Comparing Life Values of New and Old Students of Psychology Faculty of
Soegijapranata Catholic University, Semarang, Indonesia

Margaretha Sih Setija Utami, Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia
Damasia Linggarjati Novi Parmitasari, Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia

Abstract

The purpose of the research was to compare the life values of undergraduate students of Batch 2018 with those of students of previous batch of Psychology Faculty of Soegijapranata Catholic University, Semarang, Indonesia. There were twelve life values of the students: concern for multicultural life, loyal to family/group, spirituality, concern for environment, independence, achievement, being loved, scientific, creativity, financial life, humility, and sport were measured by modified of Life Values Inventory by Brown and Crace (1996). The subjects were 471 students from batch 2017 and before; and 258 students from batch 2018. The results showed that there were four life values: concern for multicultural life, loyal to family/group, spirituality, and concern for environment of the new students were higher than those of the old students (t=-4.262, p=0.000; t=-5.722, p=0.000; t=-3.3650, p=0.000; t=-3.443, p=0.000). There were four life values: Independence, Creativity, Financial Life, and Sport of the new students were lower than those of the old students (t=2.227, p=0.026; t=3.630, p=0.000; t=6.204, p=0.000; t=3.336, p=0.001); and there were four life values: achievement, being loved, scientific, and humility of the new students were not different compare to those of the old students (t=0.158, p=0.874; t=0.087, p=0.931; t=1.269, p=0.205; t=0.428, p=0.669). It is interesting to discuss why they had difference score of some life values and they had similar score of the other values.

Keywords: Life Value, Student, Psychology Faculty

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Taormina (2017) stated that values are the ideas, concepts, and qualities that are considered important in life. Values are traditionally understood as honor and morality, but this may be more noticed by people whose basic needs are met. It is different compared to the value definitions which stated by other researches. According to Shahidul, Karim, and Suffiun, (2016), values are beliefs which are tied inseparable from emotion and subjective. Values are a motivational construct. They refer to the desirable goals people strive to attain.

According to Central Board of Secondary Education of India (2012), values are like seeds that sprout, become saplings, grow into trees and spread their branches all around. Building up of values system starts with the individual, moves on to the family and community, reorienting systems, structures and institutions, spreading throughout the land and ultimately embracing the planet as a whole.

"Values are defined as everything from eternal ideas and guiding principles that lead to desirable behavioral patterns and are positive. They involve both the cognitive and affective dimensions and provide an important basis for individual choices based on connecting thoughts and feelings and emotions leading to positive action" (Central Board of Secondary Education of India, 2012, p.16)

There are many kinds of values. According to Kulzhanova and Kulzhanova (2016), values can be divided to be two types. They are life values dan cultural values. Life values are values which given to a person by nature. Cultural values are values which created by people. Cultural values are divided into material values and spiritual values. Material values are values that fulfil bodily human needs. Spiritual values are values which satisfying spiritual needs.

This is slightly different compared to the opinion of Taormina (2017) which states that values are distinguished between modern values and traditional values. Traditional values are divided into two, namely personal traditional values and public traditional values.

According to Shahidul et.al (2016), there are six values, namely political values, theoretical values, aesthetic values, religious values, and hedonistic values. It is different comparing to Sherry and Verma concept. Sherry and Verma (in Shahidul et.al, 2016) stated that there are ten human values. They are religious, social, democratic, aesthetic, economic, knowledge, hedonistic, power, family prestige and health value. Brown & Crace (2002) divided values to be loyal to family/group, spirituality, concern for environment, independency, achievement, being loved, scientific, creativity, financial life, humility,and sport.

The influencing factors of values are different among experts' opinion. The most important determinant of values, according to Shahidul et.al (2016), is social level of family because personal values was developed in early life. But the values also can be changed by the society and social media. Kulzhanova and Kulzhanova (2016) stated that personal values are the most stable characteristics of person in society. But it can be influenced by experiences and regulation in his or her community.

Sadhana Parashar, the Director (Academics and Training) of Central Board of Secondary Education of India (2012) stated that values can be taught at school or home schooling programs. According to the Central Board of Secondary Education of India (2012) value education can be done included in curriculum or extra curriculum of an educational institution. Values cannot be taught as subjects such as Mathematics, Indonesian language, or Physics. Values education is integrated into every subject and climate schools or institutions.

The Purposes of Indonesian Higher Education according to Laws of The Republic Indonesia Number 12 of 2012 About Higher Education are 1) To grow the potency of the students to become believers and to be devoted to God Almighty and to be noble, healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent, skilled, competent, and cultured for the benefit of the nation; 2) To produce masters of Science and / or Technology to fulfill national interests and increase the competitiveness of the nation; 3) To produce Science and Technology through Researches that pay attention to and applies the value of humanities to benefit the progress of the nation, as well as the progress of civilization and the welfare of mankind; and 4) To realize Community Service based on reasoning and research works that are useful in advancing public welfare and educating the life of the nation.

To achieve the goals of the purposes of Indonesian Higher Education, Soegijapranata Catholic University states the Main Academic Interest is Eco-Settlement, we have to concern about Ecological Livelihood. The Vision of Psychology Faculty, Soegijapranata Catholic University is becoming an academic community which is meaningful for multicultural communities by biopsychosocial approach based on Christian values: love, justice, and honesty.

To acheive the vision, Psychology Faculty of Soegijapranata Catholic University has activities for students consists of taking education that included 144 credits, doing research, doing community service, and doing extracurricular programs. The extracurricular programs include leadership program; scientific programs such as academic writing and debating; community service; sports; music; dancing; singing; and religious activities. Do the activities change the life values of the students? It is interested to study the comparison between the values of new undergraduate students and the old undergraduate students. The purpose of the study is to compare the life values of undergraduate students of Batch 2018 with those of students of previous batch of Psychology Faculty of Soegijapranata Catholic University, Semarang, Indonesia.

To study the comparison among life values of the students, we used modified Life Values Inventory by Brown and Crace (2002). The inventory was modified by Utami, Pratiwi, & Parmitasari (2018), the values of university students was added with concern for multicultural life. The subjects of this research consisted of 471 students from batch 2017 and before; and 258 students from batch 2018.

The results of this study are as follows. There are four values of new students (students of batch 2018) which are higher than those of old students (students of previous batches). They are concern for multicultural life; loyal to family/group; spirituality; and concern for environment (see Table 1).

No.	Values	New Students Mean	Old Students Mean	t	p
1.	Concern for multicultural life	4.51	4.30	4.262	**
2.	Loyal to family/ group	4.18	3.89	5.722	**
3.	Spirituality	4.16	4.01	3.650	**
4.	Concern for environment	4.09	3.93	3.443	**

$*p< 0.05$, $** p< 0.001$

Table 1. The values that new students have higher score than those of old students

Table 2 shows that values related with independency, creativity, financial life, and sport of the students are lower than those of the old students.

No.	Values	New Students Mean	Old Students Mean	t	p
1.	Independency	3.88	4.00	2.227	*
2.	Creativity	3.41	3.59	3.630	**
3.	Financial Life	3.24	3.62	6.204	**
4.	Sport	2.59	2.87	3.336	**

$*p< 0.05$, $** p< 0.001$

Table 2. The values that the new students have lower score than those of old students

Table 3 shows that there are four values that the score of new students and old students are similar.

No.	Values	New Students Mean	Old Students Mean	t	p
1.	Achievement	3.82	3.82	0.158	-
2.	Being loved	3.68	3.68	0.087	-
3.	Scientific	3.60	3.65	1.269	-
4.	Humility	3.23	3.26	0.428	-

Table 3. The values that new students have similar score with those of the old students

The research results are interested to be discussed. The research showed that 1) the new students think that concern for multicultural life, loyal to family/group, spirituality, and concern for environment are more important than the old students do. Reflective questions for us are "Do we fail to teach those values to our students?" Or

"Are those values already famous among new generations that means those values are not our specialties anymore?" 2) The old students think that independency, creativity, financial life, and sport are more valuable than the new students do. Reflective questions for us are "Do the old students think about those because of their needs related with psychological developmental process as young adult?" Or "Do the old students think about that because of the study in our campus?" 3) There were four life values: achievement, being loved, scientific, and humility of the new students were not significantly different compare to those of the old students. According to Kulzhanova & Kulzhanova (2016), value orientations develop when a person gains social experience and masters the social, political, moral, and ethical ideals and immutable regulatory requirements to him or her as a member of society. The question is why the old and the new students have similar score of those values? Do they have similar social experience?

Based on my previous researches about the values of Psychology Students batch 2017 and before showed that 1) From 12 life values, only value of creativity and value of loyalty to family or group has significant correlation with the age of the students (r =0.128; p<0.05 and r=-0.119; p<0.05). It shows that the older students has higher life value on creativity than the younger students, but they have lower value of the loyalty to family or group (Utami & Parmitasari, 2018a). 2) The highest score of the life values of the students is the concern for multicultural life (M=4.292). The position of the other values are that spirituality in the second position (M =4.004), and the lowest score is the life values of sport (M=2.859). It shows that sport is not much valuable for our students (Utami & Parmitasari, 2018b).

Based on my research about the effectiveness of General Education Program (Utami & Parmitasari, 2018), there was no significant difference on life values as well as personality and preference score of the 14 students before and after joining a General Education program. But, there were differences of the pretest score between students who did not and who did the live in program on "concern others" and "loyalty to family or group".

Conclusion

1. The results showed that the determinants of life values of students are still questionable. The students have those values because of their individual condition, or because of their life experiences such as in school or in their own family.
2. The life values could not be changed by a temporary program such as short term general education program.
3. Long term research is needed.

References

Brown, D. & Crace, R.K. (2002). *Life Values Inventory. Facilitator's Guide*. Williamsburg: Applied Psychology Resources. www.lifevaluesinventory.com

Central Board of Secondary Education of India (2012). *Values Education A Handbook for Teachers*. New Delhi: The Secretary, Central Board of Secondary Education.

Kulzhanova, ZT & Kulzhanova, GT. (2016). Legal Culture as the Determinant of Value Orientations in Youth in the Society of the Transition Period (Philosophical Analysis). *International Journal Of Environmental & Science Education,* 11(12), 4997-5008.

Shahidul, S.M., Karim, A.H.M.Z., & S.M.A. Suffiun, SMA (2016). Personal Values Profile of Secondary School Students: A comparative study on Social Class Backgrounds. *IJRDO-Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 1(6), 83-102.

Taormina, R.J. (2017). Adherence to Chinese Traditional Values: Correlates and Determinants. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 7(9),* 612-617.

Utami, M.S.S. & Parmitasari, D.L.N, (2018a). *Do Age And Sex Predict Life Values Of Undergraduate Students?* Presented in International Conference Asian Association of Indigenous and Cultural Psychology (AAICP) in Sabah Kinibalu, Malaysia, 25-27 July 2018.

Utami, M.S.S. & Parmitasari, D.L.N. (2018b). *Rank of Life Values Of Undergraduate Psychology Students. Presented in* International Conference on Psychology in Semarang, 31 May-01 June 2018.

Utami, M.S.S., Pratiwi, R., & Parmitasari, D.L.N., (2018). *Does General Education Program Improve the Noble Values of Undergraduate Students?* Presented in Dritte Konferenz der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Positiv-Psychologische Forschung Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany. 03-05 May 2018.