

Jiří Pospíšil
Palacký University Olomouc, Department of Christian Social Work
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0074-5243>

Ivana Olecká
Palacký University Olomouc, Department of Christian Social Work
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4658-9984>

Substance Abuse, Social Values Change and Acceleration of Family Destabilization

Abstract

Background: Substance abuse has the potential to change value orientations and affects all aspects of human life.

Objectives: The text aims to show the shift in value orientations of respondents who use addictive substances compared to respondents who do not.

Methodology: One-way ANOVA was used in the statistical analysis of the dependence of the values on the occurrence of abusive behaviour, with dependencies at the level of $p \leq 0.05$ considered statistically significant.

Results: There were statistically significant differences between the group of respondents with abstinence from each addictive substance and the group of respondents without abstinence. Substance abuse shifts pro-family values towards greater individualization and thus threatens and destabilizes the family. It strengthens community-oriented values and weakens family-oriented values.

Conclusions: The transformation of the value system leads to a destabilization of family ties, which cease to be a priority. Working with values should be an opportunity for social pedagogy, social work, and all types of schools. Non-formal and informal education present particular opportunities for values education. In many cases, it is unnecessary to change the value system, but only to show the non-deviant way of fulfilling values.

Keywords: substance abuse, social values, family, destabilization

1. Introduction

Social prevention in the field of substance use is part of the policy on addictive behaviour, which is defined as a comprehensive and coordinated set of prevention, education, treatment, social, regulatory, control and other measures, including law enforcement measures, implemented at international, national, regional, and local levels. The main conceptual document in the application of measures to prevent and reduce harm resulting from substance use, pathological gambling and the overuse of modern technologies in Czech society is the National Strategy for the Prevention and Reduction of Harm Associated with Addictive Behaviour 2019–2027 (Leštinová, 2019). At the same time, social prevention in the field of substance use is part of the Health 2020 (MZČR, 2014) and Health 2030 (MZČR, 2019) strategies.

As a significant determinant of health and social well-being, substance abuse has affected all aspects of human life since the earliest days of human history. An addictive substance is one that is capable of adversely affecting a person's psyche, control or cognitive abilities or social behaviour, such substances include in particular alcohol, narcotic drugs, and psychotropic substances. They are increasingly perceived and examined in the literature as motivational components that significantly influence goals and modes of action. If values and value orientation as a whole represent, in a sense, a vector of desires toward which a person is moving, then substance abuse can be seen as a pathway to the fulfilment of these desires or even an attained goal. In both cases, the role of the addictive substance in relation to values can be seen in two ways:

- a. as a substitute for a goal or a route to a goal – in this case, the addictive substance plays a substitution role, and its use is an escape strategy when values are unable to be fulfilled by their actual content. In this case, the content supplied by the addictive substance is illusory.
- b. as an end in itself, when the transformation of the person's values has already taken place and the addictive substance becomes a value in itself (or the desire for it and the conviction of its importance).

Values as standards guide human behaviour in several ways. They lead to the formation of attitudes within social affairs and dispose the preference for political, ideological, and religious systems. They are an important factor in the construction of self-presentation before others and help judge the appropriateness of actions before others. Values are also key to comparing one's own morality and competence with that of the others. They also enable individuals to present one's own beliefs to others and assist in rationally coping with personally and

socially unacceptable feelings, attitudes, and actions (Rokeach, 1968, pp. 2–3, 1973, pp. 12–17).

The crucial role in the formation of value orientations plays family socialization. (Parsons and Bales, 1955). The value orientation the child acquires in primary socialization will enable the family ties to be built and strengthened in the procreative family. Kurtines (Kurtines and Gewirtz, 1991) notes in his book that the attention of researchers in the area of the values-substance abuse nexus has focused primarily on the adolescent target group. He notes, however, that although numerous studies have documented the existence of differences in value attitudes between illegal drug users and the general population, it is not clear whether there is a direct relationship between value orientations and the tendency to use illegal drugs. It is an area in which he sees a major knowledge gap. Our recent research has shown that substance abuse has the potential to change value orientations (Olecká and Pospíšil, 2022, pp. 95–127). Similarly to Sorys (2021), we suggest that parental substance abuse affects children in families in the broadest possible context. The environment in which a child grows up creates the conditions for developing his or her personality. These conditions can be both positive, developing the individual's personality, and negative, having a destructive and, in some cases, fatal effect on the individual. (Olecká, Přechtěl and Skarupská, 2019) Children growing up in drug-abusing families are thus a very vulnerable group. (Laslett *et al.*, 2015) The effect of what we refer to as second-hand drinking¹, for example, is not only present when a child is exposed to a family member's drinking but also affects these children in later life. (Barnes, Farrell and Cairns, 1986; Darling and Steinberg, 1993).

The aim of the text is to show a shift in the value orientations of respondents who use addictive substances in comparison with respondents who do not use these substances. We selected two types of social values from Rokeach's itineraries for the analysis. The first group consists of values that are oriented towards the community, and the second group of values consists of those that are directed inside the family to build strong family ties. We presuppose that the shift in preferences of social values in the case of substance abuse is different, and the differences are particularly noticeable between nicotine abuse (including tobacco products) and alcohol and drug abuse. We assume that alcohol and drug abuse, which unlike nicotine abuse causes family destabilization (Barnes, Farrell and Cairns, 1986; Darling and Steinberg, 1993; Laslett *et al.*, 2015), has a significantly different

¹ "Second-hand drinking" refers to the negative effects that people experience around those who drink alcohol excessively. It includes any financial difficulties of the family related to spending on alcohol, arguments, and domestic violence, emotional abuse caused by alcohol, failure to fulfil social, work or family obligations, which causes harm to others, driving under the influence of alcohol resulting in damage to the health and property of others, etc.

and negative impact on social value preferences. Substance abuse therefore affects the destabilization of family ties not only as one of the direct causes, but it also has a secondary effect through the transformation of value preferences and the restructuring of one's value system. In the case of values aimed at supporting the community and social status in the community (true friendship, freedom, social recognition), an increase in people's preferences in connection with the abuse of addictive substances can be expected, since social tolerance for abuse is high in the Czech Republic and the use of addictive substances, especially alcohol and smoking, is associated with a range of social rituals related to families, work, and community. In the case of family-oriented values (Economic prosperity, Family security, Respect for parents and the elderly, Mature love), a weakened emphasis on these values can be expected.

2. Methods

In the research, the results of which are presented in this paper, values were measured in a direct, preference-scaled manner. The measurement of variables containing value preferences was conducted consistently across values on continuous scales. All these scales were constructed so that they could be analysed separately in relation to underlying sociodemographic factors or other factor variables. The scales are designed as continuous internally restricted scales from 1 to 10. One meant 'this value/trait does not concern me and is foreign to me' and ten meant 'this value/trait is very important to me and I fully identify with it'. Technically, the measurement was made on a continuous scale with a sensitivity set at 0.1 degree/one step to achieve the effect of continuity while maintaining the respondent's freedom to express their attitude.

In constructing the questionnaire, we relied on the Rokeach scales (Rokeach, 1973, p. 26nn) of values. The reason for choosing Rokeach's itineraries was primarily due to its division into terminal and instrumental values when terminal values describe the desired end-states of things and instrumental values describe modes of action and competencies. Rokeach further subdivides the terminal values into intrapersonal and social values, and the instrumental values into moral and competence values (Rokeach, 1973, pp. 27–30). The classification of values into these subcategories was not completed by Rokeach himself, and the division was made by our research team when analysing the value measures. In the case of substance abuse, we selected social values from the itinerary of terminal values, because we assumed strong influence of these values on family and social life.

When we theorized the role of social values, we selected seven of them, three tending to support community and social life and ties (True friendship, Freedom, Social recognition), and four tending to support family ties (Economic prosperity, Family security, Respect for parents and the elderly, Mature love). The main hypothesis that is tested in the text is as follows: in individual value preferences, there is a shift in these preferences in people with substance abuse compared to groups without such abuse.

One-way ANOVA (Sheskin, 2011, pp. 885–891) was used in the statistical analysis of the dependence of the values on the occurrence of abusive behaviour, with dependencies at the level of $p \leq 0.05$ considered statistically significant. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used in the analysis of the dependencies between the dimensions of threat and value preferences (Sheskin, 2011, pp. 1247–1253). To determine statistical significance, Pearson's coefficient was transformed to a t-value and the dependency was tested at the $p \leq 0.05$ level (Sheskin, 2011, pp. 1254–1259).

In the analysis of the relationship between substance abuse and value preferences, significant differences in value preferences for the group reporting substance abuse versus the control group of the non-abusing population were compared and graphed. In the case of the threat analysis, only the abusive group continued to be analysed and within this group the relationships between the stated type of substance abuse and the value orientations of the substance users were examined. For this analysis, only those value orientations that showed statistical significance at the $p \leq 0.05$ level were included.

3. Results

Summary results for the comparison of value preferences are presented in the following two tables. Table 1 shows statistically significant differences between the group of respondents with abuse of addictive substances and the group of respondents without this abuse. Highlighted in red are p-values that indicate statistically significant differences between addictive substance users and abstainers. Our respondents regard the value Family security (A: 9.2202) as the most important and the value Social recognition (A: 6.2999) as the least important. Smokers show statistically significant differences from abstainers in the values of Economic prosperity, Family security, Freedom, and True friendship. People who take drugs show statistically significant differences in the values of Freedom and Respect for parents and the elderly. People with alcohol abuse show statistically significant differences in the values

of Family security, Mature love, and Respect for parents and the elderly. For all statistical differences, people with substance abuse regard these values less important than abstainers.

Table 1: Results of ANOVA tests (statistical dependences between values preferences between each substance users and abstainers)

	True friendship	Freedom	Social recognition	Economic prosperity	Family security	Respect for parents and the elderly	Mature love
Non abusive behavior	2571	2571	2571	2571	2571	2571	2571
	A: 8.4897	A: 8.4918	A: 6.2777	A: 7.8409	A: 9.2109	A: 8.7520	A: 8.2345
	CI: 8.399 - 8.580	CI: 8.320- 8.664	CI: 6.215- 6.340	CI: 7.719- 7.963	CI: 9.113- 9.309	CI: 8.636- 8.868	CI: 8.088- 8.381
	SD: 1.7647	SD: 1.9239	SD: 2.2724	SD: 1.8580	SD: 1.4447	SD: 1.6427	SD: 2.1000
Alcohol abuse	220	220	220	220	220	220	220
	A: 8.5377	A: 8.7173	A: 6.2268	A: 7.6564	A: 9.0000	A: 8.4073	A: 7.7064
	CI: 8.447- 8.628	CI: 8.545- 8.890	CI: 6.164- 6.290	CI: 7.534- 7.779	CI: 8.902- 9.098	CI: 8.292- 8.523	CI: 7.560- 7.852
	SD: 1.8022	SD: 1.8162	SD: 2.4846	SD: 2.0792	SD: 1.6614	SD: 1.9320	SD: 2.3928
	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2789)} = 0.149$ p = 0.6991	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2789)} = 2.808$ p = 0.0939	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2789)} = 0.100$ p = 0.7517	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2789)} = 1.960$ p = 0.1616	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2789)} = 4.213$ p = 0.0402	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2789)} = 8.665$ p = 0.0033	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2789)} = 12.526$ p = 0.0004
Drug abuse	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
	A: 8.6846	A: 9.4754	A: 6.4185	A: 7.8169	A: 9.0154	A: 8.3077	A: 8.2492
	CI: 8.594 - 8.775	CI: 9.303- 9.648	CI: 6.356 - 6.481	CI: 7.695 - 7.939	CI: 8.917 - 9.114	CI: 8.192 - 8.423	CI: 8.103 - 8.395
	SD: 1.9139	SD: 0.9593	SD: 2.6396	SD: 2.1493	SD: 2.1299	SD: 2.2116	SD: 2.4601
	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2634)} = 0.770$ p = 0.3803	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2634)} = 16.878$ p < 0.0001	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2634)} = 0.241$ p = 0.6234	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2634)} = 0.010$ p = 0.9186	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2634)} = 1.129$ p = 0.2880	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2634)} = 4.548$ p = 0.0330	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 2634)} = 0.003$ p = 0.9558

	594	594	594	594	594	594	594
To- bacco abuse	A: 8.6960	A: 8.6766	A: 6.4103	A: 8.0862	A: 9.3643	A: 8.7579	A: 8.1557
	CI: 8.605 – 8.787	CI: 8.504 – 8.849	CI: 6.348 – 6.473	CI: 7.964 – 8.208	CI: 9.266 – 9.462	CI: 8.642 – 8.874	CI: 8.010 – 8.302
	SD: 1.6836	SD: 1.7979	SD: 2.4054	SD: 1.8987	SD: 1.3198	SD: 1.7755	SD: 2.2635
	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 3163)} = 6.703$ p = 0.0097	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 3163)} = 4.561$ p = 0.0328	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 3163)} = 1.606$ p = 0.2052	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 3163)} = 8.342$ p = 0.0039	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 3163)} = 5.613$ p = 0.0179	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 3163)} = 0.006$ p = 0.9380	$F_{(df1 = 1, df2 = 3163)} = 0.660$ p = 0.4167
Total	A: 8.5320	A: 8.5565	A: 6.2999	A: 7.8709	A: 9.2202	A: 8.7227	A: 8.1876
	SD: 1.7574	SD: 1.8877	SD: 2.3166	SD: 1.8879	SD: 1.4566	SD: 1.7003	SD: 2.1586

Table notes: A – average (mean) value, CI – confidence interval, SD – standard deviation, F – a result of ANOVA test with appropriate degrees of freedom (df1, df2), p – probability. Statistically significant results at p<0.05 are greyed.

Table 2 shows the differences in the average value preferences. Values that are prioritized less by people with abuse than by abstainers are highlighted in red. Statistically significant results are marked with an asterisk. It can be seen in the table that values directed towards the community are rather overestimated by people with abuse compared to abstainers. The only exception is the value of Social recognition, which people with alcohol abuse tend to underestimate. Values directed towards the family are rather underestimated by people with alcohol and drug abuse and, on the contrary, rather overvalued by people with tobacco abuse. The value of Mature love is statistically significantly underestimated only by people with alcohol abuse. People with drug and tobacco abuse perceive this value in the same way as abstainers.

4. Discussion

Both the statistically significant and nonsignificant results are interesting for the analysis and interpretation of the research results.

Social values directed at the community are rather overestimated by the people abusing substances. True friendship is the most important value for establishing and confirming personal relationships outside of the family. In our previous research (Olecká and Pospíšil, 2022) we recognized a challenge for both social pedagogy prevention and intervention concerning the positive correlation between the value of true friendship and abusive use of tobacco,

Table 2: Comparison of differences between average values preferences among alcohol, drug, and tobacco users and abstainers

	True friendship	Freedom	Social recognition	Economic prosperity	Family security	Respect for parents and the elderly	Mature love
Alcohol abuse	0.05	0.23	-0.05	-0.18	-0.21*	-0.34*	-0.53*
Drug abuse	0.19	0.98*	0.14	-0.02	-0.2	-0.44*	0.01
Tobacco abuse	0.21*	0.18*	0.13	0.25*	0.15*	0.01	-0.08

nicotine, and related products. We confirmed that the problem of Czech society lies not only in the high tolerance of abusive use, but the abusive use has become a social norm. Any attempt to establish social ties in the community leads to such abusive behaviour. Abuse of legal substances is regarded as an inseparable part of social behaviour, a way of making contacts, and getting closer to each other.

The desire for freedom is another typical value that substance abusers prefer more strongly than abstainers (Mercer and Kohn, 1977). The Freedom value is thus logically more valued among all groups of people with substance abuse. In this case, it can be assumed that, in accordance with our initial assumption, the addictive substance plays a substitution role. Its use is an escape strategy, when the values cannot be filled with their true content. Freedom evokes autonomy, independence from existing structures. The current form of family is the result of a long-term process involving numerous changes in its structure, rights and obligations, as well as the desire for individual development of the members of the family. This, in turn, leads to the rejection of existing forms and ties, the loss of traditional beliefs, knowledge and norms, and the creation of a new type of social ties. (Sorys, 2021). In families with abuse, the value of Freedom is more significant and therefore it can be assumed that the rejection of existing forms and bonds will be passed on to the next generation. Saturation of this value through substance abuse is a high-risk factor for family stability.

The values of Social recognition and Economic prosperity, although the former is directed towards the community and the latter towards the family, are closely related (Hoevel, 2013). Achieving a certain level of economic well-being and social recognition contributes significantly to the level of socio-economic status, which is an important element for the well-being of the family. More people with drug

and tobacco abuse desire Social recognition. People with alcohol abuse, on the other hand, underestimate this value compared to abstainers and, just as they resign from Economic prosperity, they also resign from Social recognition. In this case, it could be a way of adapting to the situation, which Merton calls an escape. This is a situation where an individual who is unable to achieve cultural goals through legitimate means resigns both from the goals being achieved and from the legitimacy of the means. (Merton, 1968). In the case of smoking, however, the situation may be different. Tobacco smoking can take the form of not only smoking cigarettes, but also cigars and other luxury goods. Such abuse is then connected with managerial positions, where the desire for social recognition is completely explainable. Smoking thus symbolizes social prestige.

The value of Economic prosperity is underestimated by people with alcohol abuse and those who use drugs in our research group compared to abstainers. Smokers regard this value higher than abstainers. Alcohol abuse is typical for our respondents in the lowest economic situation, drug use does not show statistical differences according to the economic situation, and people who smoke are rather in medium economic situation (the household is sufficiently financially secure and can afford to save something) (Olecká and Pospíšil, 2022, pp. 112–114). Such a distribution of the sample can probably be partly explained by shifts in value preferences among individual types of abuse. It can be assumed that people who use alcohol largely resign themselves from the value of Economic prosperity, because they are currently in a difficult financial situation. However, due to their abuse, they do not expect this situation to improve. For the family, excessive alcohol consumption can be a heavy burden. (Barnes, Farrell and Cairns, 1986; Darling and Steinberg, 1993)

Resigning from the value of Economic Prosperity and passing on this low preference represent a risk of creating a vicious circle of social exclusion. (Olecká, Přecechtěl and Skarupská, 2019). For people with drug abuse, there are likely to be two extremes. The first extreme is people who are similar to people with alcohol abuse. The other extreme consists of people with a high economic status, but who are in a position where they did not personally deserve their economic situation and their income comes from rich family. For both of these groups, underestimation of this value is understandable. From the point of view of passing on patterns of behaviour to the next generations, the risk of economic collapse can be assumed as a consequence of underestimating this value, especially in the case of sudden life crises (Pospíšil *et al.*, 2021). Smokers have the highest Economic Prosperity value compared to abstainers and other people with abuse. It seems that smoking prevention could be very effective if focused on an increase in tobacco prices.

Like Economic prosperity, the value of Family security is rated higher by smokers than abstainers and people with other types of abuse. Awareness of the risks associated with safety is a very important value for procreative family planning (Gerhardt, 2016; Woszidlo, 2016). The literature confirms that smokers are less likely to attach importance to values of security, esteem, and a sense of belonging compared to non-smokers, as suggested by Kropp's findings (Kropp, Lavack and Holden, 1999). Underestimation of these values is thus a great risk in families with alcohol and drug abuse (Mercer and Kohn, 1977).

Smokers have a higher value of Respect for parents and the elderly. We suppose that smoking could work here as a stress reducer under heavy load in the situation that the sandwich generation² finds itself in. (Solberg, Solberg and Peterson, 2014). On the contrary, in people with alcohol and drug abuse, the underestimation of this value can indicate a certain form of defiance towards parents and obligations to them. According to Beck (1992), the family becomes a place where occupational demands, educational pressures, responsibilities to children, parents and monotonous housework are juggled. The transformation of the family, which is often discussed, did not take place at the level of gender equality or inequality, but in the very essence of the marriage union. Instead of stable families based on marriage, a so-called temporarily arranged family is emerging. Unions "until death do us part" are a thing of the past, and advancing individualization is creating a gap between men and women. The link is the fear of loneliness.

On the other hand, love and emotional relationships, which do not threaten the authenticity of the individual, become of fundamental importance. The reasons are obvious: striving for independence from the family of orientation (Solberg, Solberg and Peterson, 2014) forces the individual to seek confirmation of themselves in a relationship with a sexual partner, because, as we know from Mead (1934), a person develops only in relationships. While in the traditional family, as much emphasis was placed on the ties of parents to children and other relatives as on the ties of spouses, today, in connection with the reduction of the economic function of the family, the core concept has become the couple, regardless of the existence or non-existence of a marriage certificate (Giddens, 2013).

From this point of view, Mature love can be identified as a key pro-family value. It is not only erotic love, but it can also be perceived as agapeic love. This value is associated with building strong bonds, and in the modern concept of the family, true love is the foundation of marriage. It is a love that, just like rela-

² Adult children become the primary caregivers for an aging parent while raising their still-minor children.

tionships established on social networks, cannot be simply disconnected or connected, or blocked. As Pope Francis points out in his exhortation *Amoris Laetitia*, this creates a culture of the ephemeral (Pope Francis, 2016, para. 39). In his work, Giddens recommends separating love from infatuation if we want to define it thoroughly. According to Giddens, infatuation is explosive, obsessive, irrational, beautiful, intoxicating, and dreamy, whereas love is long work, trust, communication, commitment, pain and pleasure. (Giddens, 2013) As long as marriage was established for the purpose of maintaining and transferring private property, the concept of love had no place in explaining the cohesion of marital coexistence. However, after the economic and social changes in the twentieth century caused the breakdown of patriarchal relationships in the family, people could choose each other on the basis of mutual sympathy, which culminates in a deep feeling, which is referred to as love. It is understandable that relationships built on something as fragile as love fall apart much more easily when the initial euphoria wears off than relationships built on an economic basis.

According to Možný (1990), the societies of our cultural circle are the only ones that have placed so much trust in the functionality of partner pairing based on something as unstable as love. Singly tempers the claim by pointing out that while partners do meet and bond based on mutual likes, those likes are not completely random (in the sense that anyone can date anyone). According to Singly (1993), parents get involved and intervene in the choice of a future partner in time – that is, even before the choice itself as a part of the socialization process. When regardless of the instilled patterns, the offspring chooses an inadequate partner from the point of view of their social and cultural capital, the probability of lower family support in the desire to get married increases. Any limitation of the range of potential partners created by one's own social and cultural capital therefore remains at an unconscious level. If love becomes the subject of empirical research, we can observe a great inclination of the respondents to the ideas of the necessity of persistence and fidelity of partner love. For example, in a panel study Bawin-Legros conducted over a period of 12 years in 4,500 households in Belgium, she found that 45.1% of people believed that love can only come once. Almost half of the respondents, i.e. 49.9%, thought that love can come more than once, but love for one person alternates with love for another, but it never appears at the same time. The remaining 5% believed that we can love several partners at the same time. Men more often than women admit the possibility that they could feel love for two partners at the same time. (Bawin-Legros, 2004)

In sociology, perhaps the most famous work on the topic of love was presented by Niklas Luhmann. In his book, *Liebe als Passion: zur Codierung von Intimität*

(Luhmann, 1982), he regards love not as a feeling, but as a symbolic code through which one can successfully communicate even in cases where this is rather unlikely³. The underestimation of the value of Mature love in people with tobacco and alcohol abuse can thus refer not only to weaker family ties, but also to problems in communication. It is a question of what the inclination towards this value means in people with drug abuse. This is the only exception to the theoretical assumption that alcohol and drug abuse reduces preferences for social values and, as a result, leads to the destabilization of family and social ties. Two possible explanations are at hand. The first of them assumes that it is necessary to reject and reconceptualize the theoretical assumption. We believe that another explanation is more probable. This is based on differently conceptualized love by people who challenge the drug abuse. We assume these people emphasize the erotic dimension of love over the agapeic dimension and therefore their understanding of love is more intrapersonal than social.

5. Conclusion

According to Baumann (2004, p. 32), after the collapse of the modern project, we face a completely new situation: the individualization of life paths brings us the end of the meaning of permanence. As Baumann (2004, p. 290) points out, the long-term is only a larger package of short-term Erlebnis that can be endlessly rearranged and that have no clear order. We are facing the beginning of the disintegration of the structures that only a few years ago formed the basic springboard for understanding the world around us, and we believe that we have nothing to replace these structures with yet. The idea of a clear goal has been replaced by the obscurity of these days. Flexibility – this is the charm of an individualized society. (Bauman, 2003) The idea of duration and immortality – so characteristic of the modern project – has broken down. Uncertainty divides

³ Love in Luhmann's concept cannot be forced. It must not be provoked. It must not be recognized only on the basis of questioning. On the contrary, if it is not to appear as an obligation, it must precede all requests and questions. Because love manifests itself only in persistent attention and constant readiness to act with regard to the other. Attitudes showing love must be expressed in action, which must become a promise of permanence. In doing so, the actor deploys his or her identity, which grows with love, because, as Luhmann says, we develop our own self through the beloved and through love for him or her. To this, Luhmann adds that extreme individualization of persons can become a great danger for such a relationship, as it not only poses a threat to every marriage bond, but in a very general way places demands on intimate relationships that are difficult to meet. As Luhmann proves in his systematic theory, love is not a new phenomenon. It has always existed here in various forms. However, in today's society, it has changed its content. It is no longer reserved for a small number of great lovers. It succumbed to universalization and became available to all, not – as in the case of romantic love – the issue of only a select few. (Luhmann, 1982)

and the idea of a common interest thus becomes nebulous and elusive. In other words: Individualism supported by flexibility placed on a pedestal leads to an ever faster increase in the variety of life paths (to which, among other things, a variety of forms of coexistence is linked) and all individuals are forced to find their own way.

The French sociologist Francois de Singley also agrees with such a statement, based on the knowledge that the present time is characterized by greater control over one's own destiny; whether it is individuals or entire families. This happens for two reasons: 1. A value system that emphasizes autonomy and reduces the value of material and symbolic heritage prevails. 2. In addition, objective conditions have also emerged that make it easier to control one's own destiny – especially contraception and the laws that relate to it. (Singly, 1993)

Substance abuse shifts pro-family values towards greater individualization and thus threatens and destabilizes the family. It strengthens community-oriented values and weakens family-oriented values. This is particularly evident in the abuse of alcohol, which is an integral part of social rituals. We consider passing on these patterns to future generations a fundamental risk. The transformation of the value hierarchy leads to the destabilization of family ties, which cease to be a priority. Values and value orientations, as a reflection of a given culture, are at the core of the socialisation and enculturation process that determines and directs the behaviour of the individual. According to Parsons' theory (1991), values are a direct prerequisite for social action. At the same time, Dorotíková (1998) points out that it is important that the value orientation is not only intellectually based, but that it is also fixed emotionally. According to Juříček, (2012) the value ranking can be intervened in through the process of “apperception” (intervention through oppositional redefinition of meaning, affirmation of an alternative value, threatening of an alternative value) and “valorisation” (devaluation, otherwise discarding, inhibitory hyper-valorisation, and intentional or spontaneous restructuring of value related to the experience and development of the individual). The change of values (replacement of one value ranking by another, as a result of a purposeful intervention of the individual in the established value system, e.g. through upbringing, change of social status, etc.) then affects the overall change of personality.

Working with values is therefore a great opportunity for social pedagogy and social work. Here, the great potential of all types of school and social service institutions to work with values in different target groups becomes apparent. Particular opportunities for working with values are presented by non-formal and informal education (Pospíšilová, 2010, pp. 29–46), which we consider more suitable than formal education in terms of formation. It should be noted that in

many cases it is not necessary to change the value ranking as such, but only to show a non-deviant way of fulfilling value orientations.

Data wplynięcia: 2022-11-04;

Data uzyskania pozytywnych recenzji: 2022-12-09;

Data przesłania do druku: 2022-12-30.

References

- Barnes, G.M., Farrell, M.P. and Cairns, A. (1986) 'Parental Socialization Factors and Adolescent Drinking Behaviors', *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48(1), p. 27. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/352225>.
- Bauman, Z. (2003) *Liquid love: on the frailty of human bonds*. Cambridge, UK : Malden, MA USA: Polity Press ; Distributed in the USA by Blackwell Pub.
- Bauman, Z. (2004) *Individualizovaná společnost*. Vyd. 1. Praha: Mladá fronta.
- Bawin-Legros, B. (2004) 'Intimacy and the new sentimental order', *Current sociology*, 52(2), pp. 241-250.
- Beck, U. (1992) *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. London ; Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications (Theory, culture & society).
- Darling, N. and Steinberg, L. (1993) 'Parenting style as context: An integrative model', *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), pp. 487-496. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487>.
- Dorotíková, S. (1998) *Filosofie hodnot: problémy lidské existence, poznání a hodnocení*. Praha: Pedagogická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy.
- Gerhardt, C. (2016) 'Family of Procreation', in C.L. Shehan (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Family Studies*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119085621.wbefs223> (Accessed: 21 May 2022).
- Giddens, A. (2013) *The transformation of intimacy: Sexuality, love and eroticism in modern societies*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hoevel, C. (2013) 'Paths Towards Social Recognition', in Hoevel, C., *The Economy of Recognition*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, pp. 155-182.
- Juříček, P. (2012) 'Změny hodnotové hierarchie mladých delikventů jako reflexe patologie v kvalitě jejich života', *Sociológia*, 44(4), pp. 407-425.
- Kropp, F., Lavack, A.M. and Holden, S.J.S. (1999) 'Smokers and beer drinkers: values and consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence', *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 16(6), pp. 536-557. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363769910297498>.

- Kurtines, W.M. and Gewirtz, J.L. (1991) *Handbook of moral behavior and development*. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum. Available at: <http://books.google.com/books?id=UiR-AAAAMAAJ> (Accessed: 29 May 2022).
- Laslett, A.-M. et al. (2015) *The hidden harm: Alcohol's impact on children and families*. Canberra: Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education.
- Leštinová, Z.T. (2019) *Národní strategie prevence a snižování škod spojených se závislostním chováním 2019-2027*. Praha: Úřad vlády České republiky. Available at: https://www.vlada.cz/assets/ppov/protidrogova-politika/Narodni_strategie_2019-2027_fin.pdf.
- Luhmann, N. (1982) *Liebe als Passion: zur Codierung von Intimität*. 1st edn. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Mead, G.H. and Schubert, C. (1934) *Mind, self and society*. University of Chicago press Chicago.
- Mercer, G.W. and Kohn, P.M. (1977) 'Values associated with Marijuana Use among College Students', *Addiction*, 72(2), pp. 151-158. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.1977.tb00669.x>.
- Merton, R.K. (1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure*. 3rd edn. New York: The Free Press.
- Možný, I. (1990) *Moderní rodina: mýty a skutečnosti*. Vyd. 1. V Brně: Blok.
- MZČR (2014) *Zdraví 2020 - Národní strategie ochrany a podpory zdraví a prevence nemocí*. 1st edn. Praha: Ministerstvo zdravotnictví ČR. Available at: <https://www.databaze-strategie.cz/cz/mzd/strategie/zdravi2020> (Accessed: 23 April 2022).
- MZČR (2019) 'Strategický rámec rozvoje péče o zdraví v České republice do roku 2030'. Ministerstvo zdravotnictví ČR. Available at: <https://zdravi2030.mzcr.cz/zdravi-2030-strategicky-ramec.pdf>.
- Olecká, I. and Pospíšil, J. (2022) *Substance abuse in the Czech population: Reflections on threats, their value context and possibilities of social prevention*. 1st edn. Olomouc: Palacký University Olomouc. Available at: 10.5507/cmtf.22.24461755.
- Olecká, I., Přecechtěl, P. and Skarupská, H. (2019) 'Abúzus alkoholu pečujících osob jako rizikový faktor smrti dětí do pěti let: Limity statistických přehledů kriminality', *Sociální Pedagogika*, 7(1).
- Parsons, T. (1991) *The social system*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge.
- Parsons, T. and Bales, R.F. (1955) *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*. Free Press.
- Pope Francis (2016) *Amoris laetitia: on love in the family: apostolic exhortation*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor.
- Pospíšil, J. et al. (2021) 'Value-Based Financial Risk Prediction Model', *Risks*, 9(11). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/risks9110205>.
- Pospíšilová, H. (2010) 'Výchova k hodnotám v neformálním vzdělávání', in H. Pospíšilová (ed.) *Mládež, hodnoty a volný čas*. Olomouc: Hanex, pp. 29-46.
- Rokeach, M. (1973) *The Nature of Human Values*. New York, NY: Free Press (The nature of human values.).

- Rokeach, Milton. (1968) *Beliefs, attitudes, and values : a theory of organization and change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sheskin, D. (2011) *Handbook of Parametric and Nonparametric Statistical Procedures*. 5th edn. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Singly, F. de (1993) *Sociologie de la famille contemporaine*. Paris: Nathan (37).
- Solberg, L.M., Solberg, L.B. and Peterson, E.N. (2014) 'Measuring impact of stress in sandwich generation caring for demented parents.', *GeroPsych: The Journal of Gerontopsychology and Geriatric Psychiatry*, 27(4), p. 171.
- Sorys, S.A. (2021) 'Transformation of family ties', *Family Forum*, 10, pp. 15–35. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.25167/FF/1969>.
- Woszidlo, A. (2016) 'Family of Orientation', in C.L. Shehan (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Family Studies*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119085621.wbefs468> (Accessed: 21 May 2022).

This paper is dedicated to IGA_CMTF_2022_005. Values context of social functioning II.