

VALUE HIERARCHY OF FUTURE SUBJECT TEACHERS IN SERBIA IN THE CONTEXT OF SCHWARTZ THEORY*

Milica Marušić

Institute for Educational Research, Belgrade, Serbia**

Andreas Oikonomou

School of Pedagogical and Technological Education,
Thessaloniki, Greece

Abstract. High concordance of value priorities and actual behaviour implies the importance of studying values, especially on teachers as important agents of socialization. The theoretical framework comprises *Schwartz theory of individual values*, a taxonomy of values which embraces ten value types with different motivational goals. We applied a questionnaire in the form of five-point Likert-scale with a comprehensive list of values on the sample of 163 students, future teachers. The value hierarchy was defined as the set of the most important and less important values. For data analysis we used: descriptive statistics, paired-samples t-test; frequencies of ranks; and principal component analysis. We compared the value hierarchy of our student sample with the results obtained for the samples of students, teachers and representative samples in the cross-national study conducted by Schwartz and his associates. Generally speaking, our research results are in concordance with the results of the cross-cultural study, suggesting that the most important values can be found among the value types *Benevolence*, *Universalism* and *Self-direction*, while less important values belong to the types *Stimulation*, *Power* and *Tradition*. The main difference from the international study results is found in the treatment of the value type *tradition*, placed at the bottom of the hierarchy by our sample of students.

Key words: Schwartz theory of values, value hierarchy, future teachers, Serbia.

* *Note.* This article is the result of the projects *Improving the quality and accessibility of education in modernization processes in Serbia*, No. 47008 (2011–2014), *From encouraging initiative, cooperation and creativity in education to new roles and identities in society*, No. 179034 (2011–2014) financially supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (2011–2014).

** E-mail: millica13@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

Values are most often understood as “*an individual’s personal beliefs about how he or she ‘should’ or ‘ought’ to behave*” (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998: 354), “*a desirable model of behaviour*” (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998: 351), “*systems of ethics, ideologies and philosophies*” (Berings *et al.*, 2004: 351), or traits, activities and principles that people consider important and tend to implement in their lives (Bópoç, 2006). Personal values or values as principles refer to particular beliefs and guiding principles about how people should behave (Parks & Guay, 2009). Therefore, values can be defined on the continuum of presence of moral criteria; some values do have a strong moral connotation, while others refer to inter-individual differences in preferences (Berings *et al.*, 2004). Values as guiding principles have been studied comparatively and categorized on the basis of their motivational content in the Schwartz model (Schwartz, 1992). This particular model serves as a theoretical basis for a great number of studies of values (Parks & Guay, 2009). Schwarz has proposed two value theories. The first one describes value structure when countries are used as units of analysis – *Schwartz theory of cultural values* (Schwartz, 2006). This theoretical model consists of three cultural value dimensions: *Egalitarianism-Hierarchy*, *Embeddedness-Autonomy* and *Harmony-Mastery* and should be utilized when studying differences between cultural groups (Schiefer, 2013). The second describes personal values and will be used for the purpose of our research. *Schwartz theory of individual values* is a taxonomy of values, consisting of ten value types, constructed on the basis of their orientation towards self (*Person-Focused*) or towards others (*Social-Focused*) (Fontaine *et al.*, 2008). The person-focused value types belong to two dimensions: *Self-enhancement* and *Openness to Change*, while the social-focused values can be placed inside the dimension of *Conservation* or *Self-transcendence*. The description of these value types is in the following lines.

Person-focused values belonging to Self-enhancement:

- (1) *Power*, embracing values connected to social prestige, public image, authority, dominance and material goods.
- (2) *Achievement* focuses on personal success in a different way, through development of competences congruent with social standards. This type consists of values such as influence, ambition and success.

Person-focused values belonging to Openness to Change:

- (3) *Hedonism* is displayed by a tendency towards seeking pleasure and enjoying life.
- (4) *Stimulation* is defined by values such as: varied and exciting life, challenge and adventure.
- (5) *Self-direction* presumes independence and freedom, creating and exploring.

The *social-focused* dimension of *Self-transcendence* embraces the following value types:

- (6) *Universalism* – understanding, tolerance and protection of the welfare of all people and nature, consisting of values like social justice, friendship, peace and mature love.
- (7) *Benevolence*, which implies an orientation towards “*preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact*”.

Conservation, also a *social-focused* dimension, consists of three value types:

- (8) *Tradition*, the value type defined as “*respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self*”, contains values such as: humble, accepting my portion in life, respect for tradition.
- (9) *Conformity*, understood as obedience and respect of social norms, avoidance of actions that are in discrepancy with social expectations; and
- (10) *Security*, embracing values focused on “*safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self*” (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001: 270).

The model suggests that values are organized dynamically, being mutually compatible and incompatible and representing ten different motivational goals (Fontaine *et al.*, 2008). “*Although individuals differ substantially in the importance they attribute to values that comprise the 10 value types, near universal structure of motivational oppositions and compatibilities apparently organizes their values*” (Schwartz & Sagie, 2000: 469). In the present model, the dimension of *Self-Enhancement* is opposite to *Self-Transcendence*, and *Conservation* is opposite to the dimension *Openness to Change*. Therefore, we can expect that a person whose value priorities consist of social power, wealth and authority (value type power), also appreciates influence and success (type achievement) but does not consider important the values belonging to benevolence or universalism value type (for example, social justice, responsibility, equality and true friendship). The Schwartz theoretical model was proved to be valid in 47 different cultures (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Furthermore, research results indicate that there is a high consensus across the world about the type of values that are considered important and not important (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). In 13 representative or near representative samples taken from different nations, the hierarchy of values was tested, displaying the average hierarchy of personal values: *Benevolence* as the most highly rated value type; *Self-direction* at the second rank, *Universalism* at the third place and *Security* at fourth. Still, between *Self-direction*, *Security* and *Universalism*, there was no statistically important difference in the level of importance. Other value types were judged in the following way: *Conformity* as fifth, followed by *Achievement* and *Hedonism* (without a statistically significant difference); *Stimulation*, *Tradition* and, at the last place, *Power*. In

77 samples of teachers almost the same hierarchy was obtained cross-culturally: *Benevolence* as the first value, followed by *Self-direction*, *Universalism*, *Security* and *Conformity*. Less important values were *Achievement*, *Hedonism*, *Tradition*, *Stimulation* and *Power*. We can see that all value types except *Tradition* and *Stimulation* have the same order in the hierarchical line. The correlation between the mean value rating of the samples representative for the population in general and the samples of teachers is very high (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). We can conclude that the system of values adopted by the teacher population strongly matches the system of values of the general population, which leads to a hypothesis that teacher work implies preservation of values already existing in the society.

When compared to the results obtained for the student population, the results of representative samples also show a high concordance. Still, some difference is observed in the value hierarchy between teachers and students – less important values for students take the following order: hedonism, stimulation, tradition and finally power (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Schwartz and Bardi (2001) interpret these differences by the social position of teachers and their professional role, which makes them less open to change, and more devoted to security, tradition and conformity, compared to students.

The hierarchy of values defined through self-reported judgment of certain values can be deemed unreliable in predicting the actual behaviour. Still, there is a significant number of empirical results from different countries that provide evidence of high concordance between the self-reported value priorities and actual behaviour (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). There is also evidence of the importance of values over personality traits for an explanation of professional behaviour (Berings *et al.*, 2004). Since value priorities correlate with individuals' behaviour, it is especially significant to investigate the system of values of the profession that is responsible for the upbringing of new generations. The value hierarchy is integrated into the implicit theories of teaching, and serves as the basis of the way teachers use their scientific knowledge and perceive their surrounding (Georgiadis *et al.*, 2009). Therefore, values shape the perception of the world and events and strongly determine the way one fulfils their professional role. Second, after getting an insight into the values of students – future teachers, we can, with great certainty, understand more about the values of nowadays students and population in general, since the correlation between the value rating of samples representative for the population and student samples proves to be very high (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001).

METHODOLOGY

The present research finds its goal in identifying the hierarchy of values of future subject teachers in Serbia through analysis of the data in the context of Schwartz value theory.

The questions to be answered by this research are the following:

- (a) What is the value hierarchy of the teachers-to-be in Serbia?
- (b) What is the inner structure of the values estimated most important and less important?
- (c) How similar is the identified value hierarchy to the average hierarchy across nations (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001)?

This is a positivistically oriented, quantitative empirical research. A survey method was used, with questionnaire as an instrument for data collection. We have used the same instrument previously in a research conducted with the same goal in Greece (Georgiadis *et al.*, 2009). It consists of 80 items (values) demanding from the respondents to mark on a 5-point Likert-type scale the importance of the listed values. After that the respondents are asked to rank the five most important values from the list. It is considered a comprehensive list of values that covers the complete spectrum of personal, social and moral development (Georgiadis *et al.*, 2009). The Cronbach alpha instrument reliability (inner consistency for the scale of 80 items and for 163 respondents) is high ($\alpha=0,957$).

Data analysis

Data analysis was performed in the SPSS 20 software. Values were operationalized through the judgment of respondents who stated the level of importance of a certain value for them personally – from not important at all to very important. The importance of each value was measured through descriptive statistical data; the value hierarchy was determined through the average value of the answers obtained on 1–5 the scale (1 – not important at all, 2 – not important, 3 – somewhat important, 4 – important, 5 – very important); the values with arithmetical mean over 4,50 were considered as the most important values, while the criterion for the determination of less important values was an arithmetical mean significantly lower than 4,00; the significance of differences of value importance was calculated by paired-samples t-test; the most important values were identified by calculating the frequencies of ranks; the structure of the value system was described after the principal component analysis of the values was used to select the most important and less important ones; the content of extracted factors was analyzed in terms of Schwartz value theory. The hierarchy of values was then compared to Schwartz research results. It is hence our aim to find out if the bodies of values obtained by using other value inventory than the one used in the original research resemble the value types discovered by Schwartz and his associates (Fontaine *et al.*, 2008; Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001).

Sample. The sample consisted of 163 final year students, 53 (32,5%) male and 110 (67,5%) female; age 20 to 32 (age arithmetical mean 23). These students are prepared for teaching profession through special programmes for teacher education, or through pedagogical and didactical courses; they attend

the following programs: Chemistry teachers, Faculty of Chemistry, University of Belgrade; Biology teachers, Faculty of Natural Sciences, University of Novi Sad; Sociology, Philosophy and History, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, special courses at the Centre for Teacher Education; English Philology, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade. Therefore, our respondents were students highly likely to become teachers, since they have oriented themselves towards obtaining the necessary knowledge for this profession, through special programmes for teachers or adapted pedagogical and didactical university courses.

RESULTS

The most important values of future teachers

To present the value hierarchy of our sample of students, we will first list the values with the highest arithmetical mean, over 4,5, where 5 means “very important” (Table 1).

Table 1: The most important values of future teachers in Serbia

Value	Min	Max	AM	Std. Dev.
1. Health	2	5	4,77	,548
2. Freedom	1	5	4,76	,542
3. Respect	3	5	4,75	,534
4. Laughter	3	5	4,74	,528
5. Friendship	3	5	4,74	,531
6. Family	1	5	4,74	,646
7. Knowledge	3	5	4,73	,497
8. Honesty	2	5	4,69	,614
9. Trust	2	5	4,64	,635
10. Self-respect	3	5	4,64	,607
11. Justice	1	5	4,61	,679
12. Dignity	2	5	4,60	,708
13. Being positive	1	5	4,54	,773
14. Intelligence	2	5	4,53	,631
15. Personal development	1	5	4,53	,714
16. Understanding	2	5	4,53	,678

We can see that the most important values are connected with the respondents' close surroundings. The listed values are grouped around the social dimension, and can be understood as the tendency of keeping friendship, good relations and good humour. These values display an orientation towards social environment; at the same time, they embrace the majority of values (from our comprehensive list) that refer to fair relations with the social surrounding. Therefore, we can conclude that the values judged as very important by future teachers belong mostly to the dimension of *Self-transcendence*.

On the other hand, there is a significant number of very important values, oriented towards the personal dimension, displaying focus on personal development and improvement. We can conclude that students consider rather important having the opportunity for unobstructed personal growth, as much as they consider valuable their own health, family or friends. Intelligence, interpreted by Schwartz as an indicator of the value type achievement, easily fits the icon of a person oriented towards personal excellence and advancement. Finally, health, the value with the highest arithmetical mean, can be considered a very basic value, an ultimate condition for accomplishing other goals and aspirations named in the list.

The internal structure of values estimated as most important

The internal structure of the values listed above was determined by principal component analysis. We have performed this analysis in order to see how the values selected as the most important ones tend to be grouped, having in mind the value type definitions offered by Schwartz theory. The orthogonal Varimax rotation was applied since the theoretical model presupposes that each value belongs to only one value type.

The principal component analysis extracted four components with eigenvalue over 1, with 61,23% variance explained (Table 2). The loadings of variables on the first factor indicate an appreciation of the wellbeing of the society (friendship, freedom, justice, understanding, family) and resemble the value type *Universalism*. The second factor also embraces social-focused values respect, honesty and trust, which can be identified with the value type *Benevolence*, indicating a tendency towards preserving fair relations with people from the close social surrounding. The third factor embraces values oriented towards the personal level of functioning. The embraced values (self-respect, dignity, personal development, being positive) match *Self-direction* as a value type oriented towards personal growth, independency and creation, with the exception of the value health, understood by Schwartz as connected with *Self-enhancement* and *Power*. According to our research data, health should be considered as a value associated with personal development and wellbeing. The value intelligence is the only one with high loading on the fourth factor, which implicates its independence from other values considered in this analy-

sis. This is in accordance with Schwartz theory, since this value is connected with another value type (*Achievement*).

Table 2: Internal structure of the values recognized as most important

	Component			
	Universalism	Benevolence	Self-direction	Intelligence
Friendship	,742	,138	,094	,028
Freedom	,552	,326	,071	,258
Laughter	,590	,219	,315	,196
Knowledge	,520	,044	,346	,142
Health	,025	,125	,716	,141
Respect	,185	,821	,240	,027
Honesty	,268	,850	,138	-,092
Trust	,412	,615	,126	,311
Self-respect	,111	,345	,694	,091
Justice	,609	,474	,029	,152
Intelligence	,212	,048	,209	,821
Dignity	,125	,374	,496	,382
Being positive	,373	-,018	,635	-,162
Personal development	,329	,054	,600	,348
Understanding	,646	,421	,150	,124
Family	,562	,237	,381	-,362

In Table 3 we have presented arithmetical means of values embraced by the factors *Universalism*, *Benevolence* and *Self-direction*. From this table we can conclude that there is no difference in rating of values belonging to types *Universalism* and *Benevolence* (Sig.=,984). Hence, these value types can be placed at the first place of value hierarchy. The second place belongs to *Self-direction*, slightly less important than *Universalism* (Sig.=0,25).

When compared to the results obtained in the cross-cultural study conducted by Schwartz and associates (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001), the results we have presented seem rather similar. For 77 teacher samples, taken from 56 dif-

ferent nations, the mean importance ratings were the highest for *Benevolence*, then for *Self-direction* and *Universalism*; the same results were generated for 81 college student samples from 54 nations. The values estimated as the most important ones by Serbian students demonstrate an orientation towards family and friends, self-directedness and maintenance of good social relations. We have proved that the majority of values estimated as most important by our respondents belong to the value types resembling *Benevolence*, *Universality* and *Self-direction*, which is in concordance with the findings of the comprehensive cross-cultural study.

Table 3: Comparison of mean rating of the three most important value types

Pair	Mean ratings	t	df	Sig.
Universalism – Benevolence	4,69 – 4,69	0,020	160	,984
Benevolence – Self Direction	4,69 – 4,62	1,943	161	,054
Universalism – Self Direction	4,69 – 4,62	2,270	159	,025

What are the three most important values of future teachers?

Since there are a lot of values with high arithmetical means, we have analyzed the value ranks ordered by our respondents. Out of 80 items named on the list, students chose the following ones as the three most important (Table 4):

Table 4: The most important values of future subject teachers

Value	Rank 1		Rank 2			Rank 3		
	F	%	Value	F	%	Value	F	%
Health	48	31%	Family	30	19%	Love	21	14%
Family	26	17%	Health	20	13%	Family	9	6%
Love	13	8%	Love	17	11%	Friendship	13	8%

It is rather easy to conclude that the most important values for the teachers-to-be comprise health (the most important value for 31% of respondents), family (the most important value for 17% of respondents), and love (it is the most important value for 8% of respondents). These values were placed most frequently among the first most important as well as among the second most

important values. For 19% of our subjects the family is the second most important value; health is considered the second most important by 13% of respondents, while love is valued as the second most important by 11% of our subjects. The values found in the third line of ranking are again love (14%) and family (6%). The last value on the list is friendship, ranked as the third most important value by 8% of respondents.

From the results we have analyzed so far, we can conclude that health, family and love are the values of the utmost importance for our samples of students – future teachers, but we can also suppose with great certainty that these values are considered most important by the population in general (according to Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Hence we can mark them as general values. The constellation of values ranked as the first ones shows an interest in people in the closest environment – partner relationship, family members, or towards creating family.

Less important values of future teachers in Serbia

The cross-cultural study has recognized less important values among the value types *Stimulation*, *Tradition* and *Power*. We have presented less important values of our respondents, identified as the values with the lowest arithmetical mean, significantly lower than 4,00 “important”.

Table 5: Less important values for future teachers

Value	Min	Max	AM	Std. Dev.
70. Tradition	1	5	3,75	1,192
71. Challenge	1	5	3,74	0,942
72. Faith, religion	1	5	3,62	1,389
73. Homeland	1	5	3,61	1,371
74. Adventure	1	5	3,53	1,118
75. Physical appearance	1	5	3,50	1,113
76. Prestige	1	5	3,50	1,157
77. Beauty	1	5	3,45	1,123
78. Competitiveness	1	5	3,45	1,134
79. Flag	1	5	3,20	1,441
80. Conservatism	1	5	2,74	1,270

We observe from Table 5 that the only values considered not important are conservatism and flag, both belonging to the sub-dimension of *Tradition* – “respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide” (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001: 270). Although other values presented in Table 5 cannot be considered unimportant, they have still obtained a smaller average than the other 69 values from the questionnaire and hence can be considered less important.

Internal structure of less important values

The same procedure of principal component extraction was performed for less important values in order to determine how these values tend to be clustered. Three components with the ability to explain 64% of the total variance were extracted after using the orthogonal Varimax rotation (Table 6).

Table 6: Internal structure of the values recognized as less important

	Component		
	Tradition	Power	Stimulation
Adventure	-,077	,030	,819
Physical appearance	,087	,894	,088
Conservatism	,468	,266	-,060
Homeland	,849	,038	,018
Prestige	,194	,589	,255
Competitiveness	,273	,226	,662
Tradition	,855	,026	,072
Faith, religion	,618	,181	,165
Flag	,837	,010	,165
Beauty	,041	,883	,106
Challenge	,108	,155	,819

The first factor includes the values conservatism, homeland, tradition, faith and flag, and it clearly indicates an attitude towards tradition and the values embedded in it. The second factor, comprising physical appearance, prestige and beauty, resembles the value type *Power* (understood as acquiring social power and preserving public image), while the third factor, containing adventure, challenge and competitiveness, can be considered similar to the value

type *Stimulation*, understood as an appreciation of exciting and varied events (Fontaine *et al.*, 2008; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). The obtained factors *Tradition*, *Power* and *Stimulation* are highly representative for the groups of items in the questionnaire referring to value types *Tradition*, *Power* and *Stimulation*.

When compared, the mean ratings of values belonging to the three factors, show statistically important differences (Table 7). *Tradition* is rated as less important than both *Power* and *Stimulation* ($t=-2,101$; $Sig=,037$; $t=-2,090$, $Sig=,038$), and it can be considered the least important value, finding itself at the bottom of the hierarchy of future subject teachers in Serbia. Other two groups of values have almost equal mean ratings, and we conclude that there is no difference in the assessment of the importance of values contained in *Power* and *Stimulation* ($t=-0,121$; $Sig=,904$).

In the cross-national study of values, the least important value types for the samples representative for 13 nations were the following: *Stimulation* rated eighth, *Tradition* ninth, and *Power* tenth – the least important value. The same ranks were obtained for student samples, while for teacher samples, the ranking was somewhat different: *Tradition* and *Stimulation* switched places – *Tradition* taking the rank 8 and *Stimulation* the rank 9. Again, the value type *Power* took the last place (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001).

Table 7: Comparison of mean rating of the three least important value types

Pair	Mean ratings	t	df	Sig.
Tradition – Power	3,29 – 3,48	-2,101	162	,037
Power – Stimulation	3,48 – 3,49	-0,121	160	,904
Tradition – Stimulation	4,29 – 4,49	-2,090	160	,038

Here we observe the concordance of our results with the results of the cross-cultural study: the values contained in value types *Stimulation*, *Tradition* and *Power* are less important than other values. Still, a difference occurred in the estimation of tradition since values belonging to this value type are obviously the least important ones for our sample of students. These results are rather significant for further analysis and can be understood as a negative attitude towards national symbols. The most probable interpretation for the low valuation of tradition is connected with an instable socio-political situation maintaining in Serbia for decades.

Discussion

In the present study we have analyzed the most important and less important values from the point of view of Serbian students, future teachers. Since research methodology (instrument, sample, data analysis) is different than the methodology of Schwartz comparative study (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001) we cannot expect a complete match of the results.¹ Nevertheless, our results do allow the qualitative analysis of the content of the factors identified inside the body of values judged as the most important and less important ones, as well as an interpretation of the data in the context of Schwartz theory. This analysis indicates a concordance of value hierarchy reported by Serbian students with the hierarchy established across the world, and a relative concordance of the internal structure of values with the value types defined through Schwartz and associates' scientific work. Therefore, as the most important value types in the hierarchy of Serbian teachers-to-be we find those resembling *Universality*, *Benevolence* and *Self-direction*. No importance in mean rating was noticeable between *Benevolence* and *Universality*, and the values belonging to these types created the top of the hierarchy (family, friendship, respect, freedom, justice, honesty, knowledge etc.). *Self-direction*, as the concern for one's own good humour and the possibility for development, is slightly less important, taking the second place in the hierarchy. These results are somewhat different from the results obtained for student samples in the cross-national study, where *Benevolence* and *Self-direction* were rated the same, taking the first place (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Therefore, we can conclude that, compared to the average ratings in student samples from other countries, Serbian students – future teachers are slightly more oriented towards the social than the individual aspect of the value system.

On the top of the value hierarchy two parallel tendencies can be perceived: towards keeping fair relations with the surrounding, fitting in and being a part of the community and, at the same time, towards being a self-conscious, independent, developing individual. These tracks can be recognized in the implicit theories of upbringing, identified in teachers (Stojiljković & Dosković, 2006). There are two concepts of moral education identifiable within teachers: educating pupils through internalization of society's moral standards – shaping individuals according to existing moral norms and rules, in order to get em-

¹ The instrument used in Schwartz & Bardi (2001) research comprises the list of 56 values (within 10 value types), followed by an explanatory phrase, where the respondent rates the importance of each value as his/her guiding principle; the comparative study uses representative or near representative samples for the general population, student and teacher population; in the statistical analysis mean ratings and statistical differences between the ratings were calculated. In our research, 80 values are described by single words, with no explanation – respondents need to judge how important certain values are in their life; we used a sample representative of a certain group of students – future teachers in one country; statistical analysis relies on groups of values defined by PCA of most and less important values; mean ratings and their comparison were calculated in the same way as in Schwartz & Bardi, 2001.

bedded into the social surrounding. The other concept displays an orientation towards discovering and supporting individual's potentials, facilitating their growth, and helping them become and achieve the best they can. These concepts of education are maintained in the society and they help maintain the society. And we can easily understand that the existing value hierarchy is a consequence of these educational concepts constant coexistence.

The authors of the study relied on Parsons' explanation of values through their social function – motivation and control of group behaviour (Parsons, according to Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). The orientation towards family and people from close social surrounding, an appreciation of friendship, equality, justice and trust are certainly the prerequisites for smooth functioning of a community. The transmission of socially desirable values enables the survival of the society and directs construction of the relations inside it. By spreading these highly socially desirable values as life priorities, parents, teachers and other actors of socialization contribute to the survival and wellbeing of a particular society. Therefore, teachers seem to be a rather significant resource for studying value hierarchy, in the first place since both consciously and unconsciously they play a role in value hierarchy transmission and construction.

The values estimated as less important by Serbian future subject teachers are those similar to Schwartz value types *Stimulation*, *Power* and *Tradition*. The results indicate that the value type *Tradition* is significantly less important than the other value types, which is the reason why we placed *Tradition* at the bottom of value hierarchy. This result is not in concordance with the mean rating obtained for student samples in the cross-cultural study, and we consider it rather important. Among the least important values from the point of view of Serbian teachers we find religion, homeland, flag and tradition. In the country whose religion was forbidden and forgotten, students have lived to see their homeland change name and shape many times, as well as its national symbols, which resulted in a confusion and underestimation of their own national identity. In addition, the picture of Serbia, often created in a negative way by foreign media and policy, has certainly affected the manner of identification of youngsters with their nation.

We should remark that our research goal was to identify the most important and less important values of the student sample. Hence we did not display the mean rating of values in between. Still, on the basis of Schwartz model, we conclude that there are value types such as *Security*, *Conformity*, *Achievement* and *Hedonism* located in the continuum between *Benevolence*, *Universalism* and *Self-direction* and *Stimulation*, *Power* and *Tradition* (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001).

Teachers are supposed to be transmitters of culture and values, and it is reasonable to expect (according to our data) from young teachers in Serbia not to be devoted to the development of patriotism and the sense of national identity, and preserving of national tradition. This is certainly a problem to be addressed through educational system, the media and policies. Nevertheless,

when trying to estimate the possible influence of teachers' value priorities, we should bear in mind the research results indicating the reduction of school's influence on children upbringing (Maksić, 2001). These findings certainly raise concerns since the main goals of school work defined by the law do embrace ethical education of children and developing the sense of belonging to the state of Serbia (Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja, 2011). That is why we strongly suggest research of pupils' attitude towards national culture, history and tradition.

As far as the possibility of generalization of our data is concerned, we can consider the data liable to generalization on the student population in Serbia nowadays. Still, although the results indicate a high concordance of mean ratings given by student samples and representative samples (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001), we should have in mind certain facts. First of all, previous generations in Serbia were growing up in a different socio-political system, witnessing the state of economic and social security, and presumably their value preferences are rather different than the preferences of young generations (Stewart & Healy, 1989). Further on, students are a selected population, having a higher educational level and socio-economic status, living in bigger cities etc. Also, the sample of students can hardly be representative for the certain group of people possessing political and economic power and control. Having in mind empirical research findings that indicate differences in value preferences of people belonging to different strata of the society as well as the tendency towards preservation of value hierarchy inside a certain stratum, we are inclined to limit the possibility of our data generalization (Joksimović *et al.*, 2008; Popović i Miočinović, 1977).

Conclusion

In the concluding part we will briefly summarize our answers to the questions posed in this paper.

- (1) The top of the value hierarchy of students, future teachers in Serbia consists of value types we have named in terms of Schwartz theory: *Benevolence*, *Universalism* and *Self-direction*. The bottom of the hierarchy consists of *Stimulation*, *Power* and *Tradition*.
- (2) The inner structure of the most important values consists of the three value types named above:
 - *Universalism*, embracing values: Friendship, Freedom, Laughter, Knowledge, Justice, Understanding and Family;
 - *Benevolence*, consisting of: Respect, Honesty and Trust;
 - *Self-direction*, with values: Health, Self-respect, Dignity, Being positive and Personal development.

Less important values are clustered in the following types:

- *Stimulation*, containing values: Adventure, Challenge, Competitive-ness;
 - *Power*, embracing values: Physical appearance, Prestige and Beauty;
 - *Tradition*, consisting of: Conservatism, Homeland, Tradition, Faith-Religion and Flag.
- (3) The value hierarchy obtained in Serbian students is rather similar to that obtained in students cross-culturally. The exceptions are found in the estimation of values embraced by *Self-direction*, considered somewhat less important than the values oriented towards others, contained in *Universalism*; and values inside the type *Tradition*, estimated less important than the list of values inside the *Power* value type.

Limitations. We have already pointed out the methodological differences between the Schwartz and Bardi (2001) comparative study and our own research. Since the lists of values used in these studies differ, the comparison of value factors with value types relies on content analysis, and the factors we have obtained necessarily consist of somewhat different values than the value types identified by Schwartz (for example, the value type *Power* consists of indicators of the public image preservation and prestige, but it does not contain dominance over people and goods; the value type *Tradition* includes attitudes towards tradition, without personal characteristics, such as devoted, accepting my portion in life etc.). This methodological obstacle makes the obtained results less comparable to the results of the comparative study. For the overcoming of this limitation, we suggest a new study applying simultaneously in the same sample the 80 Values Questionnaire and the Schwartz instrument SVS, in order to interpret, compare, and discuss the results, taking into account at the same time the context of the Schwartz value theory and the open approach proposed by Georgiadis, Oikonomou and Menexes (Georgiadis *et al.*, 2009).

Reference

- Berings, D., Fruyt, F. & Bowen, R. (2004). Work Values and Personality Traits as Predictors of Enterprising and Social Vocational Interests. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 36, No. 2, 349–364.
- Fontaine, R. J., Poortinga, Y. H., Delbeke, L. & Schwartz, S. H. (2008). Structural Equivalence of the Value Domain across Cultures: Distinguishing Sampling Fluctuations from Meaningful Variation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 39, No. 4, 345–365.
- Georgiadis, M., Oikonomou, A., & Menexes, G., Γεωργιάδης Μ., Οικονόμου, Α. & Μενεξές Γ. (2009). Research on Personal Values of Student-Teachers in the one Year Pedagogical Training Program of the School of Pedagogical and Technological Education. *Διερεύνηση των προσωπικών αξιών σπουδαστών του Ετήσιου Προγράμματος Παιδαγωγικής Κατάρτισης της Ανώτατης Σχολής Παιδαγωγικής και Τεχνολογικής Εκπαίδευσης. Data Analysis Bulletin* Τετράδια Ανάλυσης Δεδομένων 10, 157–175.

- Joksimović, S., Pavlović, Z. & Maksić, S. (2008). Socioekonomski status i stavovi građana prema ciljevima vaspitanja dece. U S. Gašić & S. Joksimović (ur.), *Obrazovanje i siromaštvo u zemljama u tranziciji* (str. 117–132). Beograd: Institut za pedagoška istraživanja.
- Maksić, S. (2001). Uloga škole u vaspitanju mladih. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagoška istraživanja*, Vol. 33, 19–39.
- Meglino, B. M. & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual Values in Organizations: Concepts, Controversies, and Research. *Journal of Management* Vol. 24, No 3, 351–389.
- Parks, L. & Guay, R. P. (2009). Personality, values and motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 47, No. 7, 675–684.
- Popović, B. V. i Miočinović, L. Đ. (1977). *Moralne vrednosti dece i mladih i njihov razvoj*. Beograd: Institut za pedagoška istraživanja.
- Schiefer, D. (2013). Cultural Values and Group-Related Attitudes: A Comparison of Individuals with and without Migration Background across 24 Countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 44, No. 2, 245–262.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. In M. M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 25, 1–65. New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Sagie, G. (2000). Value Consensus and Importance: A Cross-National Study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 31, No. 4, 465–497.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Bardi, A. (2001). Value Hierarchies across Cultures: Taking a Similarities Perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 32, No. 3, 268–290.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2006). A Theory of Cultural Value Orientations: Explication and Applications. *Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 5, No. 2–3, 137–182.
- Stewart, A. J., & Healy, J. M. (1989). Linking Individual Development and Social Changes. *American Psychologist*, Vol. 44, No. 1, 30–42.
- Stojiljković, S. i Dosković, Z. (2006). Implicitne teorije o moralnom vaspitanju kod nastavnika. *Godišnjak za psihologiju*, Vol. 4, Br. 4–5, 237–251.
- Βώρος, Φ. (2006). Για τις αξίες της ζωής στον ιδιωτικό και κοινωνικο-πολιτικό βίο των ανθρώπων ή Για τις αξίες που πρεσβεύουν ή παραβλέπουν οι άνθρωποι στην προσωπική και κοινωνική – πολιτική ζωή τους. Retrieved June 16, 2013, from http://www.voros.gr/them/ar1205.html#_ftn2
- Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja* (2011). Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije, Br. 72/2009 i 52/2011.

Примљено 28.07.2013; прихваћено за штампу 30.10.2013.

Милица Марушић и Андреас Иконому
ХИЈЕРАРХИЈА ВРЕДНОСТИ БУДУЋИХ НАСТАВНИКА У СРБИЈИ
У КОНТЕКСТУ ШВАРЦОВЕ ТЕОРИЈЕ

Анстракт

Висок степен сагласности између вредносних приоритета и стварног понашања указује на важност проучавања вредности, посебно вредности наставника као важних агенаса социјализације. Теоријски оквир овог рада представља *Шварцова теорија индивидуалних вредности*, таксономија вредности која обухвата десет типова вредности са различитим мотивационим циљевима. Примењен је упитник у форми петостепене Ликертове скале који садржи обухватну листу вредности на узорку од 163 студента, будућих наставника. Вредносна хијерархија дефинисана је као скуп најважнијих и мање важних вредности. У анализи података коришћени су дескриптивна статистика, *t* тест за паралелне узорке, фреквенције рангова и анализа главних компонената. Упоредили смо вредносну хијерархију нашег узорка студената са резултатима добијеним за узорке студената, наставника и репрезентативне узорке у интернационалној студији коју је спровео Шварц са сарадницима. Уопштено посматрано, резултати нашег истраживања у складу су са резултатима кроскултуралне студије и показују да најважније вредности спадају под вредносне категорије *доброчинство*, *универзализам* и *самоусмереност*, док мање важне вредности припадају категоријама *стимулација*, *моћ* и *традиција*. Главна разлика у односу на резултате међународне студије јавља се на нивоу категорије *традиција* коју наши студенти смештају на дно хијерархије вредности.

Кључне речи: Шварцова теорија вредности, хијерархија вредности, будући наставници, Србија.

Милица Марушич и Андреас Иконому
ИЕРАРХИЯ ЦЕННОСТЕЙ БУДУЩИХ УЧИТЕЛЕЙ В СЕРБИИ
В КОНТЕКСТЕ ТЕОРИИ ШВАРЦА

Резюме

Высокая степень соответствия между ценностными приоритетами и реальным поведением указывает на важность изучения ценностей, особенно ценностей учителей как важных агентов социализации. Теоретическую основу этой работы представляет *теория индивидуальных ценностей Шварца*, систематика ценностей, которая охватывает десять типов ценностей с различными мотивационными целями. Использовалась анкета в виде пятиступенчатой шкалы Лайкерта с исчерпывающим списком ценностей на выборке из 163-х студентов, будущих учителей. Иерархия ценностей определена как совокупность наиболее важных и менее важных ценностей. При анализе данных применялась дескриптивная статистика, t-тест для параллельных выборок, частотность рангов и анализ главных компонент. Мы сравнили иерархию ценностей нашей выборки студентов с результатами, полученными на выборке студентов, учителей и результатами репрезентативной выборки из исследования, проведенного Шварцем с коллегами. В целом, результаты нашей работы соответствуют результатам кросс-культурного исследования и показывают, что наиболее важные ценности охватывают ценностные типы *доброты, универсализма и самостоятельности*, а менее важные ценности принадлежат к типам *стимуляции, власти и традиции*. Главным отличием, по отношению к результатам международного исследования, является обработка ценностного типа *традиции*, которая находится внизу иерархии у нашей выборки студентов.

Ключевые слова: теория ценностей Шварца, иерархия ценностей, будущие учителя, Сербия.