

Values of Females and Males in the East and West: Are They Similar or Different?

Arnel Onesimo O. Uy
De La Salle University
arnel.uy@dlsu.edu.ph

Edward F. Murphy
Embry Riddle Aeronautical University
edward.murphy@erau.edu

Regina A. Greenwood
Nova Southeastern University
rgreenwo@nova.edu

Understanding whether cross-cultural values are similar or different has become more important in an increasingly global marketplace. Yet, few studies have explored cross-cultural sex-based value structures. This study examines the values of 5,134 male and female working adults in three Eastern nations (Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand) and three Western nations (United States, United Kingdom, and Iceland). For similarities, males and females more highly valued personal than social terminal values. For differences, males in the East more highly valued self-actualization/competence instrumental values. Females in both geographic groups placed higher importance on social terminal values than did males, supporting prior research.

Keywords: Musser and Orke, male and female values, cross-cultural values

A question of significant importance to managers and to organizations throughout the world is: Are values becoming more similar or different? Most research on cross-cultural values, attitudes and behaviors has focused on differences with little attention paid to similarities or the boundaries between those similarities and differences in national cultures (Bailey & Spicer, 2007). "The identification of cultural similarities may be just as important as that of differences, since members of different societies need to build on common moralities and beliefs (values) when working together to meet common goals" (p. 1462). We will fill this research gap by exploring whether male and female values in three Eastern (Japan, the

Philippines, and Thailand) and three Western (U.S., UK, and Iceland) nations are more similar or different, with a specific focus on the similarities in value orientation types.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

Understanding cross-cultural values has become more important as organizations and their male and female members participate in an increasingly global marketplace (Bigoness & Blakely, 1996; Elkhoully & Buda, 1997; Neelankavil, Mathur, & Zhang, 2000; Lenartowicz & Johnson, 2002; Lenartowicz & Roth, 2001; Triandis & Suh, 2002; Ryckman & Houston, 2003; Gustavo, 2004; McGuire, Garavan, Saha, & O'Donnell, 2006).

Yet, few studies have explored cross-cultural sex-based similarities in the four value orientation types proposed originally by Rokeach (1973, 1979) and more recently by Weber (1990, 1993), and Musser and Orke (1992). Our research addressed this gap. The present study examines the values of male and female working adults in three Eastern nations (Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand) and three Western nations (United States, United Kingdom, and Iceland) in order to explore the similarities and differences in their four value orientation types.

The research literature notes that throughout the world's history, males and females have been socialized to possess different roles in society and these roles lead to differences between males and females in their values, attitudes and behaviors – the three components of culture (Hofstede, 1980). While males and females from different nations have been shown to possess culturally-based differences in their values, attitudes, and behaviors, they also have unique similarities in their roles in society (Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989).

Culture is defined as a socialized set of values, attitudes and behaviors of a particular society, organization, group, or sub-group (Rokeach, 1973, 1979; Murphy et al., 2006; Lenartowicz & Johnson, 2003). Hofstede (2001) additionally defined culture as “collective programming of the mind; it manifests itself not only in values, but in more superficial ways: in symbols, heroes and rituals” (p. 1). Rokeach (1973, 1979) and Connor and Becker (2003, 2006) explained that culture was made up of an interrelated set of values, attitudes and behaviors that form a value schema, system or value orientation. Research by Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey (1960), Kohlberg (1970), Kluckhohn (1951), Rokeach (1973), and many other psychologists and sociologists indicate that values and culture are socialized from the moment of conception, with socialization continuing until death. Children are socialized through their interaction in the environment, through the influence of families, friends, significant others, teachers, and organizations, as society teaches them how to operate and succeed.

Rokeach (1986) defined a value as “a type of belief, centrally located within one's belief system, about how one ought or ought not to behave, or about some end state of existence worth or not worth attaining” (p. 125). Kluckhohn (1951) defined values as “a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influence the selection from available modes, means and ends of action (p. 395). Values are differentiated from attitudes, defined as “a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation (Rokeach, 1986, p. 112). Values underlie the attitudes, cannot be seen, and can only be inferred through people's attitudinal responses and behaviors.

Values are important because we can explore them in order to see how people might behave. Rokeach (1979, p. 16) related that “values influence our attitudes and subsequent behavior and decision-making.” Values form value schemas, value systems or value orientations and “are simultaneously components of psychological processes, of social interaction, and of cultural patterning and storage” (Rokeach, 1979, p. 17). As part of value systems or value orientations, values interact with the environment and change slowly over time as the environment changes.

Rokeach (1986) explained that attitudes and behaviors were important constructs, but values were the more important construct to explore. First, “value seems to be a more dynamic concept since it has a strong motivation component as well as cognitive, affective and behavioral components” (p. 157). Second, while attitudes only impact behavior, values impact both attitudes and behavior. Finally, people possess only several dozen values, yet might possess thousands of attitudes. Therefore, “the value concept provides us with a more economical analytic tool for describing and explaining similarities and differences between persons, groups, nations and cultures” (pp. 157-158).

Rokeach (1973, 1979) narrowed his original listing of 500 values to a group of 36 values (18 terminal and 18 instrumental) which were present in most societies. Yes, some societies will possess more values and some less, but the majority of

societies will possess the 36 values which can, as such, be used to compare and contrast individuals, families, sub-groups, groups, organizations and societies. The 36 values were divided into 18 end-state or goals values called terminal values and 18 means-based values called instrumental values. Individuals rank order terminal and instrumental values separately. Values can thus form a hierarchy of importance of these two sets of values from most to least important. As an aggregate of individuals, each society possesses a unique hierarchical arrangement of values. This hierarchical arrangement was called a value schema, value system or value orientation.

Terminal values are further divided into personal and social value types and instrumental values are divided into moral and competence value types, developing what Rokeach (1973, 1979), Weber (1990, 1993), and Musser and Orke (1992) called a value orientation typology. These value systems or value orientations have been shown to differ in each society (Weber, 1990, 1993; Musser & Orke, 1992).

Cross-cultural Research

Values, value systems or value orientations are important variables for researchers to explore cross-culturally since values influence attitudes and intended behavior. Thus, they provide insight into how managers can develop better worldwide customer relationships, develop better human resources programs for their employees throughout the world, and predict the behaviors of other companies or competitors and their employees operating in the global marketplace (Neelankavil et al., 2000; Hofstede, 2001; Lenartowicz & Johnson, 2002; Lyons, Duxbury, & Higgins, 2005; Murphy et al., 2006; McGuire et al., 2006).

Cross-cultural research studies have explored numerous topic areas including managerial value differences (England, 1975; Rokeach, 1973; Ralston, Gustafson, Elsas, Cheung, & Terpstra, 1992; Lenartowicz & Roth, 2001; Giacominio & Eaton, 2003; Murphy, Gordon, & Anderson, 2004), cross-cultural differences in values between

developed and developing nations (Murphy et al., 2007), religious affiliation differences in values (Khilji et al., 2008), cross-cultural generation differences in values (Murphy et al., 2006), marketing and consumer behaviors (Kahle, Beatty, & Homer, 1986; Grunert & Scherhorn, 1990), and a myriad of other value-related research topics (Kawasaki, 1994; Bond & Smith, 1996; Schooler, 1996; Ralston, Thang, & Napier, 1999; Frydenberg et al., 2003; Jayawardhena, 2004).

Researchers have investigated sex differences in numerous values, attitudes or behavioral constructs around the world. For example, Wolin (2003) reviewed sex issues in advertising research; Hoeken et al. (2003) explored values and international advertising in Europe; Phalet and Schonpflug (2001) and Lyons et al. (2005) explored whether sex differences were a symptom of generation differences, and Fitzpatrick et al. (2006) studied cross-cultural differences in the social values of spouses in China as compared to Chinese residing in the U.S. and spouses of U.S. citizens.

Some studies specifically focused on cross-cultural sex differences in values using the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS): Feather (1984) examined the values of Australian undergraduate students; Dio, Sargovi, Koestner, and Aube (1996) analyzed sex differences in the values of Canadians; Johnson (1999) scrutinized sex differences in the values of Japanese male and female managers, and Giacominio and Eaton (2003) used the RVS to assess the values of males and females in accounting occupations in the U.S. Murphy, Greenwood, and Lawn-Neiborer (2004) explored sex differences and similarities in cross-cultural values and internet marketing attitudes of respondents from the United States, Japan, and United Kingdom; and Ruiz-Gutierrez et al. (2008) explored cross-cultural sex differences in values between respondents from Brazil, Colombia and Mexico.

Research on values across cultures is a daunting task. For example, in order to explore similarities and differences across cultures, you must explore the Rokeach's 36 values across each culture. If

you explored the differences across six countries or cultures, you would be exploring ranking differences in a total of 36 values by six countries, or 216 values. A relatively new, less complex way to explore the 36 different values is through Rokeach's, Weber's, and Musser and Orke's value orientation typology.

Value Orientation Typology

Rokeach (1973) identified 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values. Terminal values are divided into

two value orientation types: personal and social values. The personal values are self-centered and intrapersonal and the social values are society-centered and interpersonal. Instrumental values, the modes of conduct, are divided into two value orientation types: moral and competence values. Moral values are interpersonally focused while competence values have an intrapersonal focus. (See Figure 1.)

Social Terminal Values	Personal Terminal Values
World at Peace World of Beauty Equality Family Security Freedom Mature love National security Social recognition True friendship	Comfortable Life An exciting life Accomplishment Health Inner harmony Pleasure Salvation Self-respect Wisdom
Moral Instrumental Values	Competence or Self-Actualization Instrumental Values
Broadminded Forgiving Helpful Honest Loving Loyal Obedient Polite Responsible	Ambitious Capable Clean Courage Imaginative Independent Intellectual Logical Self-controlled

Figure 1. Social and personal terminal values and moral and self-actualization instrumental values.

Source: Rokeach (1973)

Weber (1990, 1993) developed a model (Figure 2) which extends Rokeach's value orientation typology. Weber's research indicated that people could be classified by their overall value orientation or preference for one of the personal or social terminal values and one of the moral and competence instrumental value types. For instance, a person could show a tendency to prefer: (1) personal terminal and competence instrumental values, (2) personal terminal and moral instrumental values, (3) social terminal and competence instrumental values, or (4) social terminal and moral instrumental values. Weber (1990, 1993) validated and tested this typology for the Rokeach Value

Survey in the U.S. and in several cross-cultural studies.

Musser and Orke (1992) extended Weber's personal value orientation typologies by developing a two by two value matrix (Figure 3) that identified and labeled each person's value orientation type. The value orientation types are Independent Maximizers who prefer high personal and high competence values, Honorable Egoists, who prefer high personal and high moral values, Effective Crusaders, who prefer high social and high competence values, or Virtuous Advocates, who prefer high social and high moral values.

Instrumental Values		Terminal Values	
		Personal	Social
	Competence	Preference for Personal-Competence Values	Preference for Social-Competence Values
	Moral	Preference for Personal-Moral Values	Preference for Social-Moral Values

Figure 2. Value orientation typology.

Source: Weber (1993)

Terminal Values		Instrumental Values	
		High Competence	High Moral
	High Social	Effective Crusader (EC)	Virtuous Advocate (VA)
	High Personal	Independent Maximizer (IM)	Honorable Egoist (HE)

Figure 3. Musser and Orke value type matrix.

Source: Musser and Orke (1992)

Independent Maximizers (IM) place high importance on personal and competence values; they have a concern for themselves rather than others and will use competence rather than moral means to attain their personal goals. Honorable Egoists (HE) place high importance on personal and moral values and have more concern for themselves than others; they emphasize moral means to obtain goals rather than competence means. Effective Crusaders (EC) place high importance on social and competence values, have a higher concern for others rather than self, and promote social goals over personal goals using competence instead of moral means. Virtuous Advocates (VA) are people who place high importance on social and moral values, have a concern for others rather than themselves and want to use moral rather than competence means in order to reach social goals.

Musser and Orke (1992) validated their typology in three studies of values and moral development. Their studies indicated that

respondents who were classified as effective crusaders and independent maximizers scored significantly higher on Machiavellianism and lower on narcissism as compared to the virtuous advocates and honorable egoists.

Weber's and Musser and Orke's typologies clarify Rokeach's (1973) value orientation typology. While Weber reinforced and validates Rokeach's typology, Musser and Orke gave Rokeach's four value orientation type classification names that could be easily used to explain research findings. We have integrated Rokeach's, Weber's and Musser and Orke's typologies into Figure 4. As shown in Figure 4, independent maximizers (IM) are people who place higher importance on personal and competence values; honorable egoists (HE) are people who place higher importance on personal and moral values; effective crusaders (EC) are people who place higher importance on social and competence, and virtuous advocates (VA) are people who place higher importance on social and moral values.

Instrumental Values		Terminal Values	
		High Personal	High Social
	High Competence	Preference for Personal-Competence Values Independent Maximizer (IM) Concern for self Competence for personal goals	Preference for Social-Competence Values Effective Crusader (EC) Concern for others Competence for social goals.
	High Moral	Preference for Personal-Moral Values Honorable Egoist (HE) Concern for self Moral reasons for personal goals	Preference for Social-Moral Values Virtuous Advocate (VA) Concern for others Moral reasons for social goals

Figure 4. Value orientation typology.

Adapted from Weber (1993), Musser and Orke (1992), and Eaton and Giacomino (2001).

In one of the few known non-Western studies using the Musser and Orke typology, Giacomino, Fujita, and Johnson (1999) explored sex differences in Japanese managers. In their study, males and females placed higher importance on personal as compared to social terminal values; females placed higher importance on the social terminal and moral instrumental values as compared to the males, and males placed higher importance on competence instrumental values.

In research using the Musser and Orke value orientation typology, Eaton and Giacomino (2000) explored the values of U.S. male and female accounting students, Eaton and Giacomino (2001) explored the values of U.S. business managers, Giacomino and Eaton (2003) explored the values of U.S. accounting alumni, and Ariail (2007) explored the values of U.S. CPAs. All of these studies indicated that U.S. males and females emphasized personal values more than social values, but females emphasized social values more than males. U.S. males as a group were Independent Maximizers with an emphasis on personal and competence values or Honorable Egoists with an emphasis on personal and moral values, while females were Honorable Egoists with an emphasis on personal and moral values, or Virtuous Advocates with an emphasis on social and moral values.

With these research results, we developed the following research hypotheses:

H₁: Eastern countries (Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand) will place higher importance on personal terminal values and moral instrumental values (Honorable Egoists) and will have a secondary emphasis on personal terminal values and competence instrumental values (Independent Maximizers).

H₂: Western countries (United States, United Kingdom, and Iceland) will place higher importance on personal terminal values and moral instrumental values (Honorable Egoists) and will have a secondary emphasis on personal terminal values and competence instrumental values (Independent Maximizers).

H₃: Males will place higher importance on personal and moral values (Honorable Egoists) and will have secondary emphasis on personal and competence values (Independent Maximizers).

H₄: Females will place higher importance on personal and moral values (Honorable Egoists) and will have secondary emphasis on social and moral values (Virtual Advocates).

H₅: Females will place higher importance on social terminal values than will males.

H₆: Females in Eastern and Western countries will place higher importance on social terminal values and males will place higher importance on personal terminal values.

H₇: Females in Eastern and Western countries will place higher importance on moral instrumental values and males will place higher importance on competence instrumental values.

H₈: Males in Eastern countries will place highest importance on the personal and moral value typology (Honorable Egoist) and secondary importance on the personal and competence value typology (Independent Maximizer).

H₉: Males in Western (countries will place higher importance on the personal and competence value typology (Independent Maximizer) and secondary importance on the personal and moral value typology (Honorable Egoist).

H₁₀: Females from Eastern countries will place higher importance on the personal and moral value typology (Honorable Egoists) and secondary importance on the social and moral value typology (Virtuous Advocate).

H₁₁: Females from Western countries will place higher importance on the personal and moral value typology (Honorable Egoists) and secondary importance on the social and moral value typology (Virtuous Advocate).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study expands the research literature by exploring cross-cultural sex similarities and differences in Rokeach terminal and instrumental values through their underlying four value orientation typologies, using adult respondents from three Western nations (Iceland, United States, and United Kingdom) and three Eastern nations (Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand). We used the combined Weber (1990, 1993) and Musser and Orke (1992) value orientation typology to explore cross-cultural and sex differences in value orientation types.

Survey Instrument

We chose the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) to investigate cross-cultural sex similarities and differences in value orientation types. The RVS is the most commonly used instrument for the measurement of values (Kamakura & Novak, 1992) despite criticism that it captures too large a set of cross-cultural values (Bond, 1994). We selected RVS because it is much simpler and easier to use, is shorter, easier to translate, and has shown its reliability and validity in numerous cross-cultural research studies in the past 30 years (Connor & Becker, 2003). In addition, most other commonly used instruments are based on or were developed from the RVS and/or Rokeach's value theory. For many experts, "the RVS is the best value system measuring device available" (Sikula, 1973, p. 16).

The RVS, divided into 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values, presents the values that Rokeach determined to be present in most societies. Instructions to those taking the survey are standard. Each individual is asked to rank the terminal values and then the instrumental values "in order of importance to you, as guiding principles in your life" (Obot, 1988, p. 367), from 1 (most important) to 18 (least important). When appropriate, a native speaker in each location translated the RVS into the local language and another native speaker translated the instrument back to English, making an independent

confirmation of the translation. As a clarification, the English version was left in place beside the translated version (Adler, 1983; Sekaran, 1983).

We first developed the means and medians for terminal and instrumental values. We then divided the terminal values into personal and social terminal values and instrumental values into moral and competence values as shown in Figure 1. In order to develop the Figure 4 value orientation typology, we summed the mean scores for each value orientation typology (personal and social terminal values and moral and competence instrumental values), and then developed the grand means for each sex, each culture, for Eastern and Western cultures combined, and for each male and female group in each culture. This allowed us to classify each group into Independent Maximizers (IM) who place higher importance on personal and competence values; Honorable Egoists (HE) who place higher importance on personal and moral values; Effective Crusaders (EC) who place higher importance on social and competence, and Virtuous Advocates (VA) who place higher importance on social and moral values. As values range in ranking from one (most important) to 18 least important, the lowest grand means signifies the more important value orientation type.

Since the RVS is rank-ordered, it produces non-normative data. Sample reliability tests for normative data cannot be used due to slight inter-correlations among the variables. Instead of normative reliability data procedures, reliability of the RVS was established by Rokeach (1973, 1979) and Rokeach and Ball-Rokeach (1989) using test-retest reliability for the survey instrument. Test-retest reliability for each of the 18 terminal values considered separately, from seven weeks to 18 months later, ranged from a low of 0.51 for *a sense of accomplishment* to a high of 0.88 for *salvation*. Comparable test-retest reliability scores for instrumental values ranged from 0.45 for *responsible* to 0.70 for *ambitious*. Employing a 14-16 month test interval, median reliability was 0.69 for terminal values and 0.61 for instrumental values. While these reliabilities may seem low when compared to normative data, they are well within

the norm for rank-ordered non-normative data and for value instruments (Connor & Becker, 2003, 2006).

Research Population

As part of larger studies exploring values, attitudes and behaviors in 15 countries, we administered the surveys from 2004 to 2008 to convenience samples of working adults living in major cities in the Western countries of Iceland, U.K., and U.S. and the Eastern countries of Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand. The researchers chose working adults because their values represent the values of working professionals in those countries.

In 2004, 15 researchers collaborated to form a loose-knit research project called the Global Culture and Entrepreneurship Research Group (GCERG). The GCERG has been surveying public and private sector organizations throughout the world, with a small grouping of research instruments that meet each of their research interests. The surveys used in this study are part of the data that has been collecting from 2004 to 2008. Since the U.S. data was a much larger sample, only the 2007 and 2008 data was used. The Appendix presents demographic information about the final sample of 5,134.

Statistical Analysis Techniques

Since the Rokeach Value Survey is a ranking instrument that produces non-normative data, we first used non-parametric statistical techniques followed by hierarchical regression analysis. Research by Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990), Kamakura and Novak (1992), Johnston (1995), Bigoness and Blakely (1996), Elkhoully and Buda (1997), Lenartowicz and Johnson (2002, 2003), Murphy, Snow, Carson, & Zigarmi (1997), Murphy, Gordon, and Anderson (2004), and Connor and Becker (1994, 2003, 2006) supports Rokeach's findings for statistical analysis of the RVS, but also adds several factor analysis and multidimensional scaling techniques as ways to

evaluate value systems or value orientations. Researchers using the Rokeach, Weber, and Musser and Orke (1992) value orientation typology have explored differences with the *t*-test, Wilcoxon Ranked Sum Test and the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA median test.

Research Results

We first explored whether there were cross-cultural differences in values and then value orientation types, with culture as the independent variable and values and value orientations as the dependent variables. Since some studies have shown that age, sex, education, and occupation can impact values, we used regression analysis to explore the impact of culture, age, sex, education and occupation. The Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA showed statistically significant cross-cultural differences for all 18 terminal and all 18 instrumental values, but the regression analysis beta scores indicated that age, sex, education and occupation contributed to some of the statistically significant cross-cultural differences. We next explored differences in the value orientations with culture as the independent variable and value orientations as the dependent variables with the Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA, which indicated that there were statistically significant cross-cultural differences across all four value orientation types.

Eastern countries did place higher importance on personal terminal and moral instrumental values (Honorable Egoists) and secondary importance on personal and competence values (Independent Maximizers) allowing us to accept H_1 . Western countries did place higher importance on personal terminal and moral instrumental values (Honorable Egoists) but they placed secondary importance on social and moral values (Virtual Advocate) instead of personal and competence values (Independent Maximizers) allowing us to only partially accept H_2 .

We next explored the data for sex differences in value orientations with an ANCOVA and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two sample test, Kruskal Wallis ANOVA median and chi square tests. As a

group, regardless of culture, males placed higher importance on personal and moral values (Honorable Egoists) and secondarily on personal and competence values (Independent Maximizers), allowing to accept H_3 . Females, as a group, regardless of culture, did not place higher importance on personal and moral values (Honorable Egoists) and secondarily on social and moral values (Virtual Advocates), instead, our findings were the opposite, forcing us to reject H_4 . Females placed higher importance on social values as compared to the males, allowing us to accept H_5 .

We next explored for sex similarities and differences in value orientations in Western countries grand means and Eastern countries grand means, using the t -test, multiple regression and ANOVA. For both sexes in the West, the t -values and their alphas indicated that there were statistically significant differences between them in social and personal terminal values but not for moral and competence instrumental values. The multiple regression beta scores and ANOVA F-values indicated statistically significant differences for social and personal terminal values and for moral instrumental values, but not for competence instrumental values. For the sexes in Eastern countries, the t -values and their alphas and multiple regression beta scores indicated that social and personal terminal values were not statistically significant for differences as a group, but the moral and competence instrumental values were statistically significant for differences.

The Eastern and Western countries females did place higher importance on the social terminal values and males did place higher importance on the personal terminal values, allowing us to accept H_6 . The Eastern and Western countries females did place higher importance on the moral instrumental values and males did place higher importance on the competence instrumental values, allowing us to accept H_7 .

The Eastern country males did not place higher priority on the personal and moral value typology (Honorable Egoist) and secondarily on the personal and competence value typology

(Independent Maximizer), as the reverse was true, forcing us to reject H_8 .

The Western country males did not place higher priority on the personal and competence value typology (Independent Maximizer) and secondarily on the personal and moral value typology (Honorable Egoist), instead, the reverse was true, forcing us to reject H_9 .

Eastern country females did place higher priority on the personal and moral value typology (Honorable Egoist) but not secondarily on the social and moral value typology (Virtuous Advocate), allowing us to only partially accept H_{10} .

Western country females did place higher priority on the personal and moral value typology (Honorable Egoist) but not secondarily on the social and moral value typology (Virtuous Advocate), forcing us to only partially accept H_{11} .

DISCUSSION

Our research purpose was to explore whether values were more similar or different across the cultures, with a specific focus on similarities across the sexes and cultures. To reduce complexity we used a value orientation type typology originally suggested by Rokeach (1973, 1979) and extended by Weber (1990, 1993) and Musser and Orke (1992). We focused on similarities because so many research studies focus on the differences; similarities bring a different focus to a research study (Bailey & Spicer, 2007). We are looking for common ground that organizations can use to be more effective in their global endeavors. The focus on similarities and use of the Rokeach 4-value orientation typology instead of the 36 individual values allowed us to find more commonality across the cultures and between sexes.

East-West Comparison

Working adults from Western and Eastern countries were motivated primarily by high personal and high moral value orientations, thereby

classifying them as Honorable Egoists. Honorable Egoists, with their high personal terminal values, have a self-centered or intrapersonal focus for most important goals in life. This is tempered with an interpersonal/other-centered or moral instrumental value orientation focus indicating they will use other-centered values to obtain their goals. This is positive news for organizations because, although respondents are internally focused to obtain their goals, they are morally focused on society and their organizations, supervisors, co-workers and customers. Their moral values are other-focused and “when violated, around pangs of conscience or feelings of guilt for the wrongdoing” (Rokeach, 1973, p. 8). Thus, when comparing Eastern and Western countries, respondents were more similar than different in their primary value orientations.

The results for secondary orientations also suggest that values are more similar across the cultures. Previous research (i.e., Hofstede, 1980, 2001; Schwartz, 1992; and others) has shown that respondents from Western countries primarily value individualistic or self-centered values, while respondents from Eastern countries primarily value society-centered or group-oriented values. Our research results indicate that respondents in the East and West now value both individualism (personal values) and collectivism (moral values). For example, the secondary value orientation type in the West was Virtual Advocate with its inherent high social (interpersonal focus) and high moral (interpersonal focus) value orientation; respondents from the East had a secondary value orientation of Independent Maximizer with its high personal (intrapersonal focus) and high competence (intrapersonal focus) value orientation. Our results suggest that, while their secondary value orientation types are different, the respondents in the West are adopting group-oriented (interpersonal) values and respondents in the East are adopting individual-oriented (intrapersonal).

Country Level Comparison

When explored at the country-level, we also found similar results as the primary value orientation

type for the respondents from all six counties were classified as Honorable Egoists who more highly valued personal terminal and moral instrumental values. Once again, this is positive news for organizations because, although respondents are internally focused to obtain their goals, they are morally focused on society and their organizations, supervisors, co-workers and customers. For secondary value orientations, respondents from the U.S., the Philippines, and Thailand are Independent Maximizers (high personal intrapersonal focus) and High Competence (intrapersonal focus) and the respondents from UK, Iceland, and Japan are Virtual Advocates (high social interpersonal focus) and High Moral (interpersonal focus). This knowledge will help those who work with and lead people from diverse regions of the world. Managers would know that respondents from each country will primarily focus on their own goals, tempered that with a focus on organizational goals. Secondly, respondents from the U.S., the Philippines, and Thailand might behave differently and focus themselves in personal goals and the means to obtain them, while respondents from the UK, Iceland and Japan will focus even more on interpersonal goals and the social or organizational means to obtain them.

Female-Male Comparison

Females as a group possessed primary Virtual Advocate and secondary Honorable Egoist orientations; males possessed a primary Honorable Egoist value orientation and secondary Independent Maximizer. This is identical to previous research in Japan (Giacomino, Fujita & Johnson, 1999) which indicated that males and females would possess a primary Honorable Egoist and secondary Independent Maximize (males) and Virtuous Advocate (females) value orientation.

Managers and practitioners need to understand these differences and similarities. Males have a primary personal terminal (intrapersonal) and moral (interpersonal) focus while females have an interpersonal social and moral (interpersonal) focus. This suggests that males would pursue their

inner directed goals through moral social means, while females will pursue social goals through moral social means. In other words, females will place group goals above personal goals, while males will place personal goals above group goals. The individualism of males is further indicated by their secondary Independent Maximizer orientation, with its preference for focusing on intrapersonal goals and obtaining them through intrapersonal competence means (individualism). The secondary style for females was Honorable Egoist, or a personal goal orientation with moral means. These findings support previous studies by Hofstede (1980), Schwartz (1992) and others, which indicated that women, in general, possess a social orientation and men possess a more individualistic orientation.

Female-Male Cross Cultural Comparison

We next explored similarities between Eastern and Western females and males. Western females and males and Eastern females had primary Honorable Egoist value orientations and secondary Independent Maximizer orientations. On the other hand, Eastern country males had the reverse: primary Independent Maximizer and secondary Honorable Egoist orientations. Once again, such findings can help managers in multinational organizations to understand the similarities across the sexes and cultures. Males and females in the West and females in the East primarily have an internal focus with moral values that have a social focus, while Eastern males have this as a secondary style. Males in the East are more personal (intrapersonal, individualism) focus for both goals and for the means to obtain them. Still, the results indicate strong similarities across the sexes and cultures.

When similarities by sex for each country were explored individually, we found that males and females in the Western countries of U.S., UK, and Iceland and the Eastern countries of the Philippines and Thailand and Japanese males all had primary Honorable Egoist value orientations. This suggests they would pursue their personal focused and

intrapersonal goals by social or interpersonal moral means. Once again, this is positive for organizations because respondents will pursue their own goals, but through societal and organizational means. On the other hand, Japanese females were Virtual Advocates with a primary societal interpersonal goal focus and moral interpersonal means focus, which is great news for managers, as females will pursue social and organizational goals through social and organizational means.

Further Value Analysis

Rokeach (1973), Feather (1979), Triandis (1994) and Hofstede's (1980) early cross cultural studies indicated that Western nations placed higher importance on achievement-oriented, materialistic and competitive values like *ambition*, while Eastern nations placed higher importance on the group-oriented or collectivist values *capable*, *helpful* and *obedient*. More recent research by Neelankavil, et al. (2000) supported those findings. Their research indicated that American managers highly valued individualism, an achievement orientation and material prosperity, while Eastern or Asian nations valued group goals, interdependence, social hierarchies and cooperation.

When we explored the individual values of each value orientation typology, our study indicated that achievement oriented values were more important for Eastern nations than for Western nations. For the West, *ambition* was more important than for the Eastern nations, but Western nations, like the Eastern nations, ranked *capable* as more important than *ambition*. Similarly, the importance of *helpful* and *obedient* indicated that Western nations had adopted these collectivist values into their value structures, again confirming that values were becoming more similar across the sexes and cultures.

Our results also suggest that Western nations are adopting some group-oriented values and Eastern nations adopting some individualistic values. For example, the individualistic-oriented values of *freedom* and *independent* should have

grand means less in importance in Eastern countries who instead should place higher importance on *helpful, clean, polite, obedient, and self-controlled* (Rokeach, 1973). Eastern nations have now adopted *independent* into their value structures, showing values are becoming more similar across the sexes and cultures. Additionally, the group-oriented or collectivistic values *helpful* and *polite* were similarly ranked by both Western and Eastern countries, indicating that Western nations have adopted two formerly group-oriented values in their value structures.

In past research, the West was more hedonistic than the East, placing higher importance on *an exciting life, pleasure and mature love* (Feather, 1975). In this research study, *an exciting life* was only ranked important for Japan and U.K. *Mature love* was important for all nations except for the Philippines and *pleasure* was important for all nations except the Philippines. This adoption of *an exciting life, mature love and pleasure*, formerly hedonistic values, into Eastern value structures indicates again that values are now more similar across the sexes and cultures.

Our findings are important to understand because they immediately give practitioners a point from which to start their relationship with nations in their opposite hemisphere. For example, *family security, health, honest, and responsible* were values of importance across all sexes and cultures. By understanding the importance of these values to all people, practitioners can better lead and motivate their employees, develop relationships with their trading partners, use these values as major themes for marketing or advertising campaigns, and make more effective decisions with their marketing expenditures. Each of these goals or techniques can be used as broad areas of focus while still tailoring the relationship to the culture and situation and in the case of an advertising campaign, to the target market based on the psychographics, demographics, peculiarities of the culture involved and the situation (DeMooij, 1998, 2004; Triandis, 1994).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Our study indicates that exploring similarities across sexes and cultures using a value orientation typology is a worthwhile endeavor; this typology, based on the work of Rokeach, Weber and Musser and Orke, lends itself more easily to explorations of similarities. Our research results indicate that males and females across cultures are similar in their value orientations. The majority of male and female respondents have a personal focus for goals and a moral social focus as to how to obtain those goals. When examined further, our results indicated that males are significantly more personal focused in their goals and moral focused in their means to obtain them, while females are more social focused for their goals and the means to obtain them. It appears that the individualistic nature of males is being tempered with a social focus, and the social focus of females is being tempered with a personal focus.

Understanding values allows organizational managers to gain insight into what motivates their employees, trading partners and customers. This study will also help practitioners and managers who supervise foreign nationals understand what motivates them and will help companies operating globally to develop international human resources management strategies that not only meet company needs but also the cultural needs of their organizational members. Finally, by understanding values and culture, companies should be able to achieve better performance outcomes and these outcomes should positively impact their profitability.

The limitations of this study include the research populations we used, as they were convenience samples of working adults from the capitals or major cities in each country. The U.S. sample was further limited as it encompassed respondents in only 5 states. Another limitation was the smaller sample sizes in Thailand and Iceland. Both samples were roughly one-half the size of the other countries' samples. We intend to solve these limitations in future research.

Another limitation lies in comparing our results to other studies published in the research literature. Many studies use the RVS but do not report the means and rankings for their populations, possibly due to publishing length constraints. This impedes comparison. Further, many researchers use only terminal or only instrumental values portions of the RVS, which does not allow for comparative studies using the entire RVS. We recommend that researchers using the RVS report the means, medians and rankings for each value and for each demographic variable studied thereby allowing future researchers to compare their results more precisely. Connor and Becker (1994) and Meglino (1998) also support more in-depth reporting of results.

Future research should compare our results to other studies of working adults throughout the world. We also suggest other studies of working adults by public versus private occupation, by females and males in diverse organizations, and additional cross cultural research using this value orientation typology. Further research with the value orientation typology should be conducted as well in other cities in the U.S., UK, Iceland Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand and in other countries in the East and in the West.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. (1983). A typology of management studies involving culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14, 29-47.
- Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1960). *Study of values* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Boston University Press.
- Ariail, D. L. (2007). *Gender differences associated with the moral development and personal values of certified public accountants*. Paper presented at the American Accounting Association Research Conference, October 19-20, 2007, Philadelphia, PA.
- Bailey, W., & Spicer, A. (2007). When does national identity matter? Convergence and divergence in international business ethics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6), 1462-1480.
- Bigoness, W. J., & Blakely, G. L. (1996). A cross-national study of managerial values. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(4), 739-752.
- Bond, M. H. (1994). Finding universal dimensions of individual variation in multicultural studies of values: The Rokeach and Chinese value surveys. In B. Apuka (Ed.), *New research on oral development: Moral development a compendium* (pp. 385-391). New York, NY: Garland Publishing.
- Bond, M. H., & Smith, P. B. (1996). Cross-cultural social and organizational psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, 205-220.
- Connor, P. E., & Becker, B. W. (1994). Personal values and management: What do we know and why don't we know more? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 3(1), 67-73.
- Connor, P. E., & Becker, B. W. (2003). Personal values and decision-making styles of public managers. *Public Personnel Management*, 32, 155-181.
- Connor, P. E., & Becker, B. W. (2006). Public sector managerial values: United States and Japan. *International Journal of Organizational Theory and Behavior*, 9(2), 147-160.
- DeMooij, M. (1998). *Global marketing and advertising: Understanding cultural paradoxes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DeMooij, M. (2004). *Consumer behavior and culture: Consequences for global marketing and advertising*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dio, D. L., Saragovi, C., Koestner, R. M., & Aube, J. (1996). Linking personal values to gender. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 34(9-10), 621-630.
- Eaton, T. V., & Giacominio, D. E. (2000). Personal values of business students: Differences by gender and discipline. In B. Schwartz (Ed.), *Research on accounting ethics* (pp. 83-102). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science, Ltd.

- Eaton, T. V., & Giacomino, D. E. (2001). Personal values of business students: Differences by gender and discipline. *Research on Accounting Ethics*, 7, 83-102.
- Elkhouly, S. M. E., & Buda, R. (1997). A cross-cultural comparison of value systems of Egyptians, Americans, Africans and Arab executives. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 7, 102-199.
- England, G. W. (1975). *The manager and his values: An international perspective from the U.S., Japan, Korea, India and Australia*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Feather, N. T. (1975). *Values in education and society*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Feather, N. T. (1979). Values, expectancy, and action. *Australian Psychologist*, 14, 243-260.
- Feather, N. T. (1984). Masculinity, femininity, psychological androgyny, and the structure of values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(3), 604-620.
- Fitzpatrick, J., Liang, S., Feng, E., Crawford, D., Sorell, G., & Morgan-Fleming, B. (2006). Social values and self-discourse: A comparison of Chinese native, Chinese resident (in U.S.) and North American spouses. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 37(1), 113-121.
- Frydenberg, E., Lewis, R., Kennedy, G., Ardila, R., Frindte, W., & Hannoun, R. (2003). Coping with concerns: An exploratory comparison of Australian, Colombian, German and Palestinian adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 32(1), 59-67.
- Giacomino, D., Fujita, A., & Johnson, T. M. (1999). Are the effects of age and gender changing the personal values of Japanese executives? *Business Forum*, 24(1/2), 15-21.
- Giacomino, D., & Eaton, T. (2003). Personal values of accounting alumni: An empirical Examination of differences by gender and age. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 15, 369-380.
- Grunert, S. C., & Scherhorn, G. (1990). Consumer values in West Germany: Underlying dimensions and cross-cultural comparison with North America. *Journal of Business Research*, 20(2), 97-107.
- Gustavo, C. (2004). Religiosity, values and horizontal and vertical individualism-collectivism: A study of Turkey, the U.S. and the Philippines. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 12(1), 1-25.
- Hoeken, H., Brandt, C. V. D., Crijns, R., Dominguez, N., Hendriks, B., Planken, B., & Starren, M. (2003). International advertising in Western Europe: Should differences in uncertainty avoidance be considered when advertising in Belgium, France, the Netherlands, and Spain? *Journal of Business Communication*, 40(3), 195-205.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Cultures consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Jayawardhena, C. (2004). Personal values' influence on e-shopping attitudes and behavior. *Internet Research*, 14, 127-138.
- Johnson, T. M. (1999). *Are the effects of age and gender changing the personal values of Japanese executives?* Retrieved September 27, 2005, from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-70659000.html>
- Johnston, C. S. (1995). The Rokeach Value Survey: Underlying structure and multidimensional scaling. *The Journal of Psychology*, 129(5), 583-597.
- Kahle, L. R., Beatty, S. E., & Homer, P. (1986). Alternative measurement approaches to consumer values: The List of Values (LOV) and Values and Life Style (VALS). *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(3), 405-409.
- Kamakura, W. E. A., & Novak, T. P. (1992). Value-system segmentation: Exploring the meaning of LOV. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(1), 119-132.
- Kawasaki, K. (1994). Youth culture in Japan. *Social Justice*, 21(2), 185-205.
- Khilji, S. E., Mujtaba, B., Greenwood, R. A.,

- Murphy E. F. Jr., Chaturvedi, S., Christoforou, P. T.,... Woodhull, M. (2008). *A cross-cultural investigation of religious affiliation differences in personal values across 11 countries and six regions*. Best Paper Proceedings of the Academy of International Business, Milan, Italy.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). The study of values. In D. N. Barrett (Ed.), *Values in transition* (pp. 17-45). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1970). *Stages in the development of moral thought and action*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lenartowicz, T., & Johnson, J. P. (2002). Comparing managerial values in twelve Latin American Countries: An exploratory study. *Management International Review*, 42(3), 279-307.
- Lenartowicz, T., & Johnson, J. P. (2003). A cross-national assessment of the values of Latin America managers: Contrasting hues or shades of gray. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 34, 266-281.
- Lenartowicz, T., & Roth, K. (2001). Does subculture within a country matter? A cross-cultural study of motivational domains and business performance in Brazil. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(2), 305-320.
- Lyons, S., Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2005). Are gender differences in basic human values a generational phenomenon? *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 53(9-10), 763-775.
- McGuire, D., Garavan, T. N., Saha, S. K., & O'Donnell, D. (2006). The impact of individual values on human resource decision-making by line managers. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(3), 251-273.
- Meglino, B. M. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies and research. Retrieved, December 22, 2002, from jom.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/24/3/351
- Murphy, E. F. Jr., Gordon, J. D., & Anderson, T. (2004). An examination of cross-cultural age or generation-based value differences between the United States and Japanese. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 21-48.
- Murphy, E. F., Jr., Greenwood, R., & Lawn-Neiborer, L. J. (2004). *Sex differences and similarities in cross-cultural values and internet marketing attitudes between the United States, Japan and United Kingdom*. Paper presented at the annual Southern Academy of Management meeting, Dallas, TX.
- Murphy, E. F. Jr., Greenwood, R. A., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J. A., Manyak, T. G., Mujtaba, B., & Uy, O. O. A. (2006). *Generational value changes: Their history and a cross-cultural empirical test*. Paper presented at annual Academy of Management Meeting, Atlanta, GA.
- Murphy, E. F. Jr., Chaturvedi, S., Greenwood, R. A., Ruiz-Gutierrez, J. A., Khilji, S. E., Olivas-Lujan, M. R.,... Woodhull, M. D. (2007). *An investigation of Type A behavior pattern and personal values: A cross-cultural study between developed and developing countries*. Paper presented at the annual Academy of Management Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.
- Murphy, E., Jr., Snow, W., Carson, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1997). Values, sex differences and psychological androgyny. *International Journal of Value-Based Management*, 10, 69-99.
- Musser, S. J., & Orke, R. A. (1992). Ethical value systems: A typology. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 28(3), 348-362.
- Neelankavil, J. P., Mathur, A., & Zhang, Y. (2000). Determinants of managerial performance: A cross-cultural comparison of the perceptions of middle-level managers in four countries. *International Business Studies*, 31(1), 121-130.
- Obot, I. (1988). Value systems and cross-cultural contact: The effect of perceived similarity and stability on social evaluations. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 12, 363-379.
- Phalet, K., & Schonpflug, U. (2001). Intergenerational transmission in Turkish

- immigrant families: Parental collectivism, achievement values and gender differences. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 32(4), 489-499.
- Ralston, D., Gustafson, D., Elsas, P., Cheung, F., & Terpstra, R. (1992). Eastern values: A comparison of managers in the U.S., Hong Kong and PRC. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77, 664-671.
- Ralston, D., Thang, N., & Napier, N. (1999). A comparative study of the work values of North and South Vietnamese managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30(4), 655-670.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1979). *Understanding human values: Individual and societal*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1986). *Beliefs, attitudes and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rokeach, M., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1989). Stability and change in American value priorities. *American Psychologist*, 44, 775-784.
- Ruiz-Gutierrez, J. A., Monserrat, S. I., Olivas-Lujan, M. R., Madero, S., Greenwood, R. A., Murphy, E. F. Jr., & Santos, N. M. (2008). *Personal values and attitudes towards women in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Mexico: A cross-cultural investigation*. Proceedings of The Business Association of Latin American Studies (BALAS) Conferences. University of Los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia.
- Ryckman, R. M., & Houston, D. M. (2003). Value priorities in American and British female and male university students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 143(1), 127-138.
- Schooler, C. (1996). Cultural and social structural explanations of cross-national psychological differences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 323-350.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 878-891.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 878-891.
- Sekaran, U. (1983). Methodological and theoretical issues and advances in cross-cultural research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14, 61-73.
- Sikula, A. F. (1973). The values and value systems of governmental executives. *Public Personnel Management*, January-February 1973, 16-22.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S-C. Choi, G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, methods and applications* (pp. 41-51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Triandis, H. C., & Suh, E. M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 2002, 133-150.
- Weber, J. (1990). Managerial value orientations: A typology and assessment. *International Journal of Value Based Management*, 3(2), 37-54.
- Weber, J. (1993). Exploring the relationships between personal value and moral reasoning. *Human Relations*, 36, 435-364.
- Wolin, L. D. (2003). Gender issues in advertising: An oversight synthesis of research: 1970-2002. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 43(1), 111-125.

Appendix
Survey Sample Demographics

	ICE	UK	U.S.	West	East	JA	PI	TH
Sample Size N = 5134	512	1052	1371	2935	2199	909	1064	226
Sex								
Male N = 2944	387	490	753	1630	1314	731	451	132
Female F = 2190	125	562	618	1305	885	178	613	94
Age								
18-25	7	117	250	374	697	140	505	52
26-30	130	156	285	571	590	356	216	18
31-39	146	296	261	703	387	197	145	45
40-45	84	96	154	334	247	122	85	40
46-50	34	78	177	289	150	30	74	46
51+	111	309	244	664	128	64	39	25
Education								
No HS					28		28	
HS	83	650	223	981	365	42	305	18
Work AS	261	146	210	617	82	54	27	1
AS	35	12	204	251	111	82	24	5
Work BA	91	214	200	551	743	668	47	28
BA	14	0	202	216	684	25	574	85
Work MA	28	30	200	329	90	38	3	49
M A			117	117	76		49	27
Work PhD			20		3		1	2
PhD			5		7		6	1
Occupation								
Student Work Part-time in Private Sector					13		9	4
Student and Work Full Time in Private Sector		402	473	875	378	190	150	38
Government/Public Sector			456	456	119		42	77
Military					8			8
Work in Private Sector	512	650	442	1604	1252	719	450	83
Entrepreneur					412		396	16