



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.  
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: ATI120618V12

**Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.**

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/>

**Año: VII Número: 1 Artículo no.:8 Período: 1 de Septiembre al 31 de diciembre, 2019.**

**TÍTULO:** Dinámicas de cambio de tendencias de riqueza en estudiantes de diferentes especialidades.

**AUTOR:**

1. Dr. Mustafayev Mushvig Huseyn.

**RESUMEN:** El artículo examina características emergentes de las tendencias de riqueza de los jóvenes en los campos de humanidades y técnicos, y los factores que influyen en ellos. El análisis del mecanismo psicológico de este proceso entre los jóvenes, incluida la investigación en esta área, analiza los ideales relacionados con el estudio de los valores. Los resultados muestran que la riqueza es un factor clave en la formación de una personalidad propensa, siendo la base de su plan de acción; existe relación entre el sistema de valores de los jóvenes y las áreas en las que se educan, y aunque existe diferencia entre los indicadores de ambos grupos en términos de valores normativos, no existe una diferencia significativa en el nivel de comportamiento personal.

**PALABRAS CLAVES:** valor, personalidad, tendencias de riqueza, juventud, humanidades y áreas técnicas.

**TITLE:** Dynamics of changing of wealth tendencies in students of different specialties.

**AUTHOR:**

1. Dr. Mustafayev Mushvig Huseyn.

**ABSTRACT:** The article examines emerging characteristics of the tendencies of wealth of young people in the humanities and technical fields, and factors that influence them. Analyzing the psychological mechanism of this process among young people, including research in this area analyzes ideals related to the study of values. The results show that wealth is a key factor in the formation of a prone personality, which is the basis of its action plan; there is a relationship between the value system of young people and the areas in which they are educated, and although there is a difference between the indicators of both groups in terms of normative values, there is no significant difference in the level of personal behavior.

**KEY WORDS:** value, personality, tendencies of wealth, youth, humanities and technical fields.

## **INTRODUCTION.**

The manifestation of wealth values and moral values in young people and its formation depend primarily on the level of norms and standards that exist in the society in which these young people live.

The problem of tendency of wealth is the subject of research in a number of sciences about human and society, including philosophy, sociology, pedagogy, anthropology, psychology. Wealth tendencies are the most controversial and polysemantic concept for value phenomenon research. The basis of values of a person's wealth tendencies is arranged on his values. The emergence of a value system at a young age serves as a key factor in the formation of wealth tendency in the young person. In the young age, a number of changes in the moral development of the personality, new psychological states appear. During this time, young people, not only understand and evaluate their own psychological qualities but also change the content of their self-awareness and their perceptions about themselves.

Young people try to evaluate their moral values from a social point of view and to evaluate other people in this regard. At the same time, it should be noted that during this period there are a number of radical changes in the moral development of the personality, new psychological states.

On the other hand, it should be noted that the problems of young people are not only of the younger generation, but of the whole of society, and that finding solutions to these problems will not only be better today but also tomorrow. As in many countries of the world in relation to globalization, changes in the values and tendency of the wealth of Azerbaijani youth are also manifested. These new developments, on the one hand, are positive, but also contribute to the development of a number of negative aspects.

## **DEVELOPMENT.**

### **Description of research.**

In various psychological schools, the concept of identity values has been analyzed as monosemantic concept. For behaviorists, it is interpreted as "ethics, morality and values - the result of more associative learning" [Peterson, M.F. & Thomas, D.C., 2007]. In classical psychoanalysis, Z. Freud focuses on the internal biological factors of personality development. In classical psychoanalysis, Z. Freud focuses on the internal biological factors of personality development. Z.Freud's approach reflects both unconscious and socially conditioned morality orientations, ethnic values, and a set of behavioural norms that are the judge or censor of some type of Egon [Freyd Z.,1989]

The social aspects of personality development that were only directly touched upon by Z.Freud has been further developed in the work of A.Adler and E.Frommund, his successors. In the psychology of personality, like A.Adler's sense of unity, the theory of "social interest" of identity, which is understood as the source of the libido activity identified by Freud, plays an important role [Adler F., 1976].

Social interest is formed in the identification process and develops in three main areas of life: within activities, love and Me-You relationships. According to Fromm, human relationships with the world are formed through the processes of assimilation (by buying the things and use of them) and socialization (by building relationships with other people). The peculiarities of these processes and their interrelationships form one or another type of social character that relates to the system of personality values and determines its direction [Adler F., 1976 ].

Note that the problem of the formation of personality values plays an important role among the problems learned by humanistic and existential psychology. As one of the prominent representatives of the humanistic direction, A. Maslow considered the values as a consequence of the individual's mental characteristics and health, and referred them to a particular group, calling homeostatic values (peace, dream, rest, defense, retreat and even desire for death) "immature" or "limited." He showed that such values do not play a key role in the health of a person. In his opinion, the highest human nature is not homeostasis, but focused on self-actualization, which is why A. Maslow called it "B-values". B-values (truth, divinity, beauty, completeness, vitality, rarity, perfection, etc.) are able to significantly enhance the individual's existence [A.Maslou, 1976].

Classification of values put forward by V. Frankl is of particular interest. In his classification, "creative values", "impression values" and "relationship values" have been differed from each other. These groups of values represent three main directions that a person has found meaning in life. The first direction relates to what an individual gives to the world by his or her creation, the second direction relates to what an individual experiences in the world and what he or she gets from the impressions that come with it, and the third direction relates to what location in relation to situations in which the individual's destiny cannot be changed [V. Frankl,1990].

According to M. Rokich, an outstanding researcher who analyzes the value problem, values are characterized by the following characteristics:

- 1) The total quantity of values considered to be the relatively small property of a person.
- 2) All people are at different levels but have the same values.
- 3) The values have been organized in the system form.
- 4) The sources of values are analyzed in culture, society and its institutions and personality.
- 5) The effects of values are practically explored in all social phenomena that require learning.

According to M. Rokich, each value is based on a belief. The tendency to wealth is based on a set of beliefs and values [M. Rokich, 1976].

According to A.N. Leontiev, the meaning-generating functions of personality values are manifested both in motivational situations for choosing the direction of actual activities and as in the formation of other meaning structures [A.N.Leontiev,1981]. The author described his personal values as stable, non-situational, generalized motivational derivatives, whose functions were expressed in the form of provoking action through concrete situational motives. According to A.N.Leontiev, the personal meaning is a direct reflection of the relationship of the subject's real life and lives within it. The essence of bodies and events differs from according to a number of important features. First, personal meaning exists not only in the form of perception but also in the form that is often not understood. Second, it is impossible to control the formation of personal meaning directly and to make an impact through the word (They do not teach the personality, bring up the personality). Third, unlike the importance of things, personal meaning does not exist on its own, in an objective manner. They occur within a particular activity and cannot be independently learned outside their context, activity by themselves. At the same time, the importance of things is psychologically relevant to the system of individual consciousness, that is, it has a personal meaning.

The formation of personal meaning is a complex and multifaceted process. In some cases, the importance of things does not just match their personal meaning to the subject, but even contradict each other. Motivations that are of personal importance are becoming more conscious as they are

understood in the course of action and subject to objective logic of the activity [A.N.Leontyev 1981]. The discovery of the dialectic of the interplay of positive and negative motivation in moral development allows us to explain certain aspects of spiritual development, to define the role and position of self-improvement. Thus, a positive evaluation of one's own personality can lead to moral values, attitudes, and at the same time, it leads to comprehend and to understand that it is good. Values are based on practical activities that require the human capacity to realize. V. Yadov showed in the theory of personality disposition structure that the concept of wealth is more complex and deeper than the concept of value. The tendency of wealth controls an individual's social behavior as a whole. In Yadav's view, based on wealth tendencies, human beings make their decisions and build their future lives on these tendencies [Yadov, 1979].

According to M.N. Myasishev, the content of the values is a compilation of the relationships associated with this system of values and the visual content of the human experience. V.N. Myasishev described the values of the subject in the plan of personal relationships implemented within the subject-object relationship. Relationships prove human subjectivity, intercession, that some values are prioritized over others. Each individual chooses and focuses what is most important to him or her among the values accepted in society and values in society [V.N.Myasishev, 1998].

In the study of the problem of wealth tendencies, research by prof. A.S.Bayramov's students on the role of wealth tendencies and ideals in the development of their personality is of particular importance. He notes that the immoral acts that occur in the behavior and treatment of different people depend largely on the micro-environment they live in. In other words, a person is surrounded by a number of people, and they encourage him. It is well known that these or other effects on personality are not left intact. It is very important to take from whom an example here. How are himself or herself and the people around him for the tendency of wealth, what do they see the meaning of their life in, what are they trying to do, such issues cannot be left out of focus. Everyone treats this or that person

or group from the point of view of their tendency of wealth. It is clear to every active person from his or her own experience that when one of the members of collective changes his or her position, his or her position in interpersonal relationships also changes.

According to A.S.Bayramov, the qualities that each person appreciates are related to the appropriate stereotype, ethanol and ideals, and are an important part of the process of forming their wealth tendencies. Man's imagination of wealth is connected with his real life, his social and moral needs, interests and goals [Akbar Bayramov, 2003].

When we look at a person's tendency of wealth, we come across two aspects. First, each person's vision of wealth, or his or her own tendency towards wealth, is a serious attempt at the actual behavior of that person. In some people, the contradiction between these two approaches is evident. In other words, there is a mismatch between the wealth that is based on the language, the wealth it seeks in the real action and his or her behaviour. In some cases, the great contradiction between words and the actions of people comes from this.

He or she appreciates honesty with word, objectivity, fairness, and moral factors, but does not follow them in real behavior. From this point of view, as if man lives two contradictory lives.

### **Research Aim.**

The study is primarily based on the assumption that there are significant differences between the normative ideals and the level of personal behavior of students studying in the humanities and technical faculties.

### **Research Methods.**

The Schwarz 57-item value survey method was used. Through Schwartz's 57-item value survey, we measured "ideal I" and "real I" and based on the estimates made by the 1,000 respondents who participated in the research, in both groups (technical students and humanitarian students), the

difference between the “ideal I” and the “real I” was analyzed at two levels, namely the level of normative ideals and personal behavior. For this purpose, two methods of intergroup comparison (T. Test) were used in the analysis using SPSS: method of comparing pairs of samples in the group to check the difference between the "ideal I" and the "real I" in the group (Paired Samples Test), a method of comparing independent samples to determine the difference between the “ideal I” and the “real I” between the two groups (Independent Samples Test).

### Discussion.

Based on the statistical table for the difference of examples of in pairs, it becomes clear that in both groups, statistics and values regarding the level of normative behaviors and personal behaviors in students studying technical and humanitarian specialities differ from each other. The numerical average of the points ( $\bar{X}$ ) scored by normative ideals students who studying in the technical fields was higher than the numerical average for the behavioral level, and the difference was 24,948. For students studying in humanities, the numerical average of scores scored on normative ideals is higher than the numerical average for behavioral levels and the difference is 24,948.

Table 1. Indicators of the observed difference between normative ideals and behavioral levels of students in humanities and technical faculties.

Paired Samples Statistics (statistics of pairs samples).					
Speciality	Symptom	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Technical	Normative ideals - Schwartz	135.20	500	26.046	1.165
	The level of behavior - Schwartz	109.25	500	47.531	2.126
Humanitarian	Normative ideals - Schwartz	138.91	500	22.579	1.010
	The level of behavior - Schwartz	108.80	500	42.167	1.886

The statistical significance of the observed differences between normative ideals and behavior levels in both groups is presented below in the “paired sample test T table”. From the table, it is clear that the difference between normative ideals and behavioral levels in both groups is significant at 0.01.



Thus, it is  $P = 0.000$  in technical students and  $P = 0.000$  in humanitarian students. This suggests that the difference between the two signs (normative ideals and behavioral levels) is significant.

Table 2. Indicators of the observed difference between normative ideals and behavioral levels of students in humanities and technical faculties as a result of comparison of pairs of samples.

Speciality		Paired Samples Test (Comparison of pairs of samples)					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Paired Differences							
		Numerical mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
Lower	Upper								
Technical	Normative ideals The level of behavior	25.948	42.641	1.907	22.201	29.695	13.607	499	.000
Humanitarian	Normative ideals The level of behavior	30.106	45.534	2.036	26.105	34.107	14.785	499	.000

As a result of comparison of pairs of samples in both groups, it was observed a significant difference between normative ideals and behavioral levels, but another issue that needs to be identified here is that the difference in the variables mentioned above is higher and more intense. In the technical group for normative ideals, it is  $\bar{X} = 135.20$  and for humanitarian group it is  $\bar{X} = 138.91$ .

At the same time, in the humanitarian group on behavioral, it is  $\bar{X} = 109.25$  and it is  $\bar{X} = 108.80$  in the technical group. “An independent sampling T table” should be consulted to determine whether this difference is statistically significant. According to this table, the difference between the two groups on normative ideals is significant at 0.05 level. Here is  $P = 0.16$ . Inter-group differences in behavioral levels are not statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Here is  $P = 0.874$ .

Table 3. Indicators of observed difference between normative ideals and behavioral levels.

Independent Samples Test (Comparison of independent samples)									
	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Normative ideals	29.071	.000	-2.405	998	.016	-3.708	1.542	-6.733	-.683
The level of behavior	5.866	.016	.158	998	.874	.450	2.842	-5.126	6.026

According to Schwartz's values survey, values and attributes such as "conformity, tradition, kindness, universality, independence, stimulation, hedonism, success, dominion, security" were measured at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior. Then, in both groups (normative ideals and personal behavior), the scores obtained by the respondents on the two levels were compared and the intergroup differences and whether it was statistically significant were studied.

As can be seen from the table below, only the inter-group difference in the level of personal behavior on the conformity variable is significant at 0.01 level ( $P=0.001$ ). There is a significant difference between the levels of normative ideals and the behavioral level on the variables of tradition, and this difference is significant at 0.01 level ( $P=0.000$  and  $P=0.000$ ).

There is an only significant inter-group difference in the level of personal behavior on the variables of kindness ( $P=0.001$ ). The intergroup differences are observed at both levels on the sign of universality. Due to it is  $P = 0.000$  at the level of normative ideals, we can say that the current difference is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, we can also say that the inter-group difference is significant at 0.01, as  $P = 0.001$  at the level of personal behavior. The inter-group difference at both levels is not statistically significant on the variables of independence and the  $P$  coefficient is greater than 0.05. There is a significant inter-group difference only at the level of normative ideals on the variables of stimulation ( $P=0.000$ ).

On the variables of hedonism, the inter-group difference at the level of normative ideals was significant at 0.05 and was  $P = 0.016$ . the inter-group difference at both levels was statistically insignificant on the variables of success ( $P=0.056$  and  $P=0.929$ ). When it is  $P=0.000$  at the level of normative ideals on the variables of dominion, the current difference is considered serious and significant. At the same time, on the variables of dominion, the intergroup difference at the level of personal behavior is significant at 0.05 level and is  $P = 0.042$ . On the variables of security, the inter-group difference at both levels cannot be considered significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 4. Values such as "conformity, tradition, kindness, universality, independence, stimulation, hedonism, success, dominion, security" and signs of normative ideals and indicators of measurement of values at the level of personal behavior.

Independent Samples Test (Comparison of independent samples)									
	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Conformity -LNI	19.25	.000	.500	998	.618	.178	.356	-.521	.877
Conformity -LPB	12.49	.000	3.300	998	.001	.908	.275	.368	1.448
Tradition - LNI	.968	.325	6.690	998	.000	3.148	.471	2.225	4.071
Tradition - LPB	134.63	.000	-6.833	998	.000	-2.322	.340	-2.989	-1.655
Kindness - LNI	4.48	.034	1.457	998	.145	.846	.581	-.293	1.985
Kindness - LPB	56.14	.000	-3.458	998	.001	-1.270	.367	-1.991	-.549
Universality - LNI	76.63	.000	-5.348	998	.000	-3.222	.602	-4.404	-2.040
Universality - LPB	56.14	.000	-3.458	998	.001	-1.270	.367	-1.991	-.549
Independence - LNI	8.48	.004	.992	998	.321	.384	.387	-.375	1.143
Independence - LPB	8.83	.003	-1.029	998	.304	-.260	.253	-.756	.236
Stimulation- LNI	46.39	.000	-6.928	998	.000	-1.748	.252	-2.243	-1.253
Stimulation- LPB	10.56	.001	1.420	998	.156	.380	.268	-.145	.905
Hedonism- LNI	34.18	.000	-2.409	998	.016	-.706	.293	-1.281	-.131
Hedonism- LPB	46.60	.000	-.942	998	.346	-.244	.259	-.752	.264
Success - LNI	.846	.358	-1.916	986	.056	-.888	.464	-1.798	.022
Success - LPB	.839	.360	.089	998	.929	.026	.293	-.549	.601
Dominion - LNI	14.00	.000	-4.833	998	.000	-1.840	.381	-2.587	-1.093
Dominion - LPB	13.47	.000	-2.038	998	.042	-.500	.245	-.981	-.019
Security - LNI	53.76	.000	1.031	998	.303	.368	.357	-.332	1.068
Security - LPB	3.364	.067	.711	998	.477	.238	.335	-.419	.895

At the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups, on the variables of “conformity, tradition, kindness, universality, independence, stimulation, hedonism, success, dominion and security” each group's scores on the variables mentioned above were analyzed at two levels in order to determine whether there were differences within groups.

Table 5. Indicators of values at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior.

Paired Samples Statistics. (Schwarz's questioning of values at the level of normative ideas and personal behavior)					
Speciality		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Technical	Conformity - LNI	17.14	500	6.219	.278
	Conformity - LPB	17.60	500	3.921	.175
	Tradition - LNI	20.34	500	7.735	.346
	Tradition - LPB	15.78	500	6.497	.291
	Kindness - LNI	21.63	500	9.633	.431
	Kindness - LPB	26.04	500	6.626	.296
	Universality - LNI	32.65	500	10.898	.487
	Universality - LPB	26.04	500	6.626	.296
	Independence - LNI	21.82	500	6.561	.293
	Independence - LPB	20.30	500	4.452	.199
	Stimulation - LNI	12.48	500	4.483	.200
	Stimulation - LPB	15.09	500	4.624	.207
	Hedonism- LNI	12.45	500	4.961	.222
	Hedonism- LPB	13.57	500	4.577	.205
	Success - LNI	15.66	488	7.334	.332
	Success - LPB	16.80	488	4.618	.209
	Dominion - LNI	14.46	500	6.653	.298
	Dominion - LPB	12.64	500	3.638	.163
	Security - LNI	24.12	500	6.333	.283
	Security - LPB	23.77	500	5.755	.257
Humanitarian	Conformity - LNI	16.96	500	4.980	.223
	Conformity - LPB	16.69	500	4.741	.212
	Tradition - LNI	17.19	500	7.134	.319
	Tradition - LPB	18.10	500	3.940	.176
	Kindness - LNI	20.78	500	8.702	.389
	Kindness - LPB	27.31	500	4.851	.217
	Universality - LNI	35.87	500	7.921	.354
	Universality - LPB	27.31	500	4.851	.217
	Independence - LNI	21.44	500	5.641	.252
	Independence - LPB	20.56	500	3.482	.156
	Stimulation - LNI	14.23	500	3.425	.153
	Stimulation - LPB	14.71	500	3.799	.170

	Hedonism- LNI	13.16	500	4.282	.192
	Hedonism- LPB	13.82	500	3.549	.159
	Success - LNI	16.55	500	7.237	.324
	Success - LPB	16.61	500	4.591	.205
	Dominion - LNI	16.30	500	5.311	.238
	Dominion - LPB	13.14	500	4.107	.184
	Security - LNI	23.76	500	4.859	.217
	Security - LPB	23.53	500	4.789	.214

At the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups, on the variables of “conformity, tradition, kindness, universality, independence, stimulation, hedonism, success, dominion and security” each group's scores on the variables mentioned above were compared at two levels in order to determine whether there were differences within groups.

Table 6. In humanitarian and technical groups indicators of differences within groups on variables of normative ideals and personal behavior.

Paired Samples Test. (Schwarz's questioning of values at the level of normative ideas and personal behavior).									
Speciality		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference.				
					Lower	Upper			
Technical	Conformity	-.458	4.334	.194	-.839	-.077	-2.363	499	.019
	Tradition	4.564	8.118	.363	3.851	5.277	12.572	499	.000
	Kindness	-4.414	8.513	.381	-5.162	-3.666	-11.595	499	.000
	Universality	6.612	7.848	.351	5.922	7.302	18.839	499	.000
	Independence	1.520	5.315	.238	1.053	1.987	6.394	499	.000
	Stimulation	-2.612	6.794	.304	-3.209	-2.015	-8.597	499	.000
	Hedonism	-1.124	4.035	.180	-1.479	-.769	-6.228	499	.000
	Succes	-1.143	6.517	.295	-1.723	-.564	-3.876	487	.000
	Dominion	1.818	6.072	.272	1.285	2.351	6.695	499	.000
	Security	.352	5.479	.245	-.129	.833	1.437	499	.151
Humanitarian	Conformity	.272	4.432	.198	-.117	.661	1.372	499	.171
	Tradition	-.906	6.866	.307	-1.509	-.303	-2.950	499	.003
	Kindness	-6.530	9.613	.430	-7.375	-5.685	-15.190	499	.000
	Universality	8.564	7.455	.333	7.909	9.219	25.687	499	.000
	Independence	.876	4.245	.190	.503	1.249	4.615	499	.000
	Stimulation	-.484	3.780	.169	-.816	-.152	-2.863	499	.004
	Hedonism	-.662	3.920	.175	-1.006	-.318	-3.776	499	.000
	Succes	-.066	7.536	.337	-.728	.596	-.196	499	.845
	Dominion	3.158	5.840	.261	2.645	3.671	12.092	499	.000
	Security	.222	5.535	.248	-.264	.708	.897	499	.370

We have shown in the tables above that the groups' ratings on variables such as “conformity, tradition, kindness, universality, independence, stimulation, hedonism, success, dominion and security” at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical fields are different. All these tables were based on comparative analysis or different methods of T.test. According to the purpose of the study, the relationship between these variables was analyzed against the background of correlation analysis.

Students in the technical field, at the level of normative ideals, conformity is associated with conformity at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.723$ , the increase of conformity at the level of ideals is accompanied by an increase in personal behavior.

Students in the humanitarian field, at the level of normative ideals, conformity is associated with conformity at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.585$ , the increase in conformity at ideals is accompanied by an increase in the level of personal behavior.

Table 7. “Indicators of conformity at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups”.

		Correlations		
Speciality			Conformity - at the level of normative ideas	Conformity - at the level of personal behaviour
Technical	Conformity - at the level of normative ideas	Pearson Correlation	1	.723**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Conformity - at the level of personal behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.723**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500
Humanitarian	Conformity - at the level of normative ideas	Pearson Correlation	1	.585**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Conformity - at the level of personal behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.585**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Students in the technical field, at the level of normative ideals, tradition is associated with tradition at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.360$ , the increase of tradition at the level of ideals is accompanied by an increase in personal behavior.

Students in the humanitarian field, at the level of normative ideals, tradition is associated with tradition at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.343$ , the increase in tradition at ideals is accompanied by an increase in the level of personal behavior.

Table 8. “Indicators of tradition at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups”

Correlations				
Speciality			Tradition - at the level of normative ideas	Tradition - at the level of personal behaviour
Technical	Tradition - at the level of normative ideas	Pearson Correlation	1	.360**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Tradition - at the level of personal behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.360**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500
Humanitarian	Tradition - at the level of normative ideas	Pearson Correlation	1	.343**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Tradition - at the level of personal behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.343**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Students in the technical field, at the level of normative ideals, kindness is associated with kindness at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the

same time, since  $r = 0.503$ , the increase of kindness at the level of ideals is accompanied by an increase in personal behavior.

Students in the humanities field, at the level of normative ideals, kindness is not associated with kindness at the behavioral level ( $P=0.070$ ).

Table 9. "Indicators of kindness at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups".

Correlations				
Speciality			Kindness - at the level of normative ideals	Kindness - at the level of personal behaviour
Technical	Kindness - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.503**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Kindness - at the level of personal behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.503**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500
Humanitarian	Kindness - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.081
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.070
		N	500	500
	Kindness - at the level of personal behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.081	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.070	
		N	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Students in the technical field, at the level of normative ideals, universality is associated with universality at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.700$ , the increase of universality at the level of ideals is accompanied by an increase in personal behavior.

Students in the humanitarian field, at the level of normative ideals, universality is associated with universality at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01



level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.399$ , the increase in universality at ideals is accompanied by an increase in the level of personal behavior.

Table 10. “Indicators of Universality at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups”.

Correlations				
Speciality			Universality - at the level of normative ideals	Universality - at the level of personal behaviour
Technical	Universality - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.700**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Universality - at the level of personal behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.700**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500
Humanitarian	Universality - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.399**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Universality - at the level of personal behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.399**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Students in the technical field, at the level of normative ideals, independence is associated with independence at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.593$ , the increase of independence at the level of ideals is accompanied by an increase in personal behavior.

Students in the humanitarian field, at the level of normative ideals, independence is associated with independence at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.660$ , the increase in independence at ideals is accompanied by an increase in the level of personal behavior.

Table 11. “Indicators of independence at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups”

Correlations				
Speciality			Independence - at the level of normative ideals	Independence - at the level of personal behaviour
Technical	Independence - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.593**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Independence - at the level of personal behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.593**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500
Humanitarian	Independence - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.660**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Independence - at the level of personal behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.660**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Students in the technical field, at the level of normative ideals, stimulation is associated with stimulation at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.012$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.05 level. At the same time, since  $r = -0.113$ , the increase of stimulation at the level of ideals is accompanied by an increase in personal behavior.

Students in the humanitarian field, at the level of normative ideals, stimulation is associated with stimulation at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.456$ , the increase in stimulation at ideals is accompanied by an increase in the level of personal behavior.

Table 12. “Indicators of stimulation at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups”.

Speciality		Correlations		
			Stimulation - at the level of normative ideals	Stimulation - at the level of personal behavior
Technical	Stimulation - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	-.113*
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.012
		N	500	500
	Stimulation - at the level of personal behavior	Pearson Correlation	-.113*	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	
		N	500	500
Humanitarian	Stimulation - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.456**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Stimulation - at the level of personal behavior	Pearson Correlation	.456**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).				
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).				

Students in the technical field, at the level of normative ideals, hedonism is associated with hedonism at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.645$ , the increase of hedonism at the level of ideals is accompanied by an increase in personal behavior.

Students in the humanitarian field, at the level of normative ideals, hedonism is associated with hedonism at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.512$ , the increase in hedonism at ideals is accompanied by an increase in the level of personal behavior.

Table 13. "Indicators of Hedonism at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups".

Correlations				
Speciality			Hedonism - at the level of normative ideals	Hedonism - at the level of personal behavior
Technical	Hedonism - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.645**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Hedonism - at the level of personal behavior	Pearson Correlation	.645**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500
Humanitarian	Hedonism - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.512**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Hedonism - at the level of personal behavior	Pearson Correlation	.512**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Students in the technical field, at the level of normative ideals, success is associated with success at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.482$ , the increase of success at the level of ideals is accompanied by an increase in personal behavior.

Students in the humanitarian field, at the level of normative ideals, success is associated with success at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.251$ , the increase in success at ideals is accompanied by an increase in the level of personal behavior.

Table 14. “Indicators of success at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups”.

Correlations				
Speciality			Success – at the level of normative ideals	Success – at the level of personal behavior
Technical	Success – at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.482**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	488	488
	Success – at the level of personal behavior	Pearson Correlation	.482**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	488	500
Humanitarian	Success – at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.251**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Success – at the level of personal behavior	Pearson Correlation	.251**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Students in the technical field, at the level of normative ideals, dominion is associated with dominion at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.426$ , the increase of dominion at the level of ideals is accompanied by an increase in personal behavior.

Students in the humanitarian field, at the level of normative ideals, dominion is associated with dominion at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.251$ , the increase in dominion at ideals is accompanied by an increase in the level of personal behavior.

Table 15. “Indicators of dominion at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups”.

Speciality		Correlations		
			Dominion –at the level of normative ideals	Dominion - at the level of personal behavior
Technical	Dominion – at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.426**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Dominion - at the level of personal behavior	Pearson Correlation	.426**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500
Humanitarian	Dominion – at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.251**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Dominion - at the level of personal behavior	Pearson Correlation	.251**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Students in the technical field, at the level of normative ideals, security is associated with security at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.593$ , the increase of security at the level of ideals is accompanied by an increase in personal behavior.

Students in the humanitarian field, at the level of normative ideals, security is associated with security at the behavioral level ( $P = 0.000$ ), and the existing relationship is significant at the 0.01 level. At the same time, since  $r = 0.342$ , the increase in security at ideals is accompanied by an increase in the level of personal behavior.

Table 16. "Indicators of security at the level of normative ideals and personal behavior in the humanitarian and technical groups".

Correlations				
Specialty			Security - at the level of normative ideals	Security - at the level of personal behavior
Technical	Security - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.593**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Security - at the level of personal behavior	Pearson Correlation	.593**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500
Humanitarian	Security - at the level of normative ideals	Pearson Correlation	1	.342**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	500	500
	Security - at the level of personal behavior	Pearson Correlation	.342**	1
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	500	500

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

## CONCLUSIONS.

Our research has shown that the hypothesis we make is that there are significant difference between the normative ideals and the level of personal behavior of our students who study in the humanities and technical faculties - - the hypothesis is almost confirmed.

Research has shown that other variables, except for security variables, differ substantially in terms of normative ideals and personal behavior. Other variables, except for variables in conformity, success and security in humanities, differ significantly from the normative ideals and personal behaviors of other variables. The results of our research have shown that the relationship of youth's wealth tendencies with their perceptions of themselves is conditioned by the influence of various factors. The predominant elements in the structure of young people's personalities and their demand-motivation are strongly influenced by the formation of their value system.

The results of our research show that two aspects of youth's attitudes towards values are evident. First, each person's vision of wealth or his or her own tendency to wealth is a serious attempt at the actual behavior of that person. In some people, the contradiction between these two approaches is self-evident. In other words, there is a mismatch between the wealth that is based on the language, the wealth it seeks in the real action and his or her behaviour. In some cases, a great deal of conflict between the words and actions of young people comes from this.

At the level of normative appreciated values, but does not follow them in their personal behavior. In addition, the results of our research overlap with other studies, including those of R.B. Perrin, J.Piaget and S.H.Schwartz (Schwartz, H.S. 2012). R.B.Perrin has linked the environment in which people are interested in the formation of wealth tendency. J.Piaget who focuses on ethical research, argued that values evolve according to different ages, and that values and ideas are parallel in this development. S.H.Schwartz, who draws on education and other cultural means in his research to uncover the essence of values, he created a category of values that are still used today.

Strengthening young people's perceptions of values often depends on the psychological and social implications of their circumstances. For the development of values, firstly youth need to achieve adequacy of self-esteem. For this, for the development of self-reflexivity in young people, it is necessary to achieve their self-control and self-esteem. According to the results of our research, values show the public the ideal ways of thinking and behaving. Supervises the selection and implementation of social roles and at the same time implements social control.

The results of our research show that the formation of values in young people should be carried out in 3 stages:

At the first stage, the process of understanding and comprehending of the spiritual values and moral orientations of young people should be implemented, and factors that are a serious obstacle to that process should be eliminated.



At the second stage, it is necessary to put into practice the strong ideas about spiritual values, tendencies of wealth, and moral orientations.

At the third stage, it is necessary to research how young people's perceptions affect their self-realization and spiritual development.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.**

1. Bayramov A.S. Alizada A.A.(2003). Psychology, Baku.
2. Jabbarov R. (2017). Factors affecting the development of self-realization among students of different professions. Science and Education, 9, 75-87. 10.24195/2414-4665-2017-9-12.
3. Jabbarov R.; Mustafayev, M.; Kazimova, k.; Valiyeva, Y. (2018). Factors affecting students' professional identity, science and education, DoI: 10.24195/2414-4665-2018-1-5.
4. Adler F. (1976) The value conception socialist.
5. Alport, Vernon, Lindzu(1970). Manual of values. Copyright by Hogustton.
6. Maslow, A. H. (1965). Eupsychian management. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
7. Peterson, M.F. & Thomas, D.C. (2007). Organizational behavior in multinational organizations. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28(3)
8. Rokeach M. (1973) The nature of human values. Newyork, free press,
9. Schwartz, S. H.; Bardi A. (2000). Moral dialogue cross-cultures An amerikan perspective
10. Schwartz, H.S. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Online readings in psychology and culture: International association for cross-cultural psychology.
11. Мясищев В.Н.(1998). Психология отношений : избранные психологические труды .Москва, Институт практической психологии. Воронеж : НПО 'МОДЭК'.
12. Леонтьев А.Н. (1981)Проблемы развития психики. М.: Изд. Моск.Унив.

13. Франкл В. (1990). Человек в поисках смысла. М.: Прогресс.
14. Фрейд З.(1989). Введение в психоанализу: М.: Наука.
15. Ядов В.А.(1979). Регуляция и саморегуляция социального поведения личности: постановка проблемы//Саморегуляция и прогнозирование социального поведения личности. М.

**DATA OF THE AUTHOR.**

1. Mustafayev Mushvig Huseyn. Teacher of the Department of Social and Pedagogical Psychology of BSU. Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology. E-mail: [mustafayev76@inbox.ru](mailto:mustafayev76@inbox.ru)

**RECIBIDO:** 7 de agosto del 2019.

**APROBADO:** 19 de agosto del 2019.