Analysis of Motivational Action Conflict Frequency of Turkish High School Students in Terms of Value Orientation*

Hüseyin Çalışkan¹, Çağla Karademir², Alpay Aksin³

¹Sakarya University, Education Faculty, Department of Social Studies Education, Sakarya, Turkey
²Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University, Ereğli Education Faculty, Department of Educational Sciences, Zonguldak, Turkey
³Amasya University, Education Faculty, Department of Social Studies Education, Amasya, Turkey

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate to association between motivational action conflict frequency and value orientation as well as sociodemographic correlates of value orientation among Turkish high school students. Participants consisted of 846 students in different high schools from Marmara Region of Turkey and completed Motivational Action Conflict Frequency Survey and Value Orientation Scale. Results of this study suggested that students have average well-being value orientation and low achievement value orientation. There was no significant association between achievement and well-being value orientation and school-leisure time conflict; however, a weak and positive significant relationship exist between achievement value orientation and school time-school time conflict and leisure time-leisure time conflict, and there was a negative low-level significant relationship between well-being value orientation and school time-school time conflict and leisure time-leisure time conflict. The students' achievement and well-being value orientation were significantly different based on gender and daily studying times. Well-being value orientation associated with high school type, but no significant difference found in achievement value orientation. Lastly, there was no significant difference in value orientation in terms of grade level. The results of this study may also help to understand the correlates of value orientation and motivational conflict frequency in Turkish literature where a very limited number of studies have been conducted.

© 2020 IJPES. All rights reserved.

Keywords:
motivational action conflict, value orientation, adolescence

1. Introduction

Values reflect individuals' desires, tendencies, and choices and related to the goals of individuals and the behaviour styles required to reach these objectives (Schwartz, 2007). Values are also serving as mechanisms that shape the attitudes of an individual towards the outside world. They enable people to form assumptions about how an idea, object, status, or individual will positively or negatively affect them (Schwartz, 2012). For example, if an individual care about freedom, that individual cannot value authoritarianism at the same level. If values are cognitively active and central to quality, they organize and stimulate behaviour compliant with a subject or situation. For example, intense self-sacrifice values may lead to forgiveness (Verplanken & Holland, 2002).

Values are used for identifying the properties of groups, societies, and individuals, as well as to monitor changes over time and explain the motivational basis for attitudes and behaviors (Schwartz, 2012). From the moment the socialization process begins for a person, while the socio-cultural structure transfers its own values to individual, the individual filters these values with his/her own cognitive and affective properties

---

and forms a unique system of values (Schwartz, 2007). Studies related to values among students mainly approach this topic from Rokeach's values system approach (1973) and Schwarz's value theory (1996). Fries, Schmid, Dietz, and Hofer (2005) developed value change theory, which inspired political scientist Ronald Inglehart (1997), (2015) to identify which values primarily affect students' lives and decisions. According to Inglehart (1997), (2015) modern values, such as hard work, safety, and well-being, are conflicting with post-modern values, such as compassion, spending time with friends, and self-actualization. Fries et al. (2005) entitled Inglehart's modern values as "achievement values" and post-modern values as "well-being values." Achievement values relates to the importance of effort and achievement, appreciation of school-related topics, and desire to reach objectives for the future and work. Well-being values relates to preferring social activities (e.g., leisure time activities), spending more time with friends, loving activities that are fun, and wanting to enjoy life (2005).

Since achievement and well-being value orientation occupies two important aspects of students' lives including school and leisure time, researchers also suggested that students can experience conflict in these values (Lens, Lacante, Vansteenkiste & Herrera, 2005) as school encourages achievement and well-being is dominant in leisure time (Schmid, Hofer, Dietz, Reinders & Fries, 2005).

Because behaviors judged based on complying or not complying with the value systems of individuals (Schwartz, 1992), values enable individuals to decide what to choose and what to avoid. In terms of achievement values, individuals should put more effort into better grades in school. On the other hand, in terms of well-being values, leisure time activities might play a role in hindering school-related work (Fries, Schmid, Dietz & Hofer, 2005). In daily life, individuals have choices between a wide variety of behaviors that will affect whether they reach their objectives. When individuals face conflict in decision making process both in the social and education environment, values generally act as directive. However, when students experience conflict between two desirable outcomes, it is also possible occur a conflict between achievement and well-being related value orientation known as motivational action conflict (Fries, Schmid, Dietz & Hofer, 2005).

Motivation is a directing force for an organism to act to reach a certain object or event (Budak, 2005). Motivational action conflict is defined as a conflict with two or more action options with positive external stimulants, but when these action options do not occur simultaneously (Schmid, Hofer, Dietz, Reinders & Fries, 2005). Individuals can face motivational action conflicts during the decision-making process as a result of the interaction of certain factors surrounding an individual and his/her environment (Schmid, Hofer, Dietz, Reinders & Fries, 2005). Motivational action conflict is caused by two or more behavioral paths related to mutually interconnected objectives. Although students have been free to decide how long they will study and when they will have leisure time, they can still experience motivational action conflicts. This occurs especially when making decisions between school and leisure time activities, as well as making decisions related to school (school–school conflict) and leisure time (leisure time–leisure time conflict) (Fries, Schmid, Dietz & Hofer, 2005). In other words, motivational action conflict is an intellectual, behavioural, and cognitive state experienced as a result of the negative effects of attractive alternatives when there is a need to choose between two opposite objectives related to school and leisure time (Hofer, Schmid, Fries, Dietz, Clausen & Reinders, 2007).

A student being called by a close friend to do something else while studying for an important exam the next day is an example of motivational action conflict. If both action alternatives offer positive incentives to the student (who wants a high grade but also to have fun), it is possible that this student will experience motivational action conflict. If the student decides to stay home and study, he will be less interested in studying, possibility increase the ease with which he is distracted as well as the number of distractions, his motivation will decrease, and his studying capacity will lessen based on the positive incentives offered by his friend. On the other hand, if he decides to meet with his friend, he will be distracted and feel guilty because of the importance he gives to studying and the results he wants to achieve. Among these two simultaneously occurring action alternatives, the unselected action alternative and incentivizing aspects of this alternative might conflict with desired choices and prevent existing action (Kilian, Hofer & Kuhnle, 2010).

Fries et al. (2005) assumes that the likelihood of experiencing motivation action conflict is determined by individual value orientation; therefore, the motivational action conflict concept is explained through its connection with individual value orientation. The difference between achievement and well-being value orientation is used to account for individual differences in motivational action conflicts. Individual differences related to motivational action conflict decisions affect individual differences in value orientation (Kilian, Hofer & Kuhnle, 2010). Conflicts between achievement and well-being value orientation are visible as conflicts between school and leisure time-related activities (Schmid, Hofer, Dietz, Reinders & Fries, 2005). Students' value orientation is related to systematic decisions made when they are forced to decide between school and leisure time-related activities (Fries, Schmid, Dietz & Hofer, 2005). In the case of a conflict between school and leisure time, value orientation affects students' decisions, not just in terms of motivational action conflict, but also how students handle these conflicts can change their values over time (Kilian, Hofer & Kuhnle, 2010).

A student cannot comply with two values (achievement and well-being) within the same action. He or she acts based on the relative importance of each value type on his/her own. When high achievement and high well-being value orientation are considered, and a student decides on an action plan, the student might experience doubt about whether the decision was correct after the decision or during action. For example, "Should I go out with my friends instead of studying for the mathematics exam next week?" or "Should I study for the mathematics exam next week instead of going out with my friends?" Conflicts after decisions that follows such events might be misleading. Regardless of which action is selected, the student will always have doubt, and this might lead to negative results in terms of the student's action performance (Schmid, Hofer, Dietz, Reinders & Fries, 2005).

In a semi-structured interview study with 25 high school students in Germany, Schmid et al. (2005) found that young German students failed to successfully connect achievement and well-being values, and these two values can conflict in daily life. The results of this study also showed that participants found both the success and well-being value orientations to be highly important, and the participants experienced conflict between school and leisure time. When the students were forced to decide between school and leisure time activities, they reported behavioral, cognitive, and emotional conflicts.

In a survey study with 184 secondary school and high school students, Fries et al. (2005) found that students frequently experienced conflict between both school related work and leisure time activities, and they had high scores in both achievement and well-being values. Researchers also found that students with high achievement value orientation cared about school-related tasks more than students with high well-being value orientation and value orientation is related to allocating time for learning and grade level.

In a sample of 704 secondary school students, Hofer et al. (2007) examined the relationship between individual value orientation, motivational action conflicts, and successful self-regulation, and time investment for learning. The results of this study showed that students tend to choose the action that is more compliant with dominant value orientation in motivational action conflicts. While students with high achievement value orientation tend to decide more frequently for the school-related alternative, students with high well-being value orientation tend to choose leisure time-related alternatives. Additionally, achievement value orientation and successful self-regulation predicted time investment for academic learning.

In a multi-cultural study from five countries, Hofer, Schmid, Fries, Zivkovic, and Dietz (2009) examined the relationship between students' value orientation and motivational deformation due to conflicts between learning and leisure time activities. Researchers found that well-being value orientation positively correlated with experience of motivational interference during learning and conflict frequency and negatively correlated with allocating time to school-related activities (homework, general preparation, etc.). Relationships related to achievement value orientation also showed almost opposite results.

In a sample of 817 eighth grade German students, Kuhnle, Hofer, and Kilian (2010) investigated whether the objective conflict frequency between school and leisure time acted as a mediator between students' value orientation and the effect of self-control capacity on balanced life experience. The researchers defined life balance as allocating satisfactory time for different life fields. The adolescents were pursuing a wide range of activities, interest areas, and duties, and they were forced to choose certain objectives under certain

conditions. If there was a conflict between the different objectives for the adolescents and if one pursued objective caused that individual to pay the price of not putting effort into other objectives, this could endanger life balance. The researchers argued that the general structure of value orientation is related to the frequency of objective conflict and life balance. As a result of descriptive analysis, it was determined that the students in the highest-level school (Gymnasium) were more controlled and balanced, as well as experienced less conflict. It was also found that high achievement and well-being value orientation results caused both a positive relationship between the two value orientations and conflict frequency and an indirect negative relationship with life balance due to time resource constraints. Researchers argued that life balance is an important structure for adolescents and a high level of self-control can act as a resource to effectively manage life. Thus, it is important to identify the value orientation of today's youth and the conflict frequency between school and leisure time activities, which cover an important part of their lives, to determine precautions on this area. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between motivational action conflict frequency and value orientation, as well as to examine correlates of value orientations among high school students.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

A cross-sectional research design was used to investigate to association between motivational action conflict frequency and value orientation as well as sociodemographic correlates of value orientation among Turkish high school students (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2018).

2.2. Participants

Participants consisted of 846 high school students in four different high school types in Kocaeli province, Turkey. Kocaeli is a highly populated and industrialized city which is located in the Marmara Region of Turkey. These students were selected among different school types to ensure maximum diversity in the sample. There were 281 Science High School students (33.2%), 283 Anatolian High School students (33.5%), 112 High School students (13.2%), and 170 Technical High School students (20.1%). Among the participating students, 49.3% (*n*=417) were girls, 50.7% (*n*= 429) were boys; 34.3% (*n*=290) were in the ninth grade, 34.4% (*n*=291) were in the tenth grade, and 31.3% (*n*=265) were in the eleventh grade. Students' ages ranged from 14–19 years old (*M*=15.99, *SD*=.88). Lastly, students' daily study time varied between less than 30 minutes to 120 minutes or more, and most of the students worked from 31 to 60 minutes (*n*=271), followed by between 61 minutes to 119 minutes (*n*=241), less than 30 minutes (*n*=233), and 120 minutes or more (*n*=101).

2.3. Measures

2.3.1. Motivational action conflict frequency survey. In order to measure motivational action conflict frequency, students were asked to evaluate how frequently they experienced conflict among daily life activities. For this purpose, questions created by Fries et al. (2005) were used. The questions were translated into Turkish by the researchers using the translation and back-translation method as suggested by Brislin (1980). Three questions were used for school and leisure time conflicts (school–school, leisure time–leisure time, and school–leisure time). Before these questions were asked, students were given a description phrase: *"Some young people say their schedule is full in the afternoon. While they want to lot of things related to school, they also say they want to attend different leisure time activities. Therefore, it is sometimes hard to decide on what they want to do."* Next, they were asked the following three questions: *"1. How frequently do you experience indecisiveness about doing something for school in the afternoon or on the weekend (homework, studying for exams, etc.) or spending time on leisure time activities (meeting with friends, sports, watching television, etc.)? 2. How frequently do you want to do multiple activities in your leisure time (for example, sports, meeting with friends, etc.)? 3. When you have to do multiple things related to school (for example, studying for an exam and doing homework for a couple of classes), how frequently do you get confused about where to start?"*. Each student provided answers based on a five-point Likert type scale ranging from *Never* (1) to *Always* (5). Possible scores ranged from 1 to 5. Higher scores indicated higher school–school, leisure time–leisure time, and school–leisure time conflict in each question, respectively.

2.3.2. Value orientation scale. In order to measure value orientation of high school students, the Value Orientation Scale (VOS) developed by Fries et al. (2005) and adapted into Turkish by Çalışkan and Karademir (2014) was used. The scale consists of two subscales and four items each subscale had two items for measuring achievement and well-being value orientation. The items for identifying achievement value orientation describes a student with open objectives, who tolerates boring tasks, and wants to achieve something in his/her life. The items for identifying well-being value orientation describes a student who wants to spend most of his/her time with friends, who loves having fun and unplanned activities, and who wants to have fun in his/her life (Fries, Schmid, Dietz & Hofer, 2005). Students were asked to answer each item on a six-point scale. To ascertain the linguistic validity of the Turkish adaptation of this scale, both its Turkish and English forms were applied to 46 students in the English Teaching department, and significant correlations ranging from .60 to .79 was found between original and translated items. To determine underlying factor structure of the scale, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted. After the analyses, consistent with the conceptualization of Fries et al. (2005) a factor structure that measures two different value orientations (well-being and achievement value orientation) was obtained. The factor loadings of well-being value orientation were .60 and .80, and the factor loadings for achievement value orientation were .32 and .75 (Çalışkan & Karademir, 2014). In the original scale, Hofer et al. (2007) found test-retest reliability to be .71 for well-being value orientation and .58 for achievement value orientation. Four-week stability coefficient of well-being value orientation of the scale was .86, and achievement value orientation was .83 in Turkish version (Çalışkan & Karademir, 2014). Items are summed then averaged to obtain a scale score for well-being value orientation and achievement value orientation. Possible scores range from 1 to 5, and higher scores indicate higher well-being and achievement value orientation in each subscale.

2.4. Procedure

The data were collected from the high students between February 2017 and April 2017. Data collection process conducted by the first and second researcher in the classroom environment during lesson times. Before the students proceeding to answer the questionnaire, researchers informed to students about ethics of the study and stated that the participation in the research was voluntary, that the answers given would remain confidential, that the data would not be used for any purpose other than the research and that they could withdraw from the study without any sanction at the beginning, middle or end of the research. All students voluntarily participated to study. Students completed the questionnaire approximately in twenty minutes.

2.5. Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses were performed using the IBM SPSS 23 for Windows. Descriptive statistics including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were used to give information about study participants and the levels of achievement value orientation and well-being value orientation, and different types of motivational action conflict frequency. Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to examine the strength and direction of associations between value orientations and different types of motivational action conflict frequency. Independent samples *t*-tests used to compare the differences in mean scores of achievement value orientation and well-being value orientation between males and females. One-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to examine the differences in mean scores of achievement value orientation and well-being value orientation across high school type, grade level, and daily study time. In case of one-way ANOVA is significant, a post-hoc Tukey HSD test performed to determine the source of mean differences across different groups. Preliminary analyses were conducted to examine the assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance, or linearity in relevant analyses and no violation of assumptions were found. The level of statistical significance was set at *p*<.05 in all inferential statistics.

4. Results

Descriptive statistics for value orientation levels and motivational action conflict frequency level of high school students presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for value orientations and different motivational action conflicts

	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Value Orientation				
Achievement	2.74	1.19	1.00	6.00
Well-being	3.25	1.22	1.00	6.00
Type of Motivational Action Conflict				
School–leisure time	3.01	1.12	1.00	5.00
School–School time	3.45	1.14	1.00	5.00
Leisure time–leisure time	2.91	1.19	1.00	5.00

Note: N=846.

As seen in Table 1, the well-being value orientation (*M*= 3.25) and achievement value orientation (*M*= 2.74) of high school students were in the "low" range; however, the average well-being value orientation scores of high school students were slightly higher than the average achievement value orientation scores. In the school–leisure time conflict, the mean was at the "sometimes" (*M*= 3.01) level. In students' conflicts in school time and school time, the average was at the "mostly" (*M*= 3.45) level. In students' conflicts in leisure time-leisure time activities, the average was at the "sometimes" (*M*= 2.91).

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to examine the strength and direction of associations between value orientations and different types of motivational action conflict frequency and results of Pearson product moment correlation coefficient analyses presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of Pearson product moment correlation coefficients

	Value Orientations	
Type of motivational action conflict	Achievement	Well-being
	r	r
School time–leisure time	-.01	-.06
School time–School time	.10**	-.20**
Leisure time–leisure time	.24**	-.22**

Note: ** *p*<.01.

As seen in Table 2, there was no significant relationship between achievement and well-being value orientation (*r*= -.01, *p*>.05) and between well-being and school time–leisure time conflict (*r*= -.06, *p*>.05). However, there was a weak and positive correlation between achievement value orientation and school time-school time conflict (*r*= .10, *p*<.01), and between achievement value orientation and leisure time-leisure time conflict (*r*= .22, *p*<.01). Results of Pearson product moment correlation analyses also showed that there was a weak and negative association between well-being value orientation and school time-school time conflict (*r*= -.20, *p*<.01), and well-being value orientation and leisure time-leisure time conflict (*r*= -.22, *p*<.01). Independent-samples *t* tests conducted to compare the mean scores of the male and female high school students in achievement and well-being value orientation presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of independent samples t-tests for achievement and well-being value orientation

	M	SD	df	t	p	d
Achievement						
Female	2.93	1.31	844	4.74	.001***	.32
Male	2.55	1.02				
Well-being						
Female	3.13	1.26	844	2.80	.005**	-.20
Male	3.37	1.17				

Note: *d*= Cohen d effect size measure, Males used as reference category in calculation of Cohen's d.,
** *p*<.01, *** *p*<.001.

Results of independent samples *t*-test suggested that there was a significant difference between the means of the two groups in achievement (*t*(844)= 4.74, *p*<.001, *d*= .32) and well-being value orientations (*t*(844)= 2.80,

$p<.001$, $d= -.20$). The effect sizes for achievement and well-being value orientations differences between females and males were small. As seen in Table 3, the mean achievement value orientation of the female high school students ($M= 2.93$) was significantly higher than the mean achievement value orientation of male high school students ($M= 2.55$). However, the mean well-being value orientation of male high school students ($M= 3.37$) was significantly higher than the mean well-being value orientation of female high school students ($M= 3.13$).

One-way ANOVAs conducted to compare the mean scores of high school students with respect to high school type in achievement and well-being value orientation presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Results of one-way ANOVA for high-school type

	M	*SD*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η^2	Post-Hoc Tukey
Achievement							
1. Science High School	2.81	1.07	3, 842	.78	.508	.00	-
2. Anatolian High School	2.74	1.18					
3. High School	2.62	1.36					
4. Technical High School	2.70	1.27					
Well-Being							
1. Science High School	3.15	1.09	3, 842	3.96	.008**	.01	1-4, 2-4
2. Anatolian High School	3.16	1.18					
3. High School	3.41	1.37					
4. Technical High School	3.49	1.35					

*Note: $p<.01$**.*

As seen in Table 4, there was no significant difference in students' achievement value orientation level based on high school type ($F(3, 842)= .78$, $p>.05$, $\eta^2= .00$). However, result of one-way ANOVA was significant for well-being value orientation ($F(3, 842)= 3.96$; $p<.01$, $\eta^2= .01$). The effect size was small, such that high school type explains approximately 1% of changes in well-being value orientation scores. A Tukey HSD post hoc test showed that regular high school students ($M= 3.41$) significantly higher well-being value orientation scores than Science high school students ($M= 3.15$) or Anatolian high school students ($M= 3.16$). Other groups did not significantly differ from each other.

One-way ANOVAs conducted to compare the mean scores of high school students with respect to grade level in achievement and well-being value orientation presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Results of one-way ANOVA for grade level

	M	*SD*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Achievement						
1. 9th grade	2.79	1.24	2, 843	.77	.462	.00
2. 10th grade	2.74	1.17				
3. 11th grade	2.67	1.15				
Well-being						
1. 9th grade	3.22	1.22	2, 843	.78	.460	.00
2. 10th grade	3.33	1.31				
3. 11th grade	3.21	1.12				

As seen in Table 5, there was no significant difference in achievement value orientation level ($F(2, 843)= .77$, $p>.05$, $\eta^2= .00$) or well-being value orientation level ($F(2, 843)= .78$, $p>.05$, $\eta^2= .00$) with respect to grade level.

One-way ANOVAs conducted to compare the mean scores of high school students with respect to daily studying time in achievement and well-being value orientation presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Results of one-way ANOVA for daily study time

	M	SD	df	F	p	η^2	Post-Hoc Tukey
Achievement							
1. Less than 30 minutes	3.14	1.36	3, 842	14.82	.001***	.05	1-2
2. From 31–60 minutes	2.67	1.15					1-3
3. From 61–119 minutes	2.58	1.03					1-4
4. 120 minutes or more	2.35	.96					
Well-Being							
1. Less than 30 minutes	2.91	1.30	3, 842	11.65	.001***	.04	1-2
2. From 31–60 minutes	3.25	1.19					1-3
3. From 61–119 minutes	3.43	1.13					1-4
4. 120 minutes or more	3.64	1.15					2-4

*Note: p<.001***.*

As seen in Table 6, result of one-way ANOVA was significant for achievement value orientation (F(3, 842)= 14.82, p<.001, η^2= .05), and well-being value orientation (F(3, 842)= 11.65, p<.001, η^2= .04). The effect sizes were small, such that daily study time explains approximately 4% of changes in achievement value orientation scores and 4% of well-being value orientation scores. Results of post-hoc Tukey HSD test showed that students who studied less than 30 minutes in a day (M= 3.14) significantly higher achievement value orientation scores than students who studied between 61-119 minutes (M= 2.67), students who studied between 120 or higher minutes (M= 2.35). Moreover, results of post-hoc Tukey HSD test also showed that students who studied less than 30 minutes in a day (M= 2.91) significantly lower well-being value orientation scores than students who studied between 31-60 minutes (M= 3.25), 61-119 minutes (M= 3.43), or students who studied between 120 or higher minutes (M= 3.64). Lastly, students who studied between 31-60 minutes (M= 3.25) significantly lower well-being value orientation scores than students who studied between 120 or higher minutes (M= 3.64). There was no difference in other groups in achievement value orientation or well-being value orientation scores.

4. Discussion

This study investigated to association between motivational action conflict frequency and value orientation as well as sociodemographic correlates of value orientation among Turkish high school students. Results of this study suggested that achievement value orientation and well-being value orientation was at a low level in Turkish high school students. These findings are not in line with previous studies conducted by Fries et al. (2005) and Kilian et al. (2010) who reported that moderate levels for students' achievement and well-being value orientations. Students with high achievement value orientation tend to choose school-related activities, while students with high well-being value orientation tend to choose leisure time-related alternatives. Students with high well-being value orientation experience higher performance and mood disorders while imagining themselves in a learning activity, whereas students with high achievement value orientation experience performance and mood disorders related to leisure time-related activities. Since high achievement value orientation fundamentally offers incentives for achievement, those with this orientation are often more likely to choose learning alternatives. On the other hand, as high well-being value orientation fundamentally offers incentives for well-being, students with this orientation are more likely to decide on leisure time-alternatives (Schmid, Hofer, Dietz, Reinders & Fries, 2005). Therefore, it can be stated that students tend to choose leisure time- and social activity-related alternatives rather than school-related activities.

Students with high achievement and well-being value orientations experience more school–leisure time conflict than other students (Fries, Schmid, Dietz & Hofer, 2005). Since the participants did not have high level achievement and leisure time value orientations, school–leisure time action conflicts might be at the "sometimes" level. High achievement value orientation does not automatically mean lower well-being value orientation. Achievement and well-being value orientations explain students' school–leisure time conflict because these form part of the two main areas of students' lives (Kilian, Hofer & Kuhnle, 2010).

When the results are evaluated in terms of the relationship between students' value orientations and action conflict, no significant relationship between achievement and well-being value orientations and school–leisure time conflict is apparent. However, there is a positive low-level significant relationship between achievement value orientation and school conflict and leisure time conflict; and there is negative low-level significant relationship between well-being value orientation and school conflict and leisure time. Fries et al. (2005) identified a positive low-level significant relationship between students' well-being value orientation and leisure time conflict. According to Hofer et al. (2009), there is positive relationship between value orientation and school–leisure time conflict and a negative relationship between value orientation and studying time. While well-being and achievement values are important for students, the study participants did not have high-level value orientations. Additionally, achievement and well-being value orientations are not independent; instead, these two show a high negative correlation (2009). This might cause conflict between school–leisure time to frequently occur in students with both achievement and well-being value orientations.

The participants demonstrated a significant relationship between the two value orientations and school and leisure time conflicts. There was a meaningful association between students' school learning activities and learning program and decisions in the conflict state (Dietz, Hofer & Fries, 2007). The amount of value conflict is related to mandatory decision making between school and leisure time activities. This conflict is not only characterized by decision making situations related to school and leisure time, but also the difficulty of those decisions (Fries, Schmid, Dietz & Hofer, 2005). Individual differences related to motivational action conflict decisions may affect individual differences in value orientation (Kilian, Hofer & Kuhnle, 2010). There was a positive low-level significant relationship between participating students' achievement value orientation and leisure time conflicts. A study by Hofer et al. (2009) found that students with high achievement value orientation have fewer problems with leisure time thoughts occurring while they are engaged in academic activities.

Additionally, there was a significant difference in the achievement and well-being value orientations of the participants with respect to gender, which was similar to the results of other studies. It has been found that female students have significantly different achievement value orientations compared to male students. Uncu (2008) determined that the difference for the achievement dimension in terms of gender is in favor of girls in a sample of teachers and administrators. Similarly, Uyguç (2003) discovered a difference in terms of the importance levels of values based on students' gender in a sample of college students. Thus, results of this study also support and extend previous studies in a high school student sample. According to Güngör (2000), the different values that females and males have are related to cultural rather than biological factors, and these differences form society. Society cannot create intelligence differences between genders; however, living a different life is due to the different interests and expectations imposed by societal norms. For example, while academic interest was previously low for Turkish women, it is currently at a high level (Güngör, 2000). Thus, the life experiences and expectations placed on men and women may lead these groups to develop different values.

In this study, the well-being value orientation showed meaningful difference for high school type. Karaca (2008) also found that certain values in value orientation showed differences based on high school type in a divinity college student sample. In terms of well-being value orientation, Technical High School students significantly higher well-being orientation than Science High School students, and Anatolian High School students. These findings may be related to selection of Technical High Schools in Turkey. Generally, students in Technical High Schools have low grades, and parents sending students to these schools to learn an occupation, and students with relatively good grades in Turkey selecting Science High Schools and Anatolian High Schools. Thus, students with high achievement and well-being value orientations experience more school–leisure time conflict than other students. On the other hand, students with a well-being value orientation, who often attend Technical High Schools, tend to choose leisure time alternatives over schoolwork (Fries, Schmid, Dietz & Hofer, 2005).

Additionally, there was no significant difference for either value orientation in terms of grade level in this study, a finding similar to that Yalmancı (2009) found in preservice teachers. In Turkey, students' choices about their future occupations shape their expectations in high school. Thus, students generally study in an exam-oriented way and have achievement expectations not based on learning but rather on acquiring an

education for a particular purpose. As a result, the meaning of achievement for high school level students is to receive an education based on employment and solve the maximum number of questions on their exams. Students' desire to learn or understand high school classes is more important to them than socio-cultural, artistic, mental, and thought development. As a result, the students who participated in this study generally did not show different value orientations at the class level since all students at every class level were focused on their anxiety about the future and desire to achieve certain grades.

Lastly, it was determined that the achievement and well-being value orientations of the participants differed significantly based on daily studying hours. Students' achievement value orientation levels showed a significant difference in favor of students studying less than 30 minutes among those who studied less than 30 minutes, 61 minutes to 119 minutes, and 120 minutes or more. According to Hofer et al. (2009), value orientations are determinants of studying time. Additionally, achievement indicators can vary between individuals, education systems, and environmental conditions. When students are free to decide on their own studying timing, their academic procrastination tendency tend to be higher. There is a relationship between students' academic studying procrastination and conflict decisions. As the academic procrastination tendency increases, it is more likely for students to choose leisure time activities over the learning alternative (Dietz, Hofer & Fries, 2007). In this study, it can be stated that in terms of studying less than 30 minutes per day, students have more leisure time activity orientation.

This study has certain limitations. Firstly, this study conducted on a limited number of Turkish high school students from Marmara Region of Turkey. Thus, the external validity of this study is low. Secondly, this study used a cross-sectional research design that prevent causal relationships between independent and dependent variables. Lastly, this study collected information from students using self-report scales.

Although this limitations, findings of this study have several important implications for research and practice in high school students. In a study that examined the relationship between post-modern value orientations and procrastination and academic performance, it was found that daily planning and conflict situations might prevent procrastination and lead students to positive learning and studying-related decisions (Dietz, Hofer & Fries, 2007). At this point, based on students' achievement and well-being value orientations, possible action conflicts might be prevented with the help of environmental changes. Participation in structured leisure time activities is also positively correlated with academic success (Eccles & Barber, 1999). Therefore, a largely structured environment offers lower potential for action conflict and might lead to lower possible negative results. Additionally, while studying, certain students' value orientations and motivational action conflicts might change. Hofer et al. (2009) showed that while students' achievement value orientation decreased over time, well-being value orientation increased. Since this study was conducted in a limited environment, different studies with intercultural comparisons could also be conducted for different political, economic, and social orders. Motivation to learn is an important factor in shaping students learning activities (Tentama, Subardjo & Abdillah, 2019). Further studies can examine the association between motivation to learn and value orientations.

5. Conclusion

Consequently, results of this study suggested that achievement value orientation and well-being value orientation of Turkish high school students were low. Results of this study also suggested that some sociodemographics also correlated with high school student's achievement value orientation and well-being value orientation. Specifically, achievement goal orientations of high school students positively associated with being female but not correlated with grade level and school type. Moreover, students with low study time tend to be more achievement value oriented than students with high study time. Students with high achievement value orientation also more likely to experience school time-school time and leisure time-leisure time conflict. With respect to well-being value orientation, study results suggested that being male, being Science or Anatolian high school students and having high study time positively associated with well-being value orientation. Moreover, students with high well-being value orientation also less likely to experience school time-school time and leisure time-leisure time conflict. The results of this study may help to understand the correlates of value orientations of high school students in Turkish psychology literature where a very limited number of studies have been conducted.

References

Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written material. *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 2(2), 349–444.

Budak, S. (2005). *Psikoloji sözlüğü*. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.

Çalışkan, H., & Karademir, Ç. (2014). Değer Yönelimleri Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması [Adaptation of the Value Orientation Scale into the Turkish Language]., *Journal of Values Education*, 12(28), 47–68.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). New York: Routledge.

Dietz, F., Hofer, M., & Fries, S. (2007). Individual values, learning routines and academic procrastination. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(4), 893–906. doi:10.1348/000709906X169076

Eccles, J. S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14(1), 10–43. doi:10.1177/0743558499141003

Fries, S., Schmid, S., Dietz, F., & Hofer, M. (2005). Conflicting values and their impact on learning. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 20(3), 259–273.

Güngör, E. (2000). *Değerler psikolojisi üzerinde araştırmalar: Ahlâk psikolojisi, ahlâkî değerler ve ahlâkî gelişme* [Research on the psychology of values: Moral psychology, moral values and moral development]. İstanbul: Ötüken.

Hofer, M., Schmid, S., Fries, S., Dietz, F., Clausen, M., & Reinders, H. (2007). Individual values, motivational conflicts, and learning for school. *Learning and Instruction*, 17(1), 17–28.

Hofer, M., Schmid, S., Fries, S., Zivkovic, I., & Dietz, F. (2009). Value orientations and studying in school–leisure conflict: A study with samples from five countries. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 19(1), 101–112.

Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization* (5th ed.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. (2015). *The silent revolution: Changing values and political styles among western publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Karaca, R. (2008). *İlahiyat Fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer yönelimleri* [Divinity faculty students' value priorities]. (Master's Thesis). Marmara University, Istanbul.

Kilian, B., Hofer, M., & Kuhnle, C. (2010). Value orientations as determinants and outcomes of conflicts between on-task and off-task actions in the classroom. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20(5), 501–506.

Kuhnle, C., Hofer, M., & Kilian, B. (2010). The relationship of value orientations, self-control, frequency of school–leisure conflicts, and life-balance in adolescence. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20(3), 251–255.

Lens, W., Lacante, M., Vansteenkiste, M., & Herrera, D. (2005). Study persistence and academic achievement as a function of the type of competing tendencies. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 20(3), 275–287.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

Schmid, S., Hofer, M., Dietz, F., Reinders, H., & Fries, S. (2005). Value orientations and action conflicts in students' everyday life: An interview study. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 20(3), 243–257.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6

Schwartz, S. H. (1996). Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In C. Seligman, J. M. Olson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario symposium* (pp. 1–24). Hillsdale, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Basic human values: Theory, measurement, and applications. *Revue française de sociologie*, 47(4), 929–968.

Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, *2*(1), 11.

Tentama, F., Subardjo, & Abdillah, M. H. (2019). Motivation to learn and social support determine employability among vocational high school students. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, *8*(2), 237–242. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v8i2.18188

Uncu, Ü. (2008). *Öğretmen ve eğitim yöneticilerinin değer yönelimlerinin çok boyutlu olarak incelenmesi (İstanbul ili örneği)* [The multi-faceted analysis of 'the value intensions? For teachers and executives (the sample for Istanbul City)]. (Master's Thesis). Yeditepe University, Istanbul.

Uyguç, N. (2003). Cinsiyet, bireysel değerler ve meslek seçimi [Gender, personal values and choice of profession]. *Dokuz Eylul University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal*, *18*(1), 93–104.

Verplanken, B., & Holland, R. W. (2002). Motivated decision making: Effects of activation and self-centrality of values on choices and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(3), 434–447. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.82.3.434

Yalmancı, R. (2009). *Öğretmen adaylarının değer yönelimlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* [Investigation of preservice teachers' tendency of value with regard to several variables]. (Master's Thesis). Zonguldak Karaelmas University, Zonguldak.