

UDC 159.9.072.43

THEORETICAL BASIS OF CULTURAL VALUE ORIENTATIONS

Oksana RYBAK

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,
1, Universytetska Str., Lviv, Ukraine, 79000*

Problem statement. Prevailing cultural value orientations represent ideals. As such, they promote coherence among the various aspects of culture. Aspects of culture that are incompatible with them are likely to generate tension and to elicit criticism and pressure to change. Cultures are not fully coherent, of course. Subgroups within societies espouse conflicting values. The dominant cultural orientation changes in response to shifting power relations among these subgroups. But change is slow [10]. Yet, cultural value orientations do change gradually. Societal adaptation to epidemics, technological advances, increasing wealth, contact with other cultures, wars, and other exogenous factors leads to changes in cultural value emphases.

In order to measure cultural orientations as latent variables, we could analyze the themes of the popular children's stories in a society, its proverbs, movies, literature, socialization practices, legal systems, or the ways economic exchange is organized. Such manifestations each describe a narrow aspect of the culture. Moreover, many are the product of particular subgroups within society, aimed at particular audiences, or negotiated among elites. When researchers try to identify culture by studying these types of manifestations, what they seek, implicitly or explicitly, are underlying value emphases. Hence, studying value emphases directly is an especially efficient way to capture and characterize cultures [10].

Analysis of the latest studies and publications. There are three major models of cultural value orientations: 1) Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's Dimensions of Value Orientations; 2) Hall's Dimensions of Cultural Value Orientations; and 3) Hofstede's Five Dimensional Model of Values. We will also briefly touch on Milton Rokeach's work from *The Nature of Human Values*.

The primary point in all of these models is that all cultures face similar challenges of internal and external adaptation, and draw from a similar set of raw materials to find successful ways to adapt. However, the conclusions reached by different cultures can manifest themselves in very different forms.

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck suggest that there are six ways in which cultures will frequently differ in terms of key themes or ideas. Their Dimensions of Value Orientations include the following items:

- The Nature of the Individual.
- The Relationship of People to their World.

- Individualism versus Collectivism.
- Doing versus Being.
- Time Orientation.
- Space Orientation.

The manner in which a culture adheres to these different elements fundamentally shapes the world view of the people within that culture, according to Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck. A culture that believes people are fundamentally evil and flawed from birth will have very different approaches to personal and social relationships than a culture that views people as fundamentally good [5].

A culture that believes in living one's life as a journey of being, in harmony with the world, will have very different ideas about such things as personal growth, individuation and the accumulation of wealth than will a culture that believes people should compete with each other and try to dominate the planet and rival competitors in competition for the world's resources.

Western Civilization tends to make very specific choices about each of these dimensions, and this affects a great many things in how people from Western cultures approach life. When these value dimensions are superimposed upon different cultures, there may be fundamental conflicts generated in the interaction.

Hall's dimensions add a number of other concepts, addressing three important areas of culture: Context, Time, and Message Speed. His ideas are that cultures exist in the following dualities:

- High Context Cultures versus Low Context Cultures.
- Monochronic Time versus Polychronic Time.
- Fast Message Speed versus Slow Message Speed.

In High Context cultures, more of the meaning of messages between people is encoded in the environment and the context in which people are interacting. This means that verbal or written communications cannot be taken just at face value, without taking into account the context in which the message is being presented.

For example, in certain high context cultures, there tend to be clearly prescribed rituals for situations, where not much needs to be said for everyone to understand what is going on and what is being communicated. The rituals themselves hold the meaning, and the words do not comprise a great deal of that meaning.

In Low Context cultures, communication is much more contained in the actual verbal messages that are passed back and forth. People in low context cultures do not focus as much on the context, nor have as many parts of the meaning defined by rituals or pre-determined messages embedded in the context.

People from low context cultures tend to struggle with understanding communication with people from high context cultures. Much of the meaning is encoded in the situation, and people from low context cultures often do not understand the context or know how to read the cues embedded in the rituals and protocols.

In Monochronic Time, events occur discretely, one at a time, according to schedules that are understood the same way by all parties. In monochronic cultures, it is very important to be punctual. Monochronic cultures tend to run on schedules by the clock.

Polychronic cultures, on the other hand, tend not to see – or value -time in the same way. It may not be very important to be prompt, because all events occur in the midst of other, equally important activities, with a greater sense of flexibility and freedom from schedules.

Clinicians, who tend to set very fixed schedules in order to accommodate the greatest number of clients might have difficulties in working with clients who come from polychronic cultures. Clients from polychronic cultures may show up late and not understand why the clinician cannot see them when they arrive.

Fast Message Speed cultures tend to transmit and receive messages quickly, and respond to them equally quickly. Fast message speed cultures are more likely to be monochronic. They want things to be done more quickly, so they impart their communications with a sense of urgency that slow message speed cultures do not have.

In slow message speed cultures, messages are designed to unfold slowly, with layers of meaning that become apparent as the message develops over time. The messages would be responded to in a deliberate and careful manner.

Because these elements are so deeply embedded in the cultures that hold them, it can be difficult for someone coming from a different culture to grasp the meaning and importance of the elements. It may be difficult for a person from a different culture to even see some aspects of these elements, as if they were completely invisible.

Clinicians are advised to pierce through this veil of invisibility when working with clients from different cultures. Only through understanding their orientation towards the world can you hope to work with them in ways that turn out to be ethical and responsible.

Hofstede's Five Dimensional Model of Values was derived from examining business and work relationships. He describes five different areas of difference between cultures in their work environment:

- Power Distance
- Individualism versus Collectivism
- "Masculinity" versus "Femininity"
- Uncertainty Avoidance
- Long versus Short Term Orientation

Power Distance is concerned with the degree to which it is expected that people in positions of authority will wield greater amounts of power and authority. In high power distance cultures, subordinates do not expect to be allowed to challenge the decisions of people in positions of authority. Low power distance cultures are more egalitarian in the distribution of power and authority.

Hofstede's understanding of the continuum of Individualism versus Collectivism is similar to that of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck. Some cultures are oriented towards individual rights at the expense of collective responsibilities, while others are oriented towards few individual rights and a high degree of collective or community responsibilities.

The United States was founded as an experiment in seeking individual rights and Western based market cultures tend to champion those rights at the expense of taking care of common interests and collective responsibilities. This contrasts with many other cultures in which the individual exists to serve the well being of the community.

“Masculinity” versus “Femininity” (please note the quotation marks, denoting that these are not meant to be taken literally) is concerned with the degree to which a culture promotes values of aggressiveness and excelling in competition, versus caring for other (and weaker) members of the culture, as well as the overall quality of life.

Uncertainty Avoidance has to do with the degree to which cultures try to avoid unclear or ambiguous situations. Cultures that have a high degree of uncertainty avoidance tend to have many formalized rules and rituals that allow its members to know how to approach personal interactions. Cultures that tolerate uncertainty more easily are able to improvise personal interactions more flexibly.

When persons from low uncertainty avoidance cultures interact with persons from high uncertainty avoidance cultures, there can be a great deal of misunderstanding and tension created. Typically, the person from the culture with low uncertainty avoidance will need to learn the rules and rituals of interaction, so that the uncertainty can be kept at a manageable level for the benefit of the parties with high uncertainty avoidance.

Hofstede’s final dimension is concerned with Long-term versus Short-term Orientation. This is the degree to which a culture tends to operate with a long-term view of the world and the role of its members in the great sweep of history, as opposed to a short-term, narrowly focused sense of time.

Dr. Rokeach analyzed the different ideals held out by different cultures. From his study of different cultural values, he suggested that all cultures drew from a common pool of ideals when determining what are the most important values within their culture. However, each culture rank orders these ideals in different ways, based upon their systems of values and beliefs. Let’s look at the list that he proposed.

Rokeach’s Personal Characteristics are:

1. Self-controlled (thinks first, restrained, self-disciplined)
2. Honest (sincere, truthful, disclosing)
3. Loving (affectionate, tender, caring)
4. Ambitious (hard working, aspiring)
5. Cheerful (light hearted, joyful)
6. Responsible (dependable, reliable)
7. Independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
8. Broad minded (open minded, flexible thinker)
9. Polite (courteous, well mannered)
10. Forgiving (willing to pardon others)
11. Intellectual (intelligent, knowledgeable)
12. Helpful (working for the welfare of others)
13. Obedient (dutiful, respectful)
14. Capable (competent, skillful)
15. Logical (consistent, rational, aware of reality)
16. Courageous (strong, willing to stand up for beliefs)
17. Imaginative (daring, creative)
18. Clean (neat, tidy, well organized)

There are cultures in which obedience and self-control are the highest virtues, while in others independence and imagination are viewed as being more important. Whichever ideals are forwarded, it will shape the culture and its members in important ways. It will also help determine the definitions of what “normal” or “deviant” behavior will be, as well as what values and behaviors each individual is supposed to aim for in order to reach a congruent sense of self within their cultural framework.

If a clinician is superimposing a different cultural framework on the client – trying push the client to aim for different ideals of virtue, values, and behaviors – it raises some difficult questions about whether the clinician is helping the client move to a better (or even more adaptive) place.

In addition to these larger perspectives on values, there are also areas of perceptions and beliefs that differ greatly from culture to culture. Cultural differences in such emotionally loaded areas as sexuality, sexual orientation, family structure, death and dying will show up frequently in cross-cultural counseling. Because they are able to raise powerful feelings, they will pose considerable difficulties for the clinician – both in terms of finding workable and adaptive solutions that help the client and in terms of managing one’s own biases and emotional responses in a responsible and ethical way.

Because there are so many different ways of conceptualizing these ideals, the clinician’s ethical task is more complicated. It requires the clinician to find a process for arriving at conclusions that make sense for the individual within the counseling relationship within the cultural framework in which the counseling takes place.

The subject matter of the next section will be concerned with beginning to outline the framework for this process [11].

Layout of core material. It is important to begin this discussion with a definition. Cultural values are defined as culture-level dimensions that reflect a set of deeply held beliefs that characterize a culture’s worldview with respect to humanity and its relationship to nature and time [5]. These value orientations impose parameters designed to establish larger patterns of cultural-specific behavior based on worldviews that can then be compared across cultures, as a way of understanding culture-group behavior. Importantly, these values are conceptualized at both the individual and culture-group level, but are focused on culture-group behaviors, rather than person-specific ones [10].

The value dimensions of individualism versus collectivism have been used in intercultural research across disciplines, spanning from the 1960s through the present. Cultural value orientations are used as dimensions through which to describe, understand, and critique cultural patterns in fields as wide-ranging as consumer research, international business, cross-cultural psychology, child development, international relations, anthropology, social history, and cross-cultural training. Indeed, these values have been expanded to include any and every marker of cultural belief, including modernity versus traditionalism [2]; familialism, romanticism, and spiritualism [7]; independent vs. interdependent self-construals (Markus and Kitayama 1991); hedonism, benevolence, conformity, and self-direction (Schwartz 1999). Further, I have found in speaking with students and colleagues over the years (as well as grading and reviewing countless papers and articles at the professional, graduate, and

undergraduate levels) that these value dimensions are the aspect of the class that they can most fruitfully apply and most easily recall (the other most probably involving cross-cultural comparisons of nonverbal behaviors). Thus, on both scholarly and pragmatic levels, cultural value orientation theories are both intuitively appealing and, it seems, highly useful. So how can I reconcile my conundrum—that such frameworks can be simultaneously problematic and constructive? Taking the perspective that value orientations do not have to contain mutually exclusive categories (that they can be both/and rather than either/or) is one way of approaching this challenge. Perceiving values more as dialectical tensions, as seen in work by Martin and Nakayama (1999), allows these dimensions to coexist within all individuals at levels that vary situationally, individually, and contextually [12].

The prevailing value emphases in a society may be the most central feature of culture (Hofstede, 1980; Inglehart, 1997; Schwartz, 1999; Weber, 1958; Williams, 1958). These value emphases express conceptions of what is good and desirable, the cultural ideals. The rich complex of meanings, beliefs, practices, symbols, norms, and values prevalent among people in a society are manifestations of the underlying culture.

Schwartz views culture as a latent, hypothetical variable that we can measure only through its manifestations. The underlying normative value emphases that are central to culture influence and give a degree of coherence to these manifestations. In this view, culture is not located in the minds and actions of individual people. Rather, it is outside the individual. It refers to the press to which individuals are exposed by virtue of living in particular social systems.

In psychological terms, this cultural press refers to the stimuli ('primes') that individuals encounter more or less frequently in their daily life, stimuli that focus conscious or unconscious attention. Daily stimuli encountered in a society may draw attention more to the individual or to the group, for example, or more to material concerns or to spiritual concerns. This cultural press can also take the form of language patterns. In sociological terms, this press refers to the expectations encountered more or less frequently when enacting roles in societal institutions.

The frequency of particular stimuli, expectations, and taken-for-granted practices in a society express underlying normative value emphases that are the heart of the culture. This view of culture contrasts with views of culture as a psychological variable. These views see culture as beliefs, values, behaviors, and/or styles of thinking distributed in a distinctive pattern among the individuals in a society or other cultural group. Culture, as Schwartz conceptualize it, influences the distribution of individual beliefs, actions, goals, and styles of thinking through the press and expectations to which people are exposed. A cultural value emphasis on modesty and obedience, for example, finds expression in stimuli and expectations that induce widespread conformity and self-effacing behavior. I was struck with this cultural emphasis and its expression, for example, when traveling through villages in Thailand and Laos.

The way social institutions are organized, their policies and everyday practices, explicitly or implicitly communicate expectations that express underlying cultural value emphases.

Competitive economic systems, confrontational legal systems, and achievement oriented childrearing, for example, express a cultural value emphasis on success and ambition. This fits the cultural stereotype of West, a stereotype with more than a kernel of truth. Through

these social institutions, individuals living in the society are continually exposed to primes and expectations that promote the underlying cultural values.

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, anthropologists, developed a model for viewing the underlying “values” structures of different cultural groups. This model has not only been explored for its theoretical and descriptive properties, but also has been employed in developing methods to understand and to address cultural values differences and similar differences at other levels of social organization as well. Although not what most people typically conceive as values, these orientations were based on the way different societies approach certain universal dimensions “solve “ certain common problems of existence. In five spheres Person, Nature, Time, Relational, Action and Human Nature, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck developed a protocol for inferring the inherent perspective/orientation taken. Since they recognized that approaches were not necessarily pure, the protocol produces “values orderings” for each culture, with the dominant perspective being presented first.

The dominant “western” culture generally evidences the ordering in the “Time Sphere” as: future-present-past. The Eastern culture (perhaps stereotypically) approaches this sphere with the ordering: present-past-future. When members from these two cultures interact, the result may be misperception and miscommunication. For example, if a mainstream business executive demands that tribal chieftain set a series of dates for meetings (a future time orientation), the chieftain may be offended or just seemingly uninterested. On the other hand, if the chieftain does not appear at a scheduled meeting because of being involved in an experience that is engaging and/or entertaining in the moment (a present time orientation), the executive may think the chieftain rude and inconsiderate.

These types of differences may cause conflicts, often at a psychological level not amenable to compromise because, even if the differences are comprehended, they are so innate as to operate at a covert and even visceral level. Similar problems often occur in both others spheres and across all cultures, although on a situational basis inconsistencies in the values orderings seem to result, that is, the secondary component or some mix may be dominant in a way that may ameliorate or even prevent a problem. To complicate matters even more, these types of difficulties and inconsistencies may, and often do, eventuate between different levels of social organization differences between individual and family values, for example.

Conclusions. In order to accept the usefulness of cultural values as descriptors and comparison points across cultures, it is imperative to understand that such values are constantly shifting and changing, depending on the context of the situation—that people are dynamic, and are continuously reassessing their worldviews through the lenses of their experiences (Smith and Schwartz 1997).

Cultural values are indeed valuable when it comes to understanding and subverting social norms, in that they are subjective, relative, and evaluative. They are intuitively appealing because they help us to understand and compare who we are to people with differing cultural backgrounds to ours. However, conflating cultural value orientations with nation-state borders and attempting to force essentializing behavioral characteristics on individuals simply due to culture-group memberships is the least useful way through which to conceptualize such theoretical perspectives. In the end, cultural value orientations must be taken into context

as a social-scientific approach to intercultural communication research—these are theories that explain and even predict behavior, but behaviors cannot be required to conform to such frameworks. As such, it is logical that it is not possible to become a scholar of intercultural communication without understanding how these values can be applied before critiquing their usefulness within the field. Thus, it can easily be seen how my self-guided tour through intercultural communication was so deeply imbedded in theories of cultural values, and how those theories are so well-adapted across disciplines and cultures [https://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/theory_connections_values.pdf].

REFERENCES

1. *Danyliuk, I. V.* (2013). Margaret Mead as the Founder of the Scientific Direction Culture and Personality. *Psychology and Personality. Scientific Journal: Kyiv – Poltava*, 2 (4), 29–42.
2. *Halychanska, A. V.* (2011). Family Tradition as a Condition for Preventing Inter-Generational Conflicts with Teenagers in the Family: Kyiv, 17–19.
3. *Hlynianyuk, N. V.* (2010). Psychological and Pedagogical Conditions of Developing Value Orientations in Contemporary Student Youth. Retrieved from http://tme.umo.edu.ua/docs/Dod/3_2010/Glinaniyk.pdf
4. *Erikson, E.* (2006). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*: Tr. from English. M. : Flinta : MPSI : Progress, 178–187.
5. *Kluckhohn, F. & Strodtbeck, R.* (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.
6. Kon, I. (1967). *Sociology of Individual*, 37.
7. *Mead, M., Wolfenstein, M.* (1955). *Childhood in Contemporary Cultures*. University of Chicago Press.
8. *Pidluzhna, O. P.* (2009). The System of Values as the Basis for Consumption Culture Development. *Scientific messages. Vol. 96. Social sciences*, 73–77.
9. Ragoza, T. E. (2012) Culture: Historical Fates and Notions. *Philosophy of Culture: Language. Rationality. Education. Materials of the Second All-Ukrainian Scientific and Practical Conference of April 20, 2012. Donetsk: DonIZT*, 20-23.
10. Schwartz S. H. Theory of Cultural Values and Some Implications for Work / S. H. Schwartz // *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 48 (1). – 1999. – P. 23–47.
11. Electronic resource: <https://www.yourceus.com/pages/eth5556-section-five-models-of-cultural-value-orientations>.
12. Electronic resource: https://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/theory_connections_values.pdf

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 25.05.2018
Прийнята до друку 07.06.2018

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ОСНОВИ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ КУЛЬТУРНО-ЦІННІСНИХ ОРІЄНТАЦІЙ

Оксана РИБАК

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,
вул. Університетська, 1, м. Львів, Україна, 79000*

Девальвація людських цінностей і спад культури, особливо у середовищі молоді, загальновідоме явище. Тому дослідження проблематики культурно-ціннісних орієнтацій є надзвичайно важливе і актуальне.

Зазвичай культурно-ціннісні орієнтації це ідеали, і сприяють узгодженості між різними аспектами культури. Аспекти культури, які несумісні з цими ідеалами, спричиняють напруження, критику та потребують змін. Зрозуміло, що між різними культурами немає повної узгодженості. Різні соціальні групи керуються суперечливими цінностями. Домінуючі культурні орієнтації змінюються відповідно до розстановки сил між соціальними групами. Однак зміни відбуваються повільно та поступово. Соціальна адаптація до епідемій, технологічних змін, зростання добробуту, контакту з іншими культурами, війн та інших екзогенних чинників призводить до змін у культурних цінностях.

Сьогодення вимагає, щоб індивідуальний стиль життя особистості відповідав цінностям і зразкам поведінки у суспільстві загалом. Ситуації, коли індивідуальний життєвий стиль не відповідає цінностям суспільства, перешкоджають соціальній адаптації та деструктивно впливають на фізичне та психічне здоров'я особистості. Отож, проблема відповідності цінностей суспільства з різним типом культури набуває важливого значення.

У процесі міжкультурних контактів виявляється величезна різниця між тим, як сприймають однакові цінності люди різних культур. Серед них можна виділити ті, які збігаються і за характером оцінювання, і за змістом. Такі цінності називаються універсальними, або загальнолюдськими, їхня універсальність зумовлюється тим, що головні риси таких цінностей ґрунтуються на біологічній природі людини та на загальних властивостях соціальної взаємодії. Немає такої культури в світі, де б позитивно оцінювали вбивство, неправду, злочинство. У кожній культурі є лише своя межа терпимості цих явищ, але загальна їхня оцінка однозначно негативна.

Ключові слова: культурно-ціннісні орієнтації, міжкультурні контакти, універсальні цінності, індивідуальний життєвий стиль.