

THE VALUES AND ATTITUDES OF YOUNG PEOPLE

Eva Abramuszkinová Pavlíková¹, Michaela Šmídová²

¹Department of Law and Social Sciences, Faculty of Business and Economics, Mendel University in Brno, Zemědělská 1, 613 00 Brno, Czech Republic

²Centre for Higher Education Studies, U Dvou srpů 2/2024, 150 00 Praha 5, Czech Republic

Abstract

ABRAMUSZKINOVÁ PAVLÍKOVÁ EVA, ŠMÍDOVÁ MICHAELA. 2017. The Values and Attitudes of Young People. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis*, 65(6): 1823–1832.

This contribution presents the research conducted at Charles University in Prague in comparison with the Mendel University in Brno. The focus is on selected aspects of values which might correspond to future job market success and also presupposed value differences of students. This innovative approach is trying to show the characteristics of young students reflecting their values, socialization and attitudes. The main aim is to analyze the differences in these two student bodies' samples with the focus on values and attitudes of future managers and business experts. The questions under focus include topics such as 1. Are students different in values because they study different field of study or are they very similar because they belong to the same age cohort? 2. Is the group of economic students homogeneous or are there big differences in value orientation? 3. Can we use this knowledge to improve educational management and prepare students successfully for their future careers? The results showed that the students of the FBE in Brno are less liberal in comparison with students of the FH from Prague. These students come from families with similar level of educational background of parents but their opinion on ideal society, where they would like to live in, is different. It seems that economic students are more diversified as there are gender differences regarding the ideal society image.

Keywords: educational management, values, attitudes, priorities, university students

INTRODUCTION

The topic of values, value preferences and the importance of value frameworks has become an interdisciplinary agenda where experts from psychology, sociology, management, economy and other disciplines exchange their knowledge on the state of the art. Sociologists are able to provide more or less representative perspective on the national preferences for the inhabitants. Psychologists are cooperating with management experts in the field of intercultural management which is becoming an alarming discipline in the age of global business. Behavioral economists are exploring what is the role of education to understand the complexity of educational investments and outcomes. As mentioned in our previous study, managerial world is traditionally supposed to be

entirely rational, whereas emotions are considered as psychological or physiological phenomena. Research shows that emotions, from the sociological perspective, in the organizations can become a key success concept of the organization. Moreover, the intercultural background may be an influential issue related to emotional behavior of managers, employees or businessmen (Pavlikova, E. A., Rozboril, B., Ziaran, P., 2015).

This contribution is focused on the values of young generation of 1st year students at two different faculties and universities in the Czech Republic. The first one, the Faculty of Business and Economics at Mendel University in Brno is located in Southern Moravia, the city of Brno. The other one, the Faculty of Humanities at Charles University, is situated in the capital city Prague. This paper

presents the explanation of the role of values, theoretical framework as well as general values in the Czech Republic, but mainly the results of own research focused on the young generation of 1st year university students.

The focus is on selected aspects of values which might correspond to future job market success and also presupposed value differences of students at these faculties. The longitudinal research among first year university students in the Czech Republic has been taking place since 2007. This innovative approach, developed by researchers at Charles University, is trying to show the characteristics of young students reflecting their values, socialization and attitudes as mentioned by Prudký *et al.* (2009) or Šmídová, Vávra and Čížek (2010). Theoretically, the research is based on the pyramid concept of values, general value priorities, value orientations, value frameworks and norms which are used in daily life as what is acceptable in behavior and what not.

The main aim is to analyze the differences in these two student bodies' samples with the focus on values and attitudes of future managers and business experts. The questions under focus include topic such as 1. Are students at these two faculties different in values because they study different field of study or are they very similar because they belong to the same age cohort? 2. Is the group of economic students homogeneous or are there big differences in value orientation? 3. Can we use this knowledge to improve educational management and prepare students successfully for their future careers?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Culture and values

As Ferraro (1998) states, culture can be defined by many concepts and authors, but to simplify, one can say that culture is basically everything that people have, think, and do as members of their society. The three main components thus include: at first, the possession of material objects, at second thinking which means ideas, values, attitudes, beliefs and at third, it is doing which makes people to behave in a prescribed way resulting in normative or expected patterns of behavior.

Culture can be presented on different levels. The culture of national or the regional society is the highest level. The corporate or organizational culture describes the way in which attitudes are expressed within a specific organization. The third level is a professional and ethical one which could be a culture of particular functions in organizations such as marketing, research and development, personnel where people with certain functions share the culture. The internationalization of business life requires more knowledge of cultural patterns. There is a theory that internalization will lead to a common culture worldwide. What is important to consider is not the fact that products and services became common to world markets

and can be found physically maybe anywhere, but what they mean to the people in each culture. The essence of culture is invisible. It is the shared ways groups of people understand and interpret the world (Trompenaars, Hampden-Turner, 1999).

The concept which we mainly use in this study was developed by L. Prudký and his team (Prudký, 2005; Prudký, 2009; Prudký, 2010). The research is based on a set of indicators which reflect value preferences as basic life values, value orientations as the focus of values, value framework as the meaning of existence, the norms of behavior including attitudes towards offences and other influences given by social, economic or demographic circumstances.

Values in Czech society

The importance of values for Czech society is reflected in the results of public opinion poll from June 2014. The representative sample based on a quote selection consisted of 1049 respondents older than 15 years which were given a standardized questionnaire during the interview. Respondents were given many item battery of questions and asked to decide which values are important for them from the areas of family life, work, social and political issues or life style. The results show that for 70% of respondents, the most important issue is happy family background, for 22% of them this item is rather important. Among very important values for 50%–75% of respondents belong assistance to family and friends, having children, having friends, having a nice housing, life in a healthy environment, have interesting job, having a meaningful and useful work, healthy life, taking care of healthy life and live according to own convictions. The comparison with the same research in 2011 shows that the answer of very important increased for the item: living in a healthy environment but also decreased for the item: own convictions. If we count together the category very important and rather important, about 70% of respondents consider as important: living in a nice environment, having always own undisturbed privacy, serving perfect professional performance, having friends which can be useful, having pleasant life and enjoy life, having any job only to avoid the state support, help people who need help, to be favorable among people, have time for hobbies and interests, to possess a general knowledge about culture, science, technology, politics, to take part in the improvement of quality of life in the place of living, to be well informed about the situation in the Czech Republic and abroad. The majority also selected as important items: having a job which enables to try new things; active participation in the protection of environment; to live interesting and exciting life; to help the development of democracy in society. It should be noted that the least important item for people is to live according the religious values and also to promote the policy of political party or a movement.

The items mentioned were included in the factor analysis, which showed seven important factors giving the structure to deeply internalized value orientation in Czech society. These factors include. 1. Private personal life: family, children, housing, nice environment, healthy life, own conviction, friends, needs of others; 2. Work as a value, as source of living, need for good work: any work, interesting work, meaningful work, good team, earn a lot of money; 3. Work and life career: important position, management function, own company, innovations, possession of nice things; 4. Civic engagement: religion principles, political party, environmental protection, community and democracy development; 5. Hedonistic approach to life: hobbies, undisturbed privacy, enjoying, possession of nice things; 6. Culture and education: be informed, general knowledge; 7. Social capital: be favorable among people, useful friends.

This research showed that there are statistical differences between young people and seniors in the following five factors. It seems to be natural that work as a value and work as a career lost its importance for seniors. The difference in civic engagement and family values, which is smaller for young people and the importance of social capital and hedonistic approach which is in the contrary higher, might be highlighting the difference in value for young and seniors. It may be assumed that the family values will become important for young people in next years but the items related to hedonistic way of life and civic engagement activities most probably may not be the case (Tuček, 2014).

Methodology

The following research was introduced at the Faculty of Humanities (FH), Charles University in Prague and at the Faculty of Business and Economics (FBE), Mendel University in Brno. The Faculty of Humanities, the youngest faculty of Charles University, offers two undergraduate Bachelor's study programs of Liberal Arts and Humanities in English and Studies of Humanities in Czech. The Faculty also offers four graduate Master's study programs of German and French Philosophy (in German), Gender Studies and Historical Sociology (in English) and Oral History and Contemporary History (in English). Students can further study at Master level 9 graduate courses and continue in several PhD study programmes. Currently, there are 795 enrolled students. Excluding distance learning students, there are 577 daily students, out of which 462 on BA level and 73 on MA level. Total number of all enrolled students by 31.12.2016 is 2415 (FH, 2017; MEYS, 2017).

Faculty of Business and Economics was established in 1959 and is the oldest business school in Moravia. It has accreditation for all degree levels: Bachelors, Masters and Ph.D. In recent accreditation the school received the highest rating (ranking in group A) as a one of the best schools

from a total of 21 business schools in the Czech Republic. It offers both economic and IT study programs at all three levels of university education in Czech and English. There are nearly 4,000 applicants on average each year. Currently, there are 843 enrolled students. Excluding distance learning students, there are 746 daily students, out of which 658 on BA level and 54 on MA level. A total number of all enrolled students by 31.12.2016 is 2882 (FBE, 2017; MEYS, 2017).

As conceptual starting point we use analytical framework of Libor Prudký (2009). This approach has been repeatedly verified in the Czech higher education area (e.g. publications such Prudký *et al.* 2010, Prudký, Pabian, Šíma 2009, Prudký 2005 etc.). For the study, we focus mainly on analysis of life priorities, value orientations and norms. This conceptual framework was introduced as a quantitative research in a form of questionnaires. So, we will use basic quantitative (statistical) analysis for analysis as well, i.e. frequency analysis and correlation analysis (testing by χ^2 , 99% significance) test. Statistical software SPSS was used.

We formulated one hypothesis which is focused on a comparative aspect of the study where two different faculties will be under investigation: Students of FBE are less liberal in comparison with students of FH. We understand "liberal" in the given context as 1) life priorities are more important for students of FBE in comparison with FH students; 2) especially xenophobic, authoritarian and religious, etatistic value orientations will be more intensively held by FBE students; 3) norms such as abortion, euthanasia, etc. will be less tolerated in comparison with FH students. The most attention will be paid to value orientations; we analyze them through (dis)agreement with given statements, ideal society preferences and attitudes towards people in need. To give educational background of students to our research we provide information about family backgrounds of students (education of parents, completeness and climate of family), and their motivation to study at given a faculty.

We compare two data sets which consist of first year students of bachelor study programs at FBE and FH. Data sets are not designed as representative. The survey at Faculty of Humanities takes place each second year, therefore we will use data which were collected in the start of academic year 2016/2017. The first wave of survey was conducted in the academic year 2002/2003. The number of respondents from the Faculty of Humanities (FH) at Charles University in Prague was 152 of which 98 females (64.5%) and 54 males (34.2%) and all of them studied BA programs in their first year study. The number of respondents from the Faculty of Business and Economics (FBE) at Mendel University in Brno was 776 which included 525 females (67.6%) and 241 males (31.7%). The collection of data took place in 2015 and 2016. All respondents are first year students.

RESULTS

The following Tab. I shows that FBE is targeted selection for almost 40% of the 1st year students who wanted to study exactly at this faculty. Together with students who were only somewhat decided where to study (37.6%) it makes about 77%. The 1st year students at the Faculty of Humanities have significantly lower targeted selection criteria, as only 18.5% were fully decided to study specifically at this faculty or about 54% have more or less taken this specific decision. About 17% of the 1st year students from the Faculty of Humanities wanted to study at different faculty but were not accepted in comparison to about 5% from students at FBE. It is clear that students of FBE are much more motivated to study there, motivation to study at FH is rather accidental or sort of „the second choice“ for those who don't know exactly where to study.

As we can see from Tab. II, the highest mothers' education of 1st year students both at the FBE and FH

is commonly a high school with A-level exam (49% FBE and 44% FH) followed by university or higher education (26% FBE and 34% FH). The highest father's education of 1st year students both at the FBE and FH is similarly high school with A-level exam (35% FBE and 37% FH) followed by university or higher education (34% FBE and 32% FH) but also including professional high school without A-level exam (20% FBE and 17% FH).

Based on the Tab. III, for the students at FBE the most important priority is family, the same for students at FH and in general it corresponds for value priorities as such. A majority of value studies confirm that among the most important values in general belong family, friends and acquaintances which is also stated here where the 2nd place is given for both FBE and FH to friends and acquaintances. As the table shows, the 3rd important priority for students at FBE is work whereas for FH students it

I: *Motivation to study at the given faculty*

| Have you enrolled for this faculty because you wanted to study here or were there different reasons? | % FBE | % FH |
|--|----------|---------|
| Yes, I wanted to study at this faculty | 39.3 | 18.5 |
| Rather yes, I wanted to study at any faculty with this specialisation | 37.6 | 35.1 |
| Either of those, I was not sure at which faculty I want to study | 15.9 | 24.5 |
| Rather not, I wanted to study at different faculty but I was not accepted | 5.2 | 17.2 |
| No, I wanted to study something different | 1.2 | 2.0 |
| Different situation | 0.8 | 2.6 |
| No answer | -- | -- |
| Total | 100 | 100 |

Source: own calculation

II: *The highest education of respondents' mothers and fathers (in %)*

| | mothers | | fathers | |
|---|---------|------|---------|------|
| | FBE | FH | FBE | FH |
| Elementary | 1.0 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| Elementary with apprenticeship | 6.5 | 4.6 | 9.2 | 12.7 |
| Professional high school without A-level exam | 12.8 | 13.9 | 20.3 | 16.7 |
| High school with A-level exam | 49.0 | 44.4 | 34.6 | 37.3 |
| University or higher | 29.5 | 33.8 | 34.2 | 32.0 |
| Different situation | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.7 |

Source: own calculation

III: *Life priorities*

| | FBE mean | FBE very important | FH mean | FH very important |
|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------------|
| Work | 1.79 | 28.6% | 2.10 | 13.2% |
| Family | 1.14 | 88.7% | 1.22 | 82.2% |
| Leisure time | 1.86 | 25.9% | 1.76 | 34.9% |
| Friends and acquaintances | 1.45 | 59.1% | 1.48 | 59.2% |
| Religion | 3.30 | 4.4% | 3.03 | 3.3% |
| Politics | 3.03 | 1.8% | 3.30 | 2.0% |

Note: 4 point scale from 1 – very important to 4 – not important at all. Source: own calculation.

is leisure time. It seems that work is for FBE much more important than for students at FH.

The importance of religion and politics were chosen by both groups of students as not really important. Even here we have a small difference. Politics seems to be little bit more interesting for FBE students than religion, whereas for students at FH the situation is the opposite. Given the fact that FBE is situated in Brno which could be considered as more religious area than Prague, where FH is located, it opens interesting issue into consideration.

Based on a statistic significance (χ^2 test, 99%), family and religion are more important for women whereas leisure time and politics are more important for men. This reflects very traditional gender focus where the priority for female is connected with a private sphere and males are more focused on the world out of family. These findings stands for FBE. For respondents from FH we analyzed that gender differences are not so visible here and only two priorities are different (family and politics) as seen from Tab. IV.

The Tab. V explains how the ideal society in the minds of FBE students looks like. According to the answer of FBE students, they would like to live in a society which is more focused on the highest economic performance, technical advantages, the decisions are taken by experts, life is driven by rules (not by freedom) and they prefer modernization changes (not the maintenance of traditions). It can be summarized that majority of students at FBE are technological, modernizing and expert optimists. There were visible gender differences. Male students tend to prefer economic development, modernizing changes, expert decision making and technological development. The item of bringing order into life was the least problematic in terms of gender differences.

There were no significant gender differences found out at the Faculty of Humanities when analysing the ideal principles for society where students want to live in.

It should be noted that except of the focus on the most effective economic results, in all other

IV: Life priorities – gender differences

| | FBE | FH | Importance according to gender |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|--------------------------------|
| Work | NO | NO | – |
| Family | *** | ** | More important for women |
| Leisure time | ** | NO | More important for men |
| Friends and acquaintances | NO | NO | – |
| Religion | ** | NO | More important for women |
| Politics | *** | *** | More important for men |

Note: Pearson χ^2 values – ***= 0,000; **= 0,001 to 0.005; *=0.006 to 0.05; NO = no significant.

V: The ideal society according to FBE students

| What principles should the society, you would like to live in, follow? | FBE mean | 1 st principle % | 2 nd principle % |
|---|----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Focus on the most effective economic results VERSUS focus on peaceful life | 2.82 | 35.4 | 59.6 |
| Prefer to follow the traditions VERSUS prefer modernizing changes | 3.06 | 32.1 | 54.2 |
| Experts decision making VERSUS public opinion | 2.75 | 53.7 | 28.2 |
| Strive for technological development VERSUS spiritual development | 2.53 | 56.7 | 31.2 |
| Bring order into life VERSUS to give people as much as freedom | 2.74 | 49.8 | 36.8 |

Note: Choices very + rather important are shown in the table, four-point scale was used for this question. Source: own calculation.

VI: The ideal society according to FH students

| What principles should the society, you would like to live in, follow? | FH mean | 1 st principle % | 2 nd principle % |
|---|---------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Focus on the most effective economic results VERSUS focus on peaceful life | 3.27 | 9.9 | 86.5 |
| Prefer to follow the traditions VERSUS prefer modernizing changes | 3.10 | 39.7 | 39.0 |
| Experts decision making VERSUS public opinion | 2.60 | 64.0 | 19.0 |
| Strive for technological development VERSUS spiritual development | 3.27 | 22.3 | 63.1 |
| Bring order into life VERSUS to give people as much as freedom | 3.19 | 30.2 | 53.9 |

Note: Choices very + rather important are shown in the table, four-point scale was used for this question. Source: own calculation

items students had problems to decide what their opinion is. From 15% to 21% students answered "I do not know" which can be described as ambiguity or ambivalence.

Students at FH prefer the society where people should be given as much freedom as possible, they strive for spiritual development and expert decision making.

We can conclude that both faculties are in the opposition when facing the image of an ideal society. The only connecting platform is expert's decision making. The students from FH and FBE have very opposite views on the role of technological or spiritual development.

The results of the Tab. VII show that the students from the Faculty of Humanities have higher empathy for people in need giving the reason of injustice in society (15.8%) in comparison with the students from the Faculty of Business and Economics (8.9%).

As can be seen from Tab. VIII, the most agreed items for the economic students include hedonistic, success and individualistic orientations. The students of humanities prefer also hedonistic and success orientations followed by egalitarian one. If we compare these two faculties, we can state that students have similar opinion on hedonism, egalitarianism and religion. There is also a visible higher xenophobic orientation among economic students (1/2) in comparison with students of humanities (1/3).

As Tab. IX shows, the responses from both groups of students to the meaning of life look quite similar with no big differences. They consider as the most important statement: *Life has only the meaning given by us*, followed by: *Life doesn't have a sense without love*. When we look in details on data, we can see the biggest difference in the statement: *In my eyes life doesn't have a particular purpose* which expresses nihilistic or transcendent life approach preferred by 9% of economic students, but on the contrary by almost 15% of humanities students.

Tab. X shows that students from the Faculty of Humanities declare a higher tendency to exceed the norms. The exception to this tendency is in the case of ethnical intolerance, non-recycling and winning at any cost over others.

As we can see from Tab. XI, students from both faculties feel very strongly affiliated with family and friends. About 20% is very bond to the city/town/village where they live. It seems that economic students are little bit more European, whereas students of humanities are more identified with the Czech Republic. Very strong faculty affiliation was mentioned by 4% of economic students.

DISCUSSION

This contribution explores the results of two research cycles in 2015/2016 done at the Faculty of Humanities at Charles University in Prague

VII: *Why do people live in need? (in %)*

| | FBE | FH |
|---|------|------|
| Because they are unlucky | 3.7 | 5.3 |
| Because of laziness and lack of willpower | 38.7 | 32.9 |
| Because of injustice in our society | 8.9 | 15.8 |
| It is an inevitable part of modern progress | 6.8 | 5.9 |
| None of these | 25.0 | 20.4 |
| I don't know | 14.8 | 19.1 |

Source: own calculation

VIII: *Value orientations (average)*

| | | FBE | FH |
|-----------------|---|------|------|
| xenophobic | Foreigners should be prohibited all political activity in our country. | 2.50 | 2.77 |
| statistic | The state and not citizens should address citizens' concerns. | 2.61 | 2.87 |
| statistic | Security and prosperity is more important than freedom. | 3.00 | 3.20 |
| statistic | It is best to live in peace, not stand out from the crowd, not to get into unnecessary trouble. | 2.92 | 3.24 |
| egalitarian | Differences in income should reduce. | 2.35 | 2.29 |
| religious | It would be good if most people in the CR believed in God. | 3.18 | 3.21 |
| individualistic | Everyone must deal with its problems alone. | 2.31 | 2.43 |
| hedonistic | Life, we must do as enjoyable as it is possible. | 1.41 | 1.59 |
| success | The most important is to gain success. | 2.29 | 2.82 |
| success | The most important is to gain success no matter how. | 2.83 | 3.17 |
| success | Contentment is more important than success at work. | 2.37 | 2.17 |

Note: 4 scale: from 1 – fully agree to 4 fully disagree. Source: own calculation

in comparison with the Faculty of Business and Economics at Mendel University in Brno. The focus was on selected aspects of values which might be important for future job market success. The longitudinal research among first year university students, developed by researchers at Charles University, has been taking place in the Czech Republic since 2007. It gives the answer on the values, socialization experience and attitudes of young people.

One of the aims was to analyze the differences among students of humanities and students of business with the focus on values and attitudes.

The questions under focus included topics such as 1. Are students at these two faculties different in values because they study different field of study or are they very similar because they belong to the same age cohort? 2. Is the group of economic students homogeneous or are there big differences in value orientation? 3. Can we use this knowledge to improve educational management and prepare students successfully to their future careers?

The topic of values, value preferences and the importance of value frameworks has become an interdisciplinary agenda where sociologists are providing more or less representative perspective

IX: *Value framework – meaning of life (average)*

| | FBE average | FHS average |
|---|------------------------|------------------------|
| One can hardly change what happens in life. | 4.16 | 4.28 |
| Life has a meaning to me because God exists. | 4.53 | 4.60 |
| In my eyes life doesn't have a particular purpose. | 4.39 | 4.09 |
| Life has only the meaning given by us. | 1.86 | 1.91 |
| It is mainly our mind which gives meaning to life. | 2.93 | 2.90 |
| Life doesn't have a sence without love. | 1.98 | 1.93 |

Note: 5 scale: from 1 – strongly agree to 5 strongly disagree. Source: own calculation.

X: *Norms (average)*

| | FBE | FH | Difference |
|--|------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Daily use of alcohol | 3.27 | 3.96 | +0.69 |
| Use of soft drugs | 3.47 | 4.64 | +1.17 |
| Lie for personal interest | 3.95 | 4.13 | +0.18 |
| Minor love affair | 2.18 | 2.95 | +0.77 |
| Accept a bribe for doing duties | 3.02 | 3.03 | +0.01 |
| Domestic violence | 1.25 | 1.32 | +0.07 |
| Abortion | 5.12 | 6.47 | +1.35 |
| Euthanasie | 6.12 | 6.84 | +0.72 |
| Use of illegal software | 6.56 | 6.71 | +0.15 |
| Nationalistic or ethnic intolerance | 3.44 | 2.73 | -0.71 |
| Car driving under alcohol influence | 1.81 | 2.14 | +0.33 |
| Not sorting a waste at home | 5.51 | 5.07 | +0.44 |
| Unauthorized requesting state aid | 2.88 | 2.94 | +0.06 |
| Win over others at any cost | 4.30 | 4.05 | -0.25 |

Note: scale from 1 fully acceptable to 10 – fully unacceptable. Source: own calculation.

XI: *Identity – How strong do you feel affiliated with ...*

| | FBE very strong | FH very strong |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| City, town, village | 18.5 | 19.1 |
| Region | 10.7 | 9.2 |
| Family | 84.8 | 72.4 |
| Friends | 63.4 | 59.2 |
| Faculty | 4.4 | – |
| CR | 10.3 | 17.1 |
| Europe | 11.4 | 9.9 |

Note: Scale – very strong, strong, weak, none. Source: own calculation.

on the national preferences for the inhabitants. In the Czech Republic, about 50% to 75% respondents from representative public opinion poll consider the following items as very important for life: assistance to family and friends, having children, having friends, having a nice housing, life in a healthy environment, having interesting job, having a meaningful and useful work, healthy life, taking care of healthy life and to live according to own convictions. The importance of living in a healthy environment increased when comparing with 2011 research. The majority also considers as important items: having a job which enables to try new things; active participation in the protection of environment; to live interesting and exciting life; to help the development of democracy in society. The least important item for people is to life according the religious values and also to promote the policy of a party or a movement. The Tuček's factor analysis identified seven important factors deeply internalized in the Czech value orientation: 1. Private personal life, 2. Work as a value, as source of living, need for good work, 3. Work and life career, 4. Civic engagement, 5. Hedonistic approach to life, 6. Culture and education and 7. Social capital. In the general Czech society there are statistical differences between young people and seniors in the factors concerning work, civic engagement, family values, social capital and hedonism.

As Ferraro (1998) stated, culture can be defined by many concepts and authors. It can be presented on different levels including national, corporate or professional as shared ways how groups of people understand and interpret the world (Trompenaars, Hampden-Turner, 1999). We have chosen the approach of Libor Prudký and experience from his team with longitudinal studies of 1st year university students. We formulated one hypothesis which was focused on comparative aspect of the study where two different faculties were under investigation: Students of FBE are less liberal in comparison with students of FH. We understand "liberal" in the given context as 1) life priorities are more important for students of FBE in comparison with FH students; 2) especially xenophobic, authoritarian and religious, etatistic value orientations will be more intensively held by FBE students; 3) norms such as abortion, euthanasia, etc. will be less tolerated in comparison with FH students. The most attention was paid to value orientations analyzed through (dis)agreement with given statements, ideal society preferences and attitudes towards people in need. To give educational background of students to our research we provided information about family backgrounds of students (education of parents, completeness and climate of family), and their motivation to study at given faculty. We compared two data sets which consisted of first year students of bachelor study programs at FBE and FH.

The results showed that the economic students of FBE are much more motivated to study at their

faculty. The motivation to study at FH was rather accidental or sort of „the second choice“ for those who don't know exactly where to study. The highest mothers' education of 1st year students both at the FBE and FH is commonly a high school with A-level exam followed by university or higher education. The highest father's education of 1st year students both at the FBE and FH is similarly a high school with A-level exam followed by university or higher education but also including professional high school without A-level exam. We can state that the education of both mothers and fathers at FBE and FH has a similar structure.

For the students at FBE, the most important priority is family, the same for students at FH and in general it corresponds for value priorities as such. The 2nd place is given for both FBE and FH to friends and acquaintances, the 3rd important priority for students at FBE is work whereas for FH students it is a leisure time. We can state, that after family and friends as the 2nd main values, there is a difference in the 3rd priority. It seems that work is for FBE much more important than for students at FH.

The importance of religion and politics was chosen by both groups of students as not really important. Even here we have a small difference. Politics seems to be little bit more interesting for FBE students than religion, whereas for students at FH the situation is the opposite. Given the fact that FBE is situated in Brno, which could be considered as more religious area than Prague, where FH is located, it opens interesting issue into consideration.

We can state, that both faculties are similar in the gender focused issues on family and religion. Based on a statistic significance (χ^2 test, 99%), family and religion are more important for women whereas leisure time and politics are more important for men. This reflects very traditional gender focus where the priority for female is connected with a private sphere and males are more focused on the world out of family. This stands for both FBE and FH faculties under investigation.

The ideal society for business students is more focused on the highest economic performance, technical advantages, the decisions taken by experts, life is driven by rules (not by freedom) and they prefer modernizing changes (not the maintenance of traditions). Majority of students at FBE are technological, modernizing and expert optimists. It is interesting to note, that among business students, there are gender differences related to ideal society image. Male students tend to prefer economic development, modernizing changes, expert decision making and technological development. The item of bringing order into life was the least problematic in terms of gender differences. On the other hand, students of humanities do not declare significant gender differences when analysing the ideal principles for society where students want to live in. Except of the focus on the most effective economic results, in all other items students had problems to decide what their

opinion is. From 15% to 21% students answered "I do not know". Students from FH were less decisive or ambivalent in many aspect of ideal society.

Students of humanities prefer the society where people should be given as much freedom as possible, they strive for spiritual development and expert decision making. These students have also higher empathy for people in need giving the reason of injustice in society in comparison with the students from the Faculty of Business and Economics. We can conclude, that both faculties are in the opposition when facing the image of an ideal society. The only connecting platform is experts' decision making. The students from FH and FBE have very opposite views on the role of technological or spiritual development.

It was found out that the most agreed items for the economic students include hedonistic, success and individualistic orientations. The students of humanities prefer also hedonistic and success orientations followed by egalitarian one. There is

also a visible higher xenophobic orientation among economic students in comparison with students of humanities. Students consider as the most important statement: *Life has only the meaning given by us*, followed by: *Life doesn't have a sence without love*. When we look in details on data, we can see the biggest difference in the statement: *In my eyes life doesn't have a particular purpose* which expresses nihilistic or transcendent life approach preffered by 9% of economic students, but on the contrary by almost 15% of humanity students. Students from the Faculty of Humanities declare a higher tendency to exceed the norms. The exception to this tendency is in the case of ethnical intolerance, non-recycling and winning at any cost over others. Students from both faculties feel very strongly affiliated with family and friends. About 20% is very bond to the city/town/village where they live. It seems that economic students are little bit more European, whereas students of humanities are more identified with the Czech Republic.

CONCLUSION

To conclude and confirm the hypotheses, we think that the students of the Faculty of Business and Economics in Brno are less liberal in comparison with students of the Faculty of Humanities from Prague. These students come from families with similar level of educational background of parents but their opinion on ideal society where they would like to live in is different. It seems, that economic students are more diversified as there are gender differences regarding the ideal society image.

It is important to note, that in general, civic engagement and family values are not so popular for young generation as for seniors. This might change when they get older but also it could be supported by for example educational system. What is more striking, is the importance of social capital and hedonistic approach, which is in the contrary more popular among young people in comparison with seniors. If the promotion of hedonism would be increasing to a large extent, it might also bring negative consequences to general society. This is again an issue which could be reflected in education of young generation. It confirms the results of our previous study which promotes implementation of senior friendly policies to increase the quality of life. It is evident that demographic transition results in population ageing in all European societies. Life expectancy is rising almost in all European countries, mortality rates are falling in many countries. It is clear that the group of older people in these countries is under focus of politicians with the aim to prepare active and healthy ageing for seniors (Rasticova, M., Birciakova, N., Pavlikova, E. A. *et al.*, 2015). In this respect, it is evident that the values of young generation are important for maintaining intergenerational solidarity and our contribution confirms the importance of research in this area.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Ing. Libor Prudký, PhD. who has inspired us for this comparative study.

This paper was supported by The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Prague, Czech Republic: LD – COST CZ, project: LD15065 titled Gender dimension of active ageing implementation in the Czech private and public sector in comparison with western countries.

REFERENCES

- FBE 2017. Faculty of Business and Economics [in Czech: Provozně ekonomická fakulta]. *Mendel University in Brno*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.pef.mendelu.cz/en/> [Accessed: 2016, December 10].
- FERRARO, G. P. 1998. *The Cultural Dimension of International Business*. Prentice Hall. New Jersey. USA.
- FH 2017. *Faculty of humanities, Charles University* [in Czech: *Fakulta humanitních studií, Univerzita Karlova*]. [Online]. Available at: <http://fhs.cuni.cz/FHSENG-711.html> [Accessed: 2016, December 1].
- MEYS 2017. Data about students and alumni of universities [in Czech: Data o studentech, poprvé zapsaných a absolventech vysokých škol]. *Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.msmt.cz/vzdelavani/skolstvi-v-cr/statistika-skolstvi/data-o-studentech-poprve-zapsanych-a-absolventech-vysokych> [Accessed: 2017, February 1].

- PAVLIKOVA, E. A., ROZBORIL, B. and ZIARAN, P. 2015. Emotional Literacy in Organizations. On the intersection of sociological and psychological phenomena. In: *18th International Conference Enterprise and Competitive Environment*. Brno: Mendel University, pp. 20–26.
- PRUDKÝ, L. 2005. Selected results of the research of value structures of 1st year students at FHS UK. [in Czech: Vybrané výsledky výzkumu hodnotových struktur studentů 1. ročníku FHS UK]. *Lidé města*, 7(2).
- PRUDKÝ, L. et al. 2009. *The inventory of values* [in Czech: *Inventura hodnot*]. Praha: Academia.
- PRUDKÝ, L. et al. 2010. *The value study* [in Czech: *Studie o hodnotách*]. Plzeň: Nakladatelství a vydavatelství Aleš Čeněk.
- PRUDKÝ, L., PABIÁN, P. and ŠÍMA, K. 2009. *Czech high education on the journey from elite to universal education* [in Czech: *České vysoké školství na cestě od elitního k univerzálnímu vzdělávání 1989–2009*]. Praha: Grada Publishing.
- RASTICOVA, M., BIRCIAKOVA, N., PAVLIKOVA, E. A., ANTOSOVA, V. and KUBICKOVA, L. 2015. *Active Ageing in the Czech Republic: A Comparison of Active Ageing Index and National Action Plan for Positive Ageing for the Period 2013–2017*. Norristown: Int Business Information Management Assoc-Ibima.
- ŠMÍDOVÁ, M. 2012. How to interpret hedonism. In: PRUDKÝ, L. (Ed.) *Values, stratification, transformation*. Plzeň: Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk, pp.105–122.
- ŠMÍDOVÁ, M., VÁVRA, M. and ČÍŽEK, T. 2010. Value orientations of university students on three types of faculties [in Czech: Hodnotové orientace vysokoškolských studentů na třech typech fakult]. *AULA*, 18(2): 2–13.
- TROMPENAARS, F. and HAMPDEN-TURNER, CH. 1999. *Riding the Waves of Culture. Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- TUČEK, M. 2014. *Which values are important for us – June 2014* [in Czech: *Jaké hodnoty jsou pro nás důležité – červen 2014*] Tisková zpráva ov140717. Naše společnost CVVM. Sociologický ústav AC ČR, v.v.i. [Online]. Available at: <http://cvvm.soc.cas.cz/vztahy-a-zivotni-postoje/jake-hodnoty-jsou-pro-nas-dulezite-cerven-2014> [Accessed: 2017, February 1].

Contact information

Eva Abramuszkinová Pavlíková: eva.pavlikova@mendelu.cz
Michaela Šmídová: smidovami@outlook.cz