents learning religious subjects and according to this they appreciate honesty and peace of mind most highly as a value. Still, all

three groups of surveyors agree in the opinion that pleasure and the world of wonderfulness aren't as much important in their lives, as are love and the care for close ones and friendship.

Regarding the differences in the preferred values and life styles we can conclude that:

a) Adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics consider as most important the faith in God and a life according to their learning about faith; then to meet a person who will love them and they will love and with him or her form a family they will totally devote to. It is also quite significant to them to help other people. These adolescents also differ from the other groups of surveyors because they prefer more instrumental values: honesty, helping, cooperation, generosity and clean, and less competing, logics and capability. This group of surveyors unlike the rest prefers significantly more these terminal values: peace of mind, peace in the world and social justice, and less: pleasure, economic welfare, self-respect and exciting life. Equity is appreciated more by adolescents neither learning ethics, nor religious subjects, but less by adolescents learning ethics.

b) Adolescents learning ethics consider as most important the care for the family and to have a well-paid job providing them full material safety and possibility to be independent and care for their own welfare. This group of surveyors respect capability was significantly more than the other groups of surveyors and significantly less decisiveness and clean as ways of behavior. They prefer cooperation, helping, generosity and competing as instrumental values significantly more than adolescents neither learning ethics, nor religious subjects, but significantly less than adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics. Regarding life goals, this group of surveyors prefer: self-respect, equity and pleasure significantly more than the other two groups of surveyors, and peace of mind significantly less than all of the surveyors. They appreciate peace in the world more than adolescents neither learning ethics, nor religious subjects, but significantly less than adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics. The economic welfare, they appreciate significantly more than adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics, but significantly less than adolescents neither learning ethics, nor religious subjects.

c) For adolescents neither learning ethics, nor religious subjects family also comes first, but also material safety, as to fun

and pleasure in life is also of large significance to them. From the instrumental values, this group of surveyors prefers decisiveness and logics significantly more than the other two groups of surveyors, and significantly less than three groups of survey or give importance to competing, generosity, cooperation, helping and honesty. They prefer capability significantly more than adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics, but less than adolescents learning ethics. This group of surveyors, unlike the other two groups, prefers significantly more following terminal values: exciting life and economic welfare, and significantly less: social justice, equity and peace in the world. Self-respecting and pleasure prefer more than adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics, but less than adolescents with learning ethics. Peace of mind they appreciate more than adolescents learning ethics, but significantly less than adolescents learning religious subjects and ethics.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The studying of the values and value orientations is especially important in the adolescent age, because it is the period of the ontogenesis when a development of value orientations happens enabling their functioning as a separate system. They especially affect the person's orientation and her active social position. Many value orientations are formed just in the adolescent period because young people are more susceptible to social and culture changes in society.

The shown differences in value orientations, instrumental and terminal values among adolescents with different education type are enough to conclude that there is statistically significant difference between value orientations in adolescents depending on their education type, respectively depending on the fact they learn ethics or religious subjects or, such subjects aren't included in their lectures.

It is obvious that value orientations in adolescents are subjected to changes in the last years, and this will surely affect the future of society in general, because nowadays adolescents are the future intellectual resources of our earth. That is why the researches of this problem are important for the total society. They show the social, cultural and spiritual changes happening among young and with this in society. So, the main mission of educational institutions must be directed towards creating of conditions for full development of

personality of adolescents and their spiritual potential.

Conflict of interests

Authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Franc, R., Šakić, V. & Ivičić, I. (2002).** Vrednote i vrijednosne orijentacije adolescenata: Hierarhija i povezanost sa stavovima i ponašnjima, 215-238, Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar, Zagreb, Hrvatska.
- Joksimović, S. (1992).** Odnos učenika prema pojedinim stilovima života kao pokazatelj njihovih vrednosnih orijentacija. *Psihologija*, 25(1), 7-3.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1965).** Education, Values and Anthropological Relativity. Culture and Behavior. New York: The Free Press.
- Kuzmanović, B. (1995).** Društvene promene i promene vrednosnih orijentacija učenika, *Psihološka istraživanja* 7. Beograd: Institut za psihologiju, 17-47.
- Lazarević, D. & Janjetović, D. (2003).** Vrednosne orijentacije studenata budućih vaspitača: stabilnost ili promena, *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, 35,289-307.
- Lazarević, D. (1987).** Stilovi života mladih kao sadržaj grupnog rada sa učenicima adolescentnog doba, *Zbornik* 11, Beograd: Pedagoška akademija za obrazovanje vaspitača, 35-40.
- Matić, D. (1990).** Vrijednosti kao predmet sociološke znanosti, *Revija za sociologiju*, 3.
- Mladenović, U. & Knebl, J. (2000).** Vrednosne orijentacije i preferencije stilova života adolescenata. *Psihologija*, 3(4), 435-454.
- Pantić, D. (1995).** *Dominantne vrednosne orijentacije u Srbiji i mogućnosti nastanka civilnog društva*; bo V. Pavlović (prir.): Potisnuto civilno društvo. Beograd: Ekocentar.71-103.
- Parsons, T. & Shils, E. (1962).** Toward a General Theory of Action. New York: Harper & Row.
- Popadić, D. (1990).** Učeničke preferencije načina života; bo N. Havelkaiser. Efekti osnovnog školovanja. Beograd: Institut za psihologiju, 235-259.
- Popadić, D. (1995).** Uzrasne i generacijske razlike u preferenciji životnih stilova, *Psihološka istraživanja* 7. Beograd: Institut za psihologiju, 71-88.
- Rokeach, M. (1973).** The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press.
- Rot, N., & Havelka, N. (1973).** Nacionalna vezanost i vrednosti kod srednjoškolske omladine. Beograd: Institut za psihologiju i Institut društvenih nauka.
- Vasović, M. (1988).** Vrednosti pripadnika neformalnih

- grupa; во S. Joksimović i sar. (прir.): Mladi i neformalne grupe. Beograd: IIC SSO Srbije i CIR SSO Beograd, 174-216.
- Битинас Б. (1971).** Многомерный анализ в педагогике и педагогической психологии. Вильнюс.
- Голуб А. М. (2009).** Формирование ценностных ориентаций молодежи в процессе досуговой деятельности, Сацьялна-педагогична работа. 4, 53-57.
- Јоксимовић, С. & Јањетовић, Д. (2008).** Појам о себи и вредноснеоријентације адолесцената, Зборник Института за педагошка истраживања. Београд. 2, 288-305.
- Јоксимовић, С. & Максић, С. (2006).** Вредносне оријентације адолесцената: усмереност према сопственој доброты и доброти других. Зборник Института за педагошка истраживања, Београд. 2, 415-429.
- Кокковић, Д. & Лазар, Ж. (2004).** Друштвена традиција и промене у систему вредности: пример Војводине, Социолошки преглед, 1-2, 249-265.
- Петровић, Ј. & Зотовић, М. (2012).** Адолесценти у Србији: у трагању за новим вредностима. Зборник. Универзитет у Новом Саду, Филозофски факултет, Одсек за психологију. Ниш, 1, 47-66.
- Рејк, Б. & Едкок, К. (1978).** Вредности, ставови и промена понашања. Београд: Нолит.
- Серпел, Р. (1978).** Утицај културе на понашање. Београд, Нолит.
- Сологуб И. Ф. (2003).** Ценностные ориентации учащихся гимназий, Адукација і вихаванне. 6, 55-58.
- Стојанова, Б. & Милошева, Ј. (2009).** Вредносни ориентации кај адолесцентите. Воспитание, Списание за теорија и практика. Педагошки факултет, Универзитет Гоце Делчев, Штип, 6, 10, 55-61.
- Фрицханд, А. (2007).** Моралната интелигенција на адолесцентите во денешен општествен контекст, Годишен зборник на Филозофски факултет, Vol. 60. Скопје.
- Широких О. (2007).** К вопросу о формировании нравственных ценностных ориентаций, Дошкольное воспитание. 9, 23-27.