

THE CONCEPT OF VALUES IN COTEMPORARY SOCIAL SCIENCES

Abdelhafid Mokadem Ph D

Institute of Psychology
University of Algiers - BOUZAREAH—Alger

THE CONCEPT OF VALUES IN COTEMPORARY SOCIAL SCIENCES

Abdelhafid Mokadem Ph D
Institute of Psychology
University of Algiers - BOUZAREAH—Alger

IT should be noted at the outset that The definition of the concept of values cannot be a straightforward matter. This is because the term is subject to confused and confusing usage in contemporary culture. The meaning of value was once clear, and its use limited. It meant the worth of a thing and the worth in question was generally economic or quasi-economic (Frankena, 1967). Not until the nineteenth century was there a recognition of the need for a systematic, general theory of value to include general questions of what ought to be, what is desired and what is desirable. These axiological questions have been subject to contentious debate in philosophy, anthropology and sociology since then. In ordinary discourse, however, the term value is a much used one, but one which is often used in many different ways which are usually not clearly specified. Nevertheless, it is as often, tacitly assumed that "we know what we mean when we use the term". Smith (1969) argues that the value concept in social sciences is in a state of "disarray", due in part to a proliferation of concepts which are related to values, but are not equivalent to them i.e., attitudes, norms, traits, needs and interests. Brown (1976) calls value theory a "semantic jungle". The term value is used in everyday language and therefore, it is possible that individuals tend to take its meaning for granted, adding to the semantic confusion.

Several illustrative definitions will be provided here as a summary of the unresolved semantic question surrounding the value concept. This summary is included as an aid in searching for unity among the differences in the definition of values.

The following are quotations from different disciplines :

1. Value is an object of any interest (Perry, 1926)
2. A value is that which one acts to gain and / or keep (Rand, 1964)
3. A value is that which one regards as conducive to one's welfare (Branden, 1966, in Locke, 1969)
4. A value is a conception explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action (Kluckhohn, 1951)
5. Values are concepts of the desirable influencing selective behaviour (Williams, 1968)
6. A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite mode of conduct or end-states of existence (Rokeach, 1973)
7. Values are expectations about what should or must be the case (Dlugos, 1981)
8. A value or moral ideal is defined as an individual concept of an ideal relationship (or state of affairs) which is used to assess the "goodness" or the "badness"; the "rightness" or the "wrongness" of actual relationships that he observes or contemplates (Scott, 1965)

As can be seen the definitions range from the general view that a value is an object of any interest (Perry, 1926) to the view that is associated with beliefs in absolute moral values (Scott, 1965)

Lammont (1955) argues that most definitions fall broadly into one of two categories; the first defines a value as "something" - a property, a relation that an object has as in economic theories of value. The second sees the attribution of value as an activity that occurs in someone's mind (p. 3)

This mental process is subjective and related to making choices and it is often called a theory of valuation in preference to a theory of value (Mumford, 1981). In this study we are concerned with the second category of definition and interpret the word values as relating to ideas which make us consider certain modes of conduct e.g., honesty, forgiving, helpful and end-states of existence (e.g., comfortable life, equality, freedom, salvation) as worth striving for, and which when met bring satisfaction and happiness. Values when applied to ideas, principles or criteria enable us to evaluate particular occurrences and to ascribe to them a positive or negative value (Mumford, 1981 : 18). In this way our values help us to make judgments.

For clarifying the value concept we would like to use the definition provided by Rokeach (1973) because it is, first; pre-eminent over other sociological and psychological constructs and it is consistent with the view of many others in social psychology including Kluckhohn (1951), Smith (1969), Williams (1968). Second; it offers both conceptual and methodological promise for the study of values at individual and organizational levels (Rokeach, 1973). He uses the following definition :

A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-states of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite mode of conduct or end-state of existence.

The critical point of the Rokeach definition is that it does not conceive of values as general frames of reference or evaluative dispositions. Rather it sees them as "belonging" to a person in the form of enduring belief about the preferability of long range life goals (terminal values) and the instrumental means for achieving them (instrumental values). The core beliefs constitute the basis for the development and maintenance of, among other things, frames of reference, standards of evaluation and conduct and object orientation.

The definition also means that values and value systems cannot simply be labelled as "good" or "bad" or "true" or "false" (Brown, 1976). The reason for this should become clearer as the definitions of the concepts used are considered more closely.

A value is enduring

To say that values are enduring means that they are relatively permanent and resistant to change. They are neither completely stable nor completely unstable. Values play a role in the continuity of human experience and therefore they change slowly. However depending on the circumstances, they can change rapidly. For example students often report significant and frequent changes in their values as they move from high school to college and toward graduation, full time employment and professional and family responsibilities.

Values are beliefs

Beliefs are expectancies about what is desirable or undesirable.

Rokeach (1968) suggests that there are four types of beliefs (1) those capable of being true or false-existential beliefs, (2) those which are concerned with judgments about what is good or bad-evaluative beliefs, (3) those concerned with causal relationships-casual beliefs and (4) those concerned with judgments about what is desirable-prescriptive and proscriptive beliefs.

The belief element in the value definition is quite complex consisting of three distinct yet related components; cognitive, affective and directive

1. The cognitive component means that the individual has a conception or knowledge of what is desirable. To suggest that an individual accepts the value of working hard is to say that cognitively this person knows that the appropriate way to behave on the job is to work hard

2. The affective component of a value means that the individual can experience emotions and feelings about the value.

3. The behavioural component of the value means that it influences the actions of the individual. Someone who believes in hard work is more likely to translate this value into action by working hard.

A value is a mode of conduct or end-state of existence

Modes of conduct or end-states of existence as elements in the definition of the value are distinct yet interrelated. Modes of conduct are ways of behaving or are instrumental or the means by which we attain the end-states. Such modes of conduct as; ambitious, capable, forgiving, helpful, logical. End-states of existence are the ultimate values or life goals that an individual strives to attain; i.e., comfortable life, salvation, freedom, equality.

In Rokeach's view, by following certain modes of conduct, people believe that they will achieve certain end-states of existence. For example the Protestant ethic which characterised Calvinism in Europe and the USA at one time held that through hard work, frugality and self-sacrifice here on earth (mode of conduct values), individuals could earn their way to salvation (end-state of existence).

A value is a preference as well as a conception of the preferable

The distinction between the preferable (desirable) and merely preference (desired) has received a good deal of attention. Smith (1969) writes that « the more serious problem which has yet to be solved in systematic research, is to distinguish dependably between values and preferences, between the desirable and merely desired » (p. 116). A value as Klyckhohn (1951) defines it, is a « conception of the desirable, and something merely desired ».

A value is a conception of something that is personally or socially preferable

One's values are not necessarily intended to apply equally to oneself and to others. They can be employed with extraordinary versatility in everyday life. Consider for example the meaning of these two statements; (a) « I should be honest with every one » (b) « management of this organization should treat workers fairly ». If we translate the first statement into the language of values it apparently means to the person asserting it, "I believe it is desirable for me to behave honestly with everyone", and the second means « I believe it is desirable for the management of this organization to behave fairly or morally with its subordinates ». Thus values are often used flexibly, they may be viewed as applicable to ourselves and not to others and vice versa. They also may be shared or not shared and thus employed as single or double standards (Rokeach, 1973 : 10).

The Rokeach definition does not state explicitly such terms as « conception of the desirable », « ought », and « should ». Rokeach notes that the « terms have been deliberately excluded, and are central to the present work ». (p. 5)

The word « conception » for Kluckhohn (1953) indicates that value is a logical construct comparable to culture or social structure.

Values are not directly observable but are based on the interpretations people make of their personal worlds and how these interpretations are translated into words and action. The « conception » can be either explicit (readily verbalised) or implicit (inferred only from overt behaviour). Although implicit values remain conceptions, verbalizability is a necessary test of value (p. 397).

The word « desirable » means that the value statements are normative and related to things which people think ought or should exist (Mumford, 1981 : 13). The phrase « ought », Rokeach states is more an attribute of values that concern morality than of those concerning competence. « The oughtness of certain values is seen to organize within society, which demands that all of us behave in certain ways that benefit and do not harm others. It is an objective demand we perceive society to place upon others no less than upon ourselves in order to insure that all people live out their lives in a social milieu within which people can trust and depend upon one another » (p. 9).

Values are standards

Most scholars in different disciplines (Kluckhohn, 1951; Rokeach, 1968, 1973, 1979; Smith, 1969; Williams, 1968) agree that values are standards that guide action. Values as standards serve various important purposes in our daily lives. They are standards that tell us how to act or what to want; they are standards that tell us what attitudes we should hold; they are standards we employ to justify one's own behaviour and attitudes, to judge morally and to compare ourselves with others. Finally values are standards we employ to tell us which values, attitudes and action of others are worth or not worth trying to influence.

Value systems

A value system is an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance (Rokeach, 1973 : 5).

Most of the literature refers to a value system as a hierarchical structure that reveals the degree of the relative importance of values. Individuals may all possess the same values, but attach different priorities and degrees of importance to them. According to this conception, people in different social classes and organizational levels do not differ in their total array of values, but rather in the ways in which they prioritize them.

When a value is learned it becomes integrated somehow into an organised system of values where in each value is ordered in priority with respect to other values. Such a relative conception of values enables us to define change in values as a reordering of priorities and at the same time, to see the total value system as relatively stable over time (Rokeach, 1973). Sikula, (1971) argues that after a person develops a system of values, he opens up channels of choice along which he is able to move. Without such a system of categories in which to store information an individual cannot effectively develop a differentiated repertoire of responses. A system of values, accordingly serves as a frame of reference (p. 282-3).

Values And Related Concepts

A review of the literature of value research reveals that such concepts as attitudes, needs interests, and goals have been seen as holding the same meaning as values. This is probably due to the ambiguity of the boundaries of these concepts and the concept of value. One way perhaps to build up these boundaries and delineate basic distinctions between them is by the definition of each concept and the illustration of its properties and characteristics.

Values And Needs

A need has been defined as a deficit state of the organism that recurs periodically and that has a specific requirement for its satisfaction. Needs tend to be negative, undesirable states that require correction and are typically defined in terms of the class of consumatory response required for their satisfaction. Thus they are closely tied to the behaviour toward a specific goal (Gordon, 1975)

Many scholars tend to equate values with needs, for example Maslow (1954) refers to self-actualization as both a need and a higher order value. he states that :

« For one thing, it looks as if there were a single ultimate value for mankind, a far goal toward which all men strive. This is called variously by different authors self-actualization, self-actualisation, integration, psychological health, individuation, autonomy, creativity, productivity, but they all agree that this amount to realising the potentialities of the person, that is to say, becoming fully human, everything that the person can become ». (1954 : 123).

Murray's (1938) list of needs is transformed into a list of values (White, 1951). The fact is that the two concepts are closely related, and the distinction between them is a complex one as Kluckhohn (1951) indicates « since a value is a complex proposition involving cognition, approval, selection and affect, then the relationship between a value system and a need or a goal system is necessarily complex. Values both rise from and create needs. A value serves several needs partially, inhibits others partially, half meets and half blocks still others ». (p. 428).

Values can be derived from one or more needs, for example, the value of a comfortable life may be derived from the need to better one's standard of living or the need to protect oneself (security).

Thus a value can serve several need. Also one need can be served by several values, for example a value of money can serve almost all the needs of an individual. Values on the other hand can be a source of many needs, for example a manager's strong need to dominate others may be derived from several values such as social recognition, self-respect, or ambition. Therefore values and needs are related, although not in a one to one ratio. The value of ambition for example is not necessarily or only associated with the need for dominance.

Therefore one should be cautious in how needs are inferred from values because values are not isomorphic with needs (Rokeach, 1973).

Values and needs differ in certain respects. Needs for example refer to the objective requirements of an organism's well-being. A value presupposes an awareness at some level of the object or conditions sought while a need does not (Locke, 1983). Needs are satisfied by specific responses or goals and are defined by the nature of the responses or goals themselves, values on the other hand can be satisfied by a variety of behaviours (Gordon, 1975). Values are what the individual considers good or beneficial, unlike needs values are not inborn (Locke, 1983). They are a result of both sociological and psychological forces acting upon the individual (Rokeach, 1973). The biological function of values is to guide man's choices and actions in order to fulfil needs (Locke, 1976). Thus the relationship of values to needs is that of means to ends. In other words values are the link between needs and action or the gratification of needs (Locke, 1983, 1986).

Values And Attitudes

Social psychologists and management scholars have long sought the attitudes towards work rather than values underlying the behaviour of workers. Perhaps no other concept from the behavioural sciences has been so widely used by theorists and researchers. Rokeach (1968) has pointed out that over the past fifty years empirically-oriented social scientists have paid considerably more attention to the theory and measurement of attitudes than to the theory and measurement of values.

This emphasis on attitudes is due to two reasons :

1. The rapid development of methods measuring attitudes
2. The vagueness of understanding about the conceptual differences between values and attitudes.

Like values, attitudes are defined in a number of ways. Rokeach (1968) defined an attitude as an « enduring organization of beliefs or opinions focused on a specific subject (physical or social) or situation, predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner » (p. 159). Comparing this definition with those of values stated previously one can make several distinctions between the two concepts.

Attitudes are beliefs about specific objects, people or situations, whereas values are seen as being more general and less tied to any specific or referent object. Values occupy a more central position than attitudes within one's personality make up and cognitive system.

For example a value of freedom transcends a specific situation but one could have an attitude about how freedom manifests itself in a specific work environment. Values, thus can serve as an organizing theme for a number of attitudes. A value is a more dynamic concept than attitudes, in effect it is a determinant of attitudes and behaviour (Rokeach, 1968). For example our attitudes towards some phenomena such as minority groups, or civil rights may be determined by our values such as equality, altruism or freedom. Each of us may have thousands of attitudes, though very few values, and that since a person possesses considerably fewer values than attitudes, the value concept provides a more economical tool in the study of behaviour (Rokeach, 1968).

Values and Norms

The terms values and norms come up many times in a number of ways. The two terms are related, yet distinctive. The most important distinction can perhaps be seen in terms of specificity. Norms refer to ways of behaving that are generally accepted within a specific social group context, in contrast, values transcend specific context.

Values and norms are both related because both are standards of what is desirable. A norm may be defined as a standard shared by group members that regulates member's behaviour (Steers, 1983). Katz and Kahn (1978) note that values and norms shade into one another, so that the distinction is one of emphasis rather than of uniqueness.

Values provide generalised justifications for appropriate behaviour.

Norms refer to the expected behaviour sanctioned by the group and thus a specific « ought » quality. Thus norm carry with them the promise of rewards and threat of sanctions. Individuals who behave according to generally accepted behavioural norms receive the rewards of social acceptance and personal satisfaction, while those who violate norms risk censure and exclusion from the group (Albanese, 1983). Values and norms differ, because values may be both instrumental and terminal whereas norms are essentially instrumental, they refer to modes of conduct.

A concrete example of a group norm is the one found in the Hawthorne experiments. The informal group in the bank wiring observation room set up a performance norm which states explicitly or implicitly that each member of the group ought not to produce above the specified output i.e., 6000 or 6600 completed connections-according to the type of equipment being wired-were considered in this group as the proper day's work for a wireman. If a man did turn out more or less than was thought proper, he was exposed to group sanctions.

Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939) reported an interview with one worker who violated the group norm. He said :

... right now I am turning out over 7000 a day, around 7040. The rest of the fellows kick because I do that. They want me to come down. They want me to come down to around 6600, but I don't see why I should (p. 412-423).

The worker does not see why he should conform to the norm, although he is aware of the reactions of his group members. He may not care. Such behaviour, one can say, is governed more by egoistic, personal or competence values than by social or moral values, probably placing high importances on accomplishment, being logical ambitious, independent, obedient to authority or freedom from group constraints.

On the other hand he places low importance on such values as helpful cooperation and friendship. Williams (1968) states that values provide the grounds for accepting or rejecting particular norms. In other words they furnish a rationale for the normative requirements (Katz and Kahn, 1978).

Values And interests

Perry (1954) considers values as an object of interest whatever the object of interest is ipso facto valuable. Interests in this definition are a train of events determined by expectation of its outcome. However, Gordon (1975) argues that interests refer to the extent to which the individual likes to engage in certain classes of vocational or avocational activities. Interests are essentially traits that encompass a liking for specified areas or classes of activity and they have been measured in this manner. Interests are essentially traits that encompass a liking for specified areas or classes of activity and they have been measured in this manner.

Interests are somewhat less general than values, being related to specific activities or classes of activities. They are less likely than attitudes to be associated with beliefs but like temperaments, have been found to be highly stable. Values, interests and abilities are sometimes thought of as the principal determinants of occupational choice (Gordon, 1975)

Values And Culture

The concept of culture, like the concept of values, is at the centre of modern thought and practice. It is a concept that has undergone considerable changes of definitions since the eighteenth century. The term « culture » was defined as the complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, law, moral, custom, any other capabilities and habits acquired by men in the society. Kroeber and Parsons (see Hofstede, 1980) defined the term culture as transmitted and created content patterns of values, ideas and other symbolic meaningful systems as factors in shaping human behaviour and the artifact produced through behaviour. Taking an anthropological approach, Kluckhohn, (1951), writes that culture

consists of patterned ways of thinking, feeling and reacting acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups including the embodiments in artifacts. The essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e; historically derived and selected ideas and especially their attached values).

Hofstede (1980); treated culture as the collective programming which distinguishes the members of one group from another. Culture, in this sense includes systems of values and values are among the building blocks of culture. According to Hofstede, culture is to human collectivity,

what personality is to an individual. Accordingly, the term culture could be defined as the "interactive aggregate of common characteristics that influence a human group response to its environment. Culture determines the human group in the same way personality determines the identity of the individual. Personality which is composed of a number of forces such as values, attitudes and modes of behaviour has been called the subjective aspect of culture (Pitirim et al, 1947 in Merrill, 1969).

In regard to the relations of values classification to culture patterns, Morris, (1956) suggests that personalities could be organised into three basic components : Dionysian (tendency to express and indulge in certain ego-centred wants), Promethean (tendency to plan, manage and alter the environment) and Budhistic (tendency to self-control by regulating one's desires). Cultural as well as individual differences make for different combinations of these value clusters. A test of several samples in different national cultures indicated variations of these basic models that resulted in 13 different value orientations.

From this one can conclude that culture and values are closely interwoven concepts, for it is a culture that determines a people's values, and it is a people's values that make up their culture. In addition values are the subjective measure of culture.

Classification Of Values

Classifications are a help both to comprehension and research.

They identify distinctions and diversity and assist an understanding of relationships, complexities and similarities and differences (Mumford, 1981). It is argued that any classification is better than no classification (Henderson in Kluckhohn, 1953), and that one cannot begin a really well informed discussion of any range of phenomena, unless at least some rough classification is at hand

Values are subject to various classifications. Social scientists have distinguished between the moral and pragmatic; between intrinsic-values that are supplemental. Likewise, there is a distinction between instrumental and terminal values or means and ends; between implicit values that are known only to the person and explicit-values that are sufficiently verbalized and thus can be measured.

A well-known classification of values in social psychology is of Spranger (1928) who proposed six basic values : theoretical, economic, aesthetic, political, social and religious.

Allport-Vernon-Lindzey (1950) prepared a scale of values using Spranger six types, to indicate which major areas of endeavour are most important to the individual.

A recent classification is that of Rokeach (1973, 1979) which distinguishes between personal, social, competence and moral.

Kluckhohn (1951) argued that much of the confusion about values undoubtedly arises from the fact that one speaker has a general category in mind, another a particular limited type of value, still another a specific type. We have not discovered any comprehensive classification of values (p. 412).

The most useful classification is one which relates clearly to the problem that is being studied and no classification should be regarded as fixed. If classification is used to assist the definition of a research problem, then a useful output of the research may be an improved classification as greater insight is achieved (Mumford, 1981 : 17).

One comprehensive classification of values has been developed by Kluckhohn (1951). he conceives of values in terms of dimensions which are presented as follows :

1 - Dimension of Modality : the positive and negative values that is one is attracted or repulsed by the object situation or conceptualization.

2 - Dimension of Content : the type of value which falls into three classes : (1) Aesthetic which refers to feelings and emotions particularly those associated with beauty, (2) Cognitive which refers to the intellectual values that rest more directly on rational or logical judgments or thinking and (3) Moral values which refer to the modes of behaviour which are based on an assumption that in « selecting » or « wanting »-the cognitive element-we strive to realise what we believe to be « good ».

3 - Dimension of intent : refers to the values associated with the preferred style or mode of behaving. They are usually termed as « mode values » or « expressive values » as they are concerned with the means (instrumental) as opposed to ends (terminal). We express a disposition to achieve something (Lammont, 1955 : 249).

4 - Dimension of generality : some values are specific to certain situations or to certain areas, others are more general. They are sometimes called domain versus global values.

5 - Dimension of intensity : refers to the strength of a value which may be determined by observing the sanctions applied and by measuring the degree of striving toward achieving or maintaining it. The method of paired comparison is particularly useful in determining the strength of a value.

The dimension of intensity has a number of tangents which are : (a) categorical versus preferential-values that are obligatory (must or must not), i.e., respect for the property of others; and those that are matters of choice, i.e., achievement, cooperation. (b) central and peripheral values; the value has a dominant role is segmental to the major line of the culture. Also, in terms of intensity, values can be classified as dominant, variant or deviant : (a) dominant values are those held by a majority of group or by the most powerful elite. Conformance to dominant values brings the highest approval and reward, (b) personal values are ordinarily variants of a group values and adherence to them brings lower-level approval, (c) deviant values whether idiosyncratic or characteristic of a segmental or distinctive of a minority are disallowed by sanctions. This classification can also be termed respectively as prescription, permission and prohibition (what we must do, what we may do, what we must not do, what we may do, what we must not do).

6 - Dimension of explicitness versus implicitness : in general an explicit value is one which is communicated verbally and about which an outside observer can make judgments. Implicit values are those known only to the person. They are hidden, assumed and internalized. Implicit values cannot be observed but can be inferred by observers from recurrent trends in behaviour including verbal behaviour.

7 - Dimension of extent : values range from idiosyncratic to group values. Idiosyncratic values are those held by only one person in a group. Idiosyncratic values are important because their existence is one way in which new values come into being as a result of individual variability and new situations. In contrast, group values are normative and usually derived from a group's history and social structure.

8 - Dimension of organization : refers to the way in which values are organised. As indicated earlier, there is almost always a hierarchical notion to thinking about values. In most situations, people always consider certain values as more important than others. Kluckhohn argues that what matters is not so much the hierarchy as the logical and meaningful relation of one value to another. General values or values which are powerful and universally accepted are likely to have both high priority of connectedness makes them both interesting and difficult to deal with. At any rate, values do appear to occur in clusters rather than alone. It may be useful to distinguish between isolated values and integrated values which form part of an interlocking- or possibly pyramiding-networks or values which are powerful and universally accepted are

likely to have both high priority of connectedness makes them both interesting and difficult to deal with. At any rate, values do appear to occur in clusters rather than alone. It may be useful to distinguish between isolated values and integrated values which form part of an interlocking-or possibly pyramiding-network.

Kluckhohn (1951) concludes that these classifications are from a conceptual point of view, and that, valid analysis of this type can be based upon only the detailed description of observed values as they appear to culture carriers.

Sources of values

Values are acquired very early in life and form part of a man's cultural identity. However, literature provides inconclusive answers to the factors generating individual values. Rader (1950) mentioned two factors : the culture and the groups in which the individual has associations. With respect to culture Linton (1945), distinguished two type of influences that are exerted on an individual's personality and/or generate values. The first is derived from the culturally patterned behaviour of other individuals towards the child. This begins to operate from the moment of the birth and is of paramount importance during infancy. The second is derived from the individual's observations of instructions in the patterns of behaviour characteristic of his society. Many of these patterns do not affect him directly, but they provide him with models for the development of his own behavioural responses to various situations.

These influences are unimportant in early infancy, but continue to affect him throughout life (Linton, 1945). It should be noted that the two types of influence overlap at certain points. They may also tend to develop two types of values with the first type developing what can be called basic or dominant values and the second developing variant values which have to do so much with the way a person rankorders them. For example, the value of achievement is already taught at the early stage of life (basic), the latter ranking of this value depends on the perception of the way others rankorder this value. The resulted behaviour, then depends partly on the one's perception of the outside world. However, the superiority of one or another in turn depends on the type of socialisation; whether it is inner-directed or outer-directed (Riesman et al, 1950). These authors point out a transition in the concept of the Protestant ethic and the dominance of the « peer group » values. Modern day man, or the other directed person, becomes accultured largely by peer groups. He looks to his contemporaries for guidance and direction. The other-directed person guides behaviour through the complexities and intricacies of modern life by picking up cues from the environment with an internal device. Lack of conformity or wrong-doing brings an anxiety of fear that he may lose the love and approval of others (Riesman et al, 1950; p. 4142).

Values and value systems are acquired and modified and may be completely changed through one's active life by access to different socialising agents. The major socialising agent, of course is the family. Others, include schools, religious institutions, social clubs, business organizations and so on.

MEASUREMENT OF VALUES

Since Thomas Znanieck, (1918) who is credited with being the first to introduce to the social sciences the notion that values could be approached empirically, a number of approaches have appeared. A review of the literature on the measurement of values revealed four main techniques. These are :

I. Content analysis : This is used for making inferences about systematically and objectively specified characteristics of messages (Holsti, 1969). Content analysis is applied to available material and to materials especially produced for particular research problems. The technique is used to analyse letters, diaries, ethnographic materials, newspaper articles and editorials, minutes of meetings and so on.

Content analysis, like observations requires objectivity of coding categories in order to assure reliability. Systematic application of these coding systems across a representative sample of material is needed in order to control observer bias, and consistency in theoretical aims so that the findings can be related to some relevant variable or variables (Kidder, 1981). Content analysis is used to determine values at individual level, the analysis is usually based on the person's writings (i.e.; books, essays, letters, stories, autobiographies). Rokeach, (1968), for example, used this technique to identify Hitler's and Lenin's political values of equality and freedom by analysing their writings.

At an organizational level, content analysis is usually focused on official documents. Rokeach (1979) used the technique to study the values of Science by analysing institutional documents (80 editorials from the magazine science). Content analysis is also used to determine the general cultural values of society. The analysis is usually focused on the folklore, literature, and mass media. A number of studies have used this approach among them is Albrecht's (1956) study of values in mass-periodical fiction. He verified the claim that the mass-media reflected general cultural values. More well known is Lowenthal's (1944) study of biographies in popular magazines, which claimed that recent biographies suggest a decline in achievement values in American society.

II. Observational techniques : The researcher here infers values from his observations of others. Participant observation is in particular the most widely used technique in social research. It is based on the theory that an interpretation of an event can only be approximately correct when it is a composite of two points of view one of the person who was a participant in the event and whose wishes and interests were in some way involved and the other of the person who was not a participant, but only an observer or analyst and these coalesce into one full synthesis (Hodder and Lindeman in Bouchard, 1976). Anthropologists are probably the most frequent users of this method. An early study that used participant observation was carried out by Nels Anderson (1923). He wanted to study the life of the hobo or transient, and could think of no better way to accomplish this than to become one himself. He travelled from city to city, living in what were then known as hobohemias, flophouses and mission homes. He gradually accumulated numerous insights into such things as the status distribution among hobos, how they communicated, their life style and something about the stages individuals were likely to go through as their status changed from being an occasional worker to a « bum ». Fouzia Diab, (1980) used participant observations along with interviews to study values and social traditions such as marriage and motherhood in a number of Egyptian villages.

The fundamental deficiency of participant observation is the lack of standardisation of data. As participant observation depends largely on the interpersonal skills of the investigator. Destroying interpretation could be expected. Though, participant observation provides initial insights that can lead to more careful formulations and explicit hypotheses, the findings are idiosyncratic and difficult to replicate (Blalock and Blalock, 1982).

III. Surveys and interviewing : Some of the complications that had arisen in the observation techniques lead to the development of quantitative methods. Surveys in which data are most often obtained through interviews or questionnaires or both, provided new impetus to the

measurement and cross-cultural comparisons of values. In contrast to the content analysis and observation techniques, the survey method provides a standardisation of data, that is its organization within uniform mutually exclusive categories such that variations and irregularities either in the researcher's perceptions or in the recording of information are minimized (Blalock and Blalock, 1982). This means that the findings could be replicated in different settings and different times by different researchers. Among the many surveys developed so far, the Rokeach Value Survey combines the practical requirements of developing short, easy to administer instruments with the logic of survey research (Zavaloni, 1980).

IV. Psychometric scales : This is an extension of the methods derived from the testing oriented field of psychometrics.

Many of the psychometric techniques used to measure values consist of forced-choice schedules, in which a respondent is asked to check a number of items constructed by the researcher. A person's responses are typically assessed against norms, or average responses that were obtained from a group possessing similar characteristics.

Among the widely used psychometric scales are the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey study of values, the Edwards Preference Schedule and the Gordon Survey of Personal Values.

SUMMARY

The present article was addressed to the concept of values as it is used in contemporary social sciences, its meaning, relations to other related concepts such as needs, attitudes and interests; and the classification of values.

The literature search showed that the meaning of the concept of value ranges from the general view that a value is an object of any rest to the view that it is associated with beliefs in absolute moral values. Rokeach, (1973) has carried out an extensive research in values and provided the most useful definition which is consistent with the view of many other social sciences. Accordingly we interpret the word values in this study as relating to ideas which make us consider certain modes of conduct (i.e.; being honest and forgiving) and end-states of existence (freedom, equality) worth striving for and which when met bring satisfaction and happiness. The article illustrated the relations of values to other related concepts such as needs which create values meanwhile needs are created and satisfied by values. Attitudes and interests which are more specific are the representation of values, culture which is more general than values tends to create values, meanwhile people's values make up their culture. Values have been classified in many ways; terminal versus instrumental, intrinsic versus extrinsic and so on. However the most useful classification was that of Kluckhohn who classified values according to their intensity, generality, specificity and so on. ever the most useful classification was that of Kluckhohn who classified values according to their intensity, generality, specificity and so on.

Values are acquired, modified and may be completely changed through one's life by both the socialisation process which starts at home and continues in other institutions and by the perception of other's modes of behaviour. Values are measured by different techniques ranging from content analysis, observation, surveys and psychometric scales.

Bibliography

- Albanese, K.** (1983) *Organizational behaviour : A managerial view-point*. Dryden Press
- Albreght M.C.** (1956) "Does literature reflect common values" ? *American Sociological Review* 21, 722-29
- Allport, G.W; Vernon, P E; Lindzey, G.A.** (1960) *A Study of values a scale for measuring the dominant interests in personality* (revised edition) Boston, Houghton-Mifflin.
- Anderson M.** (1923) *The Hobo*. Chicago : university of Chicago
- Blalock A.B., and Blalock, H.M.** (1982) *Introduction to social research*. Prentice - Hall, WC Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey
- Bouchard T.J.** (1976) "Field Research Methods" : in M.D. Dunnette (ED) *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* Rand McNally College Pub. Co.
- Brown, M A.** (1976) "Values : a necessary but neglected ingredient of motivation on the job" *Academy of Management review*, vol. 1, 15-23
- Diab, F** (1980) *Values and social traditions* Dar Annahtda Al-Arabia, Beirut Libanon
- Dlugos, G. and Welermair, K.** (Eds.): *Management under differing value systems*. Berlin : Walter de Gruyter.
- Gordon, N.** (1975) *Interpersonnal values*. MacGraw-Hill book Company.
- Hofstede, G.** (1980) *Culture's consequences : international differences in work-related values*. London : Sage publication
- Holsti, O.R.** (1969) *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities* Ready mass, Addison - Wesley.
- Kats, D. and Kahn, R.** (1978) *The social psychology of organizations*, New York, Wiley.
- Kidder, L.H.** (1981) *Research methods in social relations* Holt Saunders International edition.
- Kluckhohn, C.** (1951) "values and value orientations in the theory of action". In Parsons, T. and Shils, E. A. (Eds.) *Toward a theory of action*. Cambridge : Harvard University Press.
- Kluckhohn, C., Murray, H. A. and shneider, D.M.** (1953) *Personality in nature, society and culture*; New York : Knopf.
- Lammont, W.D.** (1955) *The value judgement*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Linton, R.** (1945) *Cultural background of personality*. Appleton century crafts : educational division, Merdith Corporation.
- Loke, E. A.** (1976) "The nature and causes of job satisfaction " . In Dunnette, M.D. (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago : Rand McNally.
- Locke, E. A.** (1983) "A new look at work motivation . Theory V " In Franke, R. (Ed.) *The science of productivity*. San Fransisco : Jossey-Bass.
- Locke, E.A. and Henne, D.** (1986) "Work motivation theories" In cooper, C. L., and Robertson, I.T (Eds.) *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* John Wiley and Sons, Chichester. New York.
- Lowenthal, L.** (1944) "Biography in popular magazines" in *Radion research* 1442-43 (Ed.) P.F Lazarsfeld and F. station New York Colombia university Bur. Allp. soc. Res
- Maslow, A. H.,** (1954) *Motivation and Personality* New York, Harper.
- Merril F. E.** (1969) *Society and culture : An introduction to sociology* Prentice - Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs New Jersey
- Morris, C.** (1956) *Varieties of human values* Chicaco : University of Chicago Press
- Mumford, E** (1981) *Work, values and thechnology*. Nijhoff Martinus.
- Murray, H. A.** (1938) *Explorations in personality : A climate and experimental study of fifty men of college age* New York, Oxford University Press
- Perry, R. B.** (1954) *Realism of values : A critique of humane civilization* Cambridge Harvard University Press.
- Rader m.** (1950) *Ethic and Society* New York : Henry Holt and Co.
- Rand. A.** (1964) "The objectivist ethics" In Rand, A (Ed.) *The virtue of selfishness* New York : Signet 13-35.
- Riesman D. Glazer, W. and Denney R.** (1980) *The lonely crowd garden city* New York Doubleday books 29-40.
- Roethlisberger, and Dickson, W. J.** (1939) *Management and the worker* Cambridge : Mass : Harvard University Press.
- Rokeach, M.** (1969) *Beliefs, attitudes and values . a theory of organization and change* Jossey-Bass- Inc. Publishers : San Fransisco.
- Scott, W. A.** (1965) *Values and organizations : A study of fraternities and sororities*. Chicago : Rand McNally.
- Sikula A. F.** (1971b) "Value and value systems : Relationship to personal goals" - *Personal journal*, April.
- Smith, M. B.** (1969) *Social psychology and human values* Chicago : Aldine.
- Spranger, E.** (1960) *Types of men : the psychology and ethics of personality* (P J Pigors, translation) New York, Johnson Reprint Co.
- White, R. F.** (1951) *Value analysis : nature and use of the method*. Ann. Arbour, Mich : Society for the psychological study of social issues.
- Williams, R. M.** (1979) "Change and stability in values and value systems : a sociological perspective", in Rokeach, M. (Ed.) *Understanding human Values : individual and societal* New York, Free Press.
- Znaniecki, W. I. and Znaniecki, F.** (1918) *The polish peasant in Europ and America*. Boston - Bodger.