

*

(31) (1990)

(36)
(0.84-0.35)
(151)

(74) (77)

()

.One-Way ANOVA

Independent "t" Test

()

()

:

.1

.(2002)

(2)

(1)

.(3)

.2005/11/9

2004/12/9

*

/

(36)
(18) (18) .(1991) (2004)

(Rokeach 1973)

(36)

.(1990) (1993)

(Rokeach, 1973)

Spranger

:

.(Teo, 2000) Types of Men

White

:

:

.(2002)

(Mehlinger, 1981)

Rokeach Values Survey

Terminal Values :

Personal Values Social Values

Instrumental Values

Competence Values Moral Values

()

(884) (Cellar, 1978)

(Marolyn, 1979)

(58)

(Schunke and Krogh, 1982)

(Silvino, 1972)

(555)

:

(12)

(610) (1987)

(1975)

(1990)

(1991)

(974)

(18)

(1990)

(Rokeach)
(2000)

(1991)

(800)

.(50- 15)

One-Way-ANOVA

(0.05)
) :

()

.()
(2001)

(450)

(439)

:

.1 (60)

(Rokeach, 1973)

:

(Marolyn, 1979) (Cellar, 1978)

) (1990)

(1991) (1990

(Piiro, 2002)

.2

:

(Schunke and Krogh, 1982)

(12) (1975)

(18) (Silvino, 1972)

(36) (1991)

(Cellar, 1978) (Rokeach, 1973)

(1990) (Marolyn, 1979)

(1991)

()

(2001)

.3

(448)

.4

(Rokeach, 1973)

(2001) (1990)

(Piiro, 2002)

.5

(191)

(Schunke and (Silvino, 1972)

Krogh, 1982)

(18) (14)

.6

2002

. 2000

1999

()

(156)

2001

()

:
(0.05= α) .1

(0.05= α) .2

(0.05= α) .3 •
•
•

: .1
: .1

.(2002) .2
.2

) () .3

)
(A)
(B and C) .4
•
•

:
 :
 :
 (10) (10)
 •
 (1990)
 •
 : (A)
 •
 : (B and C)

.2

(A)
 /2002
 (776) (1455) 2003 : 1973
 (679) (18) Terminal Values
 (18) Instrumental Values
 :
 10-1
 (151) Cluster Sampling (1) (10)
 (A)
 (B and C) :

(A) (75)
 (B and C) (76)
 (74) (77)
 %10 () :
 (1) : 2003

(1)

(B and C)	(A)		
4	2		77 =
26	36		
8	1		
10	6		74 =
21	26		
7	4		
76	75		
151			

:

(1)

(22)

/(4)

(14) (A)

/(10)

/(6)

(B and C)

(62)

(109)

(B and C)

(47) (A)

(A)

(20)

.(B and C)

(15)

()

(Rokeach)

)

.(1990

(31)

(80)

(12)

0.53

/(19)

(31) () 0.81 ()
) 0.84 () 0.55

- (
-
- :
- () .1
-) : .2
- (A) (/
- (B and C) ()
-) : .3
- (
- :

.3 .(3×1)

(SPSS)

(SPSS)

One-Way ANOVA

.(2)

(2)

(1991)

(Piiro, 2002)

()

2001 (1990) (1990)

(2)

	151= *		
	5.64		1
	5.92	()	2
	6.44	()	3
	4.75	()	4
	5.60	()	5
	5.48	()	6
	4.35	()	7
	4.74		8
	6.49	()	9
	5.78	()	10
	(10)	(1)	.10-1 *

(3)

	151= *		
	5.40	()	1
	4.50	()	2
	4.88	()	3
	5.12	()	4
	6.15	()	5
	4.60	()	6
	4.95	()	7
	6.64	()	8
	6.50	()	9
	6.18	()	10

*

(3)

(3)

()

(0.05)

:

.()

" "

(5) (4)

(4)

(4)

:

(2 4) (6 1) (10 7)

" "

)

(2.09) (2.21) (2.94)

(
" "

(0.029) (0.004)

.(149)

(0.038)

(Rokeach,

1973)

(Schunke and Krogh, 1982)

)

(1991

:

:

(1990)

(Rokeach,

1973)

(5)

)

()

(2001)

(1987

(4)

..

	()	(74=)		(77=)		
0.51	0.66	4	5.50	6	5.79	
0.89	0.14	8	5.89	9	5.96	
0.004	*2.94	10	7.05	7	5.85	
0.47	0.72	3	4.90	2	4.59	
0.029	*2.21	6	5.56	1	4.58	
0.89	0.14	5	5.51	5	5.45	
0.23	1.21	1	4.06	3	4.63	
0.038	*2.09	2	4.20	4	5.27	
0.24	1.18	9	6.21	10	6.75	
0.55	0.60	7	5.64	8	5.93	

.149

0.05 > *

(5)

..

	()	(74=)		(77=)		
0.49	0.69	6	5.56	5	5.24	
0.13	1.54	1	4.17	3	4.81	
0.22	1.22	5	5.17	1	4.61	
0.46	0.74	3	4.97	6	5.27	
0.34	0.96	8	6.35	7	5.96	
0.67	0.43	2	4.51	2	4.70	
0.62	0.50	4	5.06	4	4.84	
0.57	0.56	9	6.52	10	6.76	
0.70	0.39	10	6.59	9	6.41	
0.79	0.27	7	6.10	8	6.25	

.(149)

0.05 >

(5)

(A))
(C and B)

: (3 6) (5 1)
(0.05)

..

)

(A)
(B and C)

(0.05)

..

.(149)

..

(6) .(7) (6)

(Marolyn, 1979)

(Cellar, 1978)

()

(Shunke and Krogh, 1982)

(6) (2001)

()

(Rokeach, 1973)

()

(3 1)

(6) .() ()

:

:

() (2)

.()

(7)

(6)

..

	()	(76=)		(75=)		
0.58	0.56	5	5.52	7	5.77	
0.15	1.47	6	5.57	8	6.28	
0.42	0.81	10	6.27	9	6.61	

	()	(76=)		(75=)		
0.80	0.26	2	4.80	4	4.69	
0.003	*3.01	7	5.72	2	4.40	
0.73	0.35	4	5.40	5	5.56	
0.68	0.42	1	4.44	1	4.25	
0.76	0.31	3	4.82	3	4.66	
0.09	1.72	9	6.10	10	6.88	
0.38	0.88	8	5.98	6	5.58	

.(149) 0.05 > *

(7)

..

	()	(76=) ()		(75=) ()		
0.02	*2.35	4	4.86	7	5.94	
0.22	1.22	1	4.25	3	4.76	
0.32	1.01	5	5.11	2	4.65	
0.16	1.42	3	4.84	5	5.41	
0.92	0.10	7	6.13	8	6.17	
0.43	0.80	2	4.43	4	4.78	
0.03	*2.19	6	5.43	1	4.46	
0.82	0.23	9	6.69	10	6.60	
0.83	0.22	8	6.55	9	6.45	
0.04	*2.07	10	6.77	6	5.60	

.(149) 0.05 > *

(6)

()

()

()

()

.(

)

(3.01)

()

(2001)

(149)

(0.003)

(7)

..

()

()

(7)

(6)

()

()

() ()

(2001) :

(10 6) (6 1) (4 7)

() ()

(7)

:

()

()

(2.19) (2.35) " "

(2.07)

(0.04) (0.03) (0.02)

(0.05) (149)

()

()

(One-Way-ANOVA))

(8) (9) (8)

() ()

(8)

" "

()

	()	(20=)		(109=)		(22=)		
0.73	0.32	8	5.80	7	5.70	4	5.22	
0.22	1.52	4	5.10	8	5.92	9	6.68	
0.32	1.16	6	5.70	9	6.49	9	6.68	
0.59	0.52	2	4.75	4	4.85	1	4.22	
0.01	*4.74	10	6.70	2	4.70	5	5.36	
0.95	0.06	5	5.30	5	5.50	6	5.54	
0.87	0.03	1	4.45	1	4.35	1	4.22	

	()	(20=)		(109=)		(22=)		
0.83	0.18	3	5.05	3	4.75	3	4.45	
0.27	1.31	6	5.70	10	6.70	8	6.33	
0.29	1.24	9	6.45	6	5.56	7	6.27	

.001 > *

(9)

()

.()

	()	(20=)		(109=)		(22=)		
0.07	2.66	1	4.35	6	5.40	7	6.36	
0.31	1.19	4	5.30	1	4.42	2	4.18	
0.013	*4.34	9	6.60	2	4.58	2	4.18	
0.23	1.47	2	4.60	5	5.33	4	4.54	
0.19	1.71	10	6.90	7	5.92	8	6.59	
0.052	3.01	5	5.55	3	4.65	1	3.45	
0.32	1.14	3	5.15	4	5.13	5	4.77	
0.39	0.95	8	6.30	10	6.57	10	7.31	
0.40	0.92	6	5.80	9	6.45	9	6.95	
0.71	0.35	7	5.90	8	6.33	6	5.72	

.(148) (2)

0.013 > *

.(148) (2)

(8)

(8)

(8)

(0.01)

(0.01)

(4.74)

()

:	.1		(2001)
		(9)	
	.2		()
		(9)	
()	.3		
	.4		
	.5	(9)	
	.6	(4.34) () (0.013)	.148 (2)
	.7		
	.8	(9)	
			(1990)
		(1990)	
	.9		
	.10		.4

			...
	1992		
		.175-133 (1)2	1991
	1990		.81-45 :(2)7
			1990
		1987	.136-92 :(3)17
			1975
		2001	
			1995
		.57-9 :(3)17	
		2002	
			1996
-11 :(2)1			
		.54	2001
			2 1
	1993		
Cellar, B. L. 1978. A Study of Similarities and Differences of Values of High School Seniors in Different Communities within a Metropolitan Area. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International</i> , 38(11): 6410-A.			2004
Johnston, C. S. 1995. The Rokeach Value Survey: Underlying Structure and Multidimensional Scaling. <i>Journal of Psychology</i> , 129(5): 583-597.		.183-158 :(1)31	1994
Marolyn C.N. 1979. Value Differences among Gifted Adolescents. <i>Counseling and Values</i> , 26(1): 35-41.			2002
Piirto, Jane. 2002. I Live in My Own Bubble: The Values of Talented U.S. Ohio Adolescents Before and After September 11, 2001. Paper Presented at the European Council for High Ability Conference, Rhodes, Greece, 11, 2002.			2002
Rokeach, M. 1973. <i>The Nature of Human Values</i> . New York, the Free Press.			
Schunke, G. M. Krogh, S.L. 1982. Values Concepts of Younger Children. <i>The Social Studies</i> , 73(6): 268-272.			1990
Silvino, P.J. 1972. A Comparative Study of Social Values of Elementary School Children According to Sex, Grade, and Socioeconomic Level. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International</i> , 33(11): 6101-A.			2001
Teo, T. 2000. Eduard Spranger. In A.E.Kazdin, Editor, <i>Encyclopedia of Psychology</i> , Oxford University Press, 7: 458-459.			1991
		.239-205 :(3) 18	

Sixth Grade Pupils' Priorities of Rokeach Scale Value According to Some Variables

*Jawdat A. Saadeh, Yosra A. Zaidan and Ismael J. Abu Zyada**

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at ranking the terminal and instrumental values by grade six pupils in Salfet Governorate (Palestine) according to three variables: sex, students place of housing and the work type of their fathers.

Rokeach values survey of (36) items, which was adapted to the Jordanian educational environment by Batsh and Abdul-Rahman (1990) was evaluated by (31) jury group members, in order to select the most appropriate items to the Palestinian educational environment and to the age of sixth graders. (10) terminal values and (10) instrumental values were selected.

The reliability coefficients of ranks were calculated by applying the instrument two times, and were between (0.35-0.84). Cluster sampling of (151) sixth graders was chosen, (77) male and (74) female pupils.

To answer the study's four questions, and to test its three hypotheses, the researchers used rank means, "t" test, and One-Way ANOVA. The results showed that the first rank went to the national security as terminal value and to the cleanness as instrumental value. There was statistical significant difference for equality and free choice values in favor of the male students, and for the salvation values in favor of female pupils. There was no significant difference for each of the instrumental values according to the sex variable. The results showed also a significant difference for free choice and sacrifice values, in favor of pupils who lived in the (A) area, where the security control is for Palestinians, and for ambitions value in favor of pupils who lived in the (B and C) areas, where the security control is for Israelis. There was also a significant difference for free choice and encouragement values, in favor of pupils, whose fathers receive a monthly salary.

Most results were attributed to the severe life conditions of sixth graders, because of the Israeli occupation to Palestine.

Keywords: Value Priorities, Rokeach Scale, Pupils, Variables, Sixth Grade, Terminal Values, Instrumental Values.

*Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Human Sciences, Jordan University of Graduate Studies, Jordan(1); Palestinian Curricula's Center, Ramallah, Palestine(2); Al-Madar Statistical Center, Nablus, Palestine(3). Received on 9/12/2004 and Accepted for Publication on 9/11/2005.