

The universality of the basic structure of value categories

Janek Musek, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Marjanca Pergar Kuščer, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Andrej Bekeš, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Abstract

The psychological research of values increased constantly in past decades. From the cross-cultural perspective, the majority of research has been dedicated to the identification of the intercultural differences rather than to the establishment of intercultural universals in value systems. However, starting from the evidence of the transcultural sharing of most important categories of values we may hypothesize that the basic hierarchical structure of the value universe remains stable over different cultures. The structure of the value system of the samples emerging from two distant cultures, the Japanese and the Slovenian, has been investigated and compared in the present study. The results confirmed the cross-cultural stability of main categories of values: the higher being the level of generality, the greater is the similarity of value categories. In addition, the results also revealed some interesting differences between Japanese and Slovenian subjects, which can be attributed to different cultural backgrounds.

The universality of the basic structure of value categories

Janek Musek, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Marjanca Pergar Kuščer, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Andrej Bekeš, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Introduction

Toward a hierarchical model of values

Numerous definitions of values exist in the tradition of axiology, the discipline exploring human values. In the philosophical as well as in the psychological or sociological axiology a number of definitions and conceptions of values could be found (Brown & Herrnstein, 1975; English & English, 1972; Kluckhohn, 1951; Krech, Crutchfield & Ballachey, 1962; Musek, 1995; Popovič, 1973). There are also some differences and controversies concerning the conceptual delineation between values and other more or less related terms like ideals, preferences, interests, beliefs, attitudes and others. Nevertheless, as widely shared consensual denotations of values, two broadly accepted definitions could be mentioned here. Clyde Kluckhohn (1951) defines values as concepts of the desirable, which influence how people decide for actions and how they evaluate events. And in terms of English and English (1972) "the values are abstract, often implicit conceptions, which define to the individual the goals or means for attaining the goals he considers as desirable". Very often cited characteristics of values are the evaluative note, abstractness, cultural sharing and obligatory personal involvement.

More recently I proposed somewhat different model of values (Musek, 1982; 1993a, 1993b, 1995, 1998). According to this proposition the values could be understood as motives or motivational goals on the very high level of generality. They could be conceived as general and relatively consistent ideations about goals and events, which we highly estimate, which refer to broad classes of subordinated objects, actions and relations, and which direct our interests, attitudes and our behavior. The values then can be viewed as the most general motivational goals occupying the top of hierarchy of such goals.

Some other authors also share the opinion that the values could be defined as motivational goals. Probably the most elaborated definition of this kind originated from Schwartz and Bilsky (1987). The authors proposed the definition, that the values are [1] conceptions or beliefs about [2] desirable terminal states or behaviors, which [3] transcend specific situations, [4] direct and control the choice or the appraisal of acts and events and [5] are ordered by their's relative importance.

The values can be classified into a number of categories occupying different levels in the hierarchical structure of human goals. Numerous categories of values at different levels of hierarchy have been identified in the theoretical and empirical investigations. In our own research, a clear hierarchy of the categories of values emerged as a result of

performed factor-, cluster- and other multivariate analyses (Musek, 1993a; Musek, 1993b; Musek, 1995).

----- Insert Figure 1 about here -----

Figure 1. The four-level hierarchy of values. It includes the level of macrodimensions, the level of value types, the level of middle-range value categories and the level of specific values.

The hierarchical structure of value universe: the four-level model of value hierarchy

The values can therefore be defined as hierarchically organized general beliefs concerning the most valuable goals or ideals shared by the members of given cultural environment. The universe of human values is organized in hierarchical order showing different levels of generality. On the grounds of accumulating research evidence, the hierarchical four-level model of the value structure has been proposed (Musek, 1993a, 1993b). It extends from the bottom level of single (specific) values, through the consecutively more general levels of middle-range categories of values (about 8 to 15 categories), and value types (about four or five categories), to the most general level of two macrodimensions of values.

The results of our factor and other multivariate analyses of values (Musek, 1993a, 1993b, 1995) confirmed the existence of hierarchical structure of the values. According to this structure, the values can be classified at different levels of generality, from the most general at the top to the most specific in the bottom (Table 1). At the most general level of the entire structural hierarchy, there are only two very large categories (macrocategories) of values. In our studies they have been interpreted as dionysian and apollonian category. On the next level, each of these two categories splits into two further subcategories, which could be called the value types. Dionysian values could be therefore subdivided into two value types, namely hedonistic values and potency values. The first group (hedonistic values) contains the values, connected with sensual stimulation and material pleasures, while the second group (potency values) includes the values, which have to do with achievement, success and reputation, but also with patriotism. Apollonian values could be similarly divided into two value types. The first encompasses moral, traditional and societal values (moral value type), and the second is represented by values connected with personal, cultural, and spiritual growth (moral value type). At the next level, each of the value types could be further divided into the middle-range categories of values. Thus, the hedonistic type disjoin into sensual and security category, the potency type into the status and patriotism category, the moral type into the traditional, democratic (or societal) and social values and the fulfillment type into the cognitive, cultural, self-actualizing and spiritual values. Finally, at the most specific level of hierarchy, we can find different single values, which constitute the middle-range categories of values.

----- Insert Table 1 about here -----

The cross-cultural perspective

The study of values is very important as a means for better understanding the cross-cultural perspective of human behavior. As Smith and Bond (1998, pp. 69) say: "The best conceptual frameworks currently available to guide cross-cultural research are those provided by studies of value differences". The conceptualization of culture, however, includes both cross-cultural differences as well as intercultural universals. It is a general impression that the studies of differences across various cultures prevail in current cross-cultural research. Specifically, this conclusion is valid for the research of values in cross-cultural psychology. A tremendous research in past years has been dedicated to the discovery of intercultural differences in the universe of human values, especially to the establishment of great cross-cultural dimensions such as individualism-collectivism, power distance, masculinity-femininity, and others (Bond, 1988, 1991; Bond, Leung and Schwartz, 1992; Chinese Culture Connection, 1987; Fiske, 1991, 1992; Hofstede, 1980 1983; Hofstede and Bond, 1988; Kagitçibasi, 1970, 1996; Hui and Triandis, 1986; Leung and Bond, 1989; Leung, Bond and Schwartz, 1995; Sagiv and Schwartz, 1995; Schwartz, 1994; Smith and Schwartz, 1997; Smith, Dugan and Trompenaars, 1996, 1997; Smith, Trompenaars and Dugan, 1993, 1995; Triandis, 1990, 1995; Triandis et al., 1972). The role of the values in a given cultural context is important not only for the realm of interpersonal relationships but also for the formation of the self-concept. The difference between individualism and collectivism in cultural orientation corresponds thus to the difference between independent and interdependent self-schema (Markus and Kitayama, 1991, 1994). In this respect, deeply rooted cultural differences could be found in the languages, making the translations in cross-cultural research a very complicated task. For example, one of the Japanese words for self, *jibun*, is translated as "one's share for the shared life space" (Hamaguchi, 1987). Another known examples, characteristic for Japanese society, are *amae*, the Japanese term for a specific form of indulgent dependence (Doi, 1973; Kim et al., 1996; Nakagawa, Lamb and Miyaki, 1992), *ie*, the sense of the familial loyalty and commitment, and *kaisha*, the Japanese type of business organization. (Kashima and Callan, 1994).

Other differences based on different cultural context could also be cited. In a broad cross-cultural study, Sagiv and Schwartz (1995) found numerous values, which were differently connected to the other values as a consequence of different cultural background. Within the sample of 542 Japanese students the authors discovered that the value "true friendship" was included into the security value type, being connected most closely with the values like "sense of belonging" and "health". In other national cultures "true friendship" was typically linked with the values like "mature love", "responsibility", "meaning in life" and thus located within the value type of benevolence. Similarly, the value "forgiveness" was located within the cluster of universalism in Japanese data (associated close to the "equality" and "broadmindedness"), whereas in other countries it was clustered into the value type of benevolence (being closest to the "honesty" and helpfulness").

On the other side, culturally different value systems have much in common. We are, psychologically understandably, much interested in cultural differences, but very probably, common or shared characteristics prevail over cultural differences in the cross-cultural

perspective. If the contrary would be true, the efficient communication between different cultures would be impossible.

The meta-analytical evidence from cross-cultural value research is in agreement with the opinion mentioned immediately before (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990). The results of a great cross-cultural study drawn from 20 different national samples confirmed the cross-cultural stability of ten domains or types of values (Schwartz, 1991). In even more extended study, comprising forty nations, Sagiv and Schwartz (1995) confirmed again the consistency of the structure of values across cultures.

The value types of Schwartz (1991; see also Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987, 1990) correspond to the concept of middle-range categories of values in our model. The question remains, however, whether the hypothesis of cross-cultural stability of value categories is also valid for all other levels of the structural hierarchy of values (see Figure 1). The solution of this problem is the aim of our present investigation.

Our statement claims that the universalia in the value systems could be related especially to the hierarchical structure of values. The main categories of values are similar or even the same in different cultures: the higher the generality level of those categories, the higher the intercultural similarity. The differences between cultures exist by majority in the extent of importance that is attributed to the given category in a given culture. Also, there are many culturally based differences in the location of single values within broader categories or types of values.

Starting from previous preliminary considerations, an empirical study was programmed aimed (1) to establish the hierarchical structure of values in Japanese subjects, and (2) to compare the value systems of Japanese and Slovenian subjects in order to ascertain shared characteristics of both value systems as well as main differences between them.

Method

Results and discussion

The primary goal of our analysis has been to compare the structural hierarchies of values for Japanese and Slovenian subjects. In the first step, the data from MLV were correlated and factor analyzed for Japanese and Slovenian subjects respectively. Factor analysis yielded 13 factors (so-called primary factors) for Japanese and 15 factors for Slovenian subjects (extracted according to Kaiser criterion). The factors in Japanese sample explained 72.4 percent of total variance, while the factors of Slovenian sample accounted for 73.1 percent of total variation. The obtained factors from both samples were rotated by means of Varimax method, in order to achieve the adequate basis for psychological interpretation. According to our hierarchical model, primary factors represent the level of middle-range categories of values. The detailed analysis and interpretation of all extracted factors would be a rather time and space

consuming procedure for the reader. Therefore, we shall only briefly concentrate upon summary results, presented in Table 2.

----- Insert Table 2 about here -----

It is evident from the Table 2 that only some extracted factors in one sample clearly correspond to the relevant factors from the other sample. The resemblance of the factors extracted in both groups of subjects is much less convincing than in the case of five or two general superdimensions, which will be discussed later. Only four primary factors correspond quite well, further five factors share some similarity, but the rest of the factors are quite different in both samples. It is obvious therefore, that on the level of primaries (that corresponds to the level of middle-range categories of values in the model shown in the Figure 1) the cross-cultural differences are much less expressed in comparison to the levels of value types or value macrocategories.

The next generality level of the value structure in our model is the level of value types. It is the intermediate level between the level of middle-range categories (represented by primary factors of our factor analysis data) and the level of value superdimensions. According to our model, about four value types could be expected, probably close to the types of hedonism, potency, morality, and fulfillment being identified in the previous studies. The inspection of the descending percents of the variance explained by extracted primary factors (scree test) shows a noticeable gap between the first five factors and the rest of extracted factors in the data for Japanese and Slovenian subjects. According to this, we could proceed to the five-factor solution of our data with the loadings of single values on five factor dimensions (see Table 3).

----- Insert Table 3 about here -----

The correlations of five factors with single values reveal a remarkable resemblance of the underlying structure of both samples. It seems that four of extracted factors correspond to a high degree. Moreover, all four corresponding factors could be interpreted as very close to the value types of our model of value hierarchy. The first factor of both samples could be identified as the approximation of the moral type of values, and the second as the potency type. Further, we can easily find the resemblance between the third factor of Japanese sample, and the fourth factor of Slovenian sample (fulfillment type). Finally, there is a definite similarity between the fifth factor of Japanese sample, and the third factor of Slovenian sample. Both dimensions correlate mostly with the hedonistic and stimulation values, and may therefore represent the hedonistic type. It is very likely that all four factors represent those condensations of primary factors, which imply the increase in similarity between both cultures.

On the other hand, both remaining factors, the fourth factor in Japanese subjects, and the fifth factor in Slovenian sample are obviously not connected, although they could have some in common with other factors in five-factor solution. Probably, these two factors are agglomerations of respective primaries, which do not contribute to the rise of intercultural similarity. Regarding the results of five-factor solution, some additional intercultural differences could be also mentioned. For instance, patriotic values (PATRIOTISM, NATIONAL PRIDE) are connected with fulfillment dimension, but are also close to the moral dimension in Japanese subjects. In Slovenian sample, they have been dominantly related to the potency dimension, but have also substantial correlations with moral dimension.

It is quite clear that the resemblance between Japanese and Slovenian data is greater for five-factor solution than for primary factors. Consequently, we could confirm greater cross-cultural similarity in rated importance of value types in comparison to middle-range categories of values or even single values.

In order to obtain insight into the last, the most general level of value hierarchy, we may progress to still more robust analysis. The first two extracted factors very significantly exceeded the others, explaining 27.2 and 9.1 percent of variance for Japanese and 21.8 and 8.9 percent of variance for Slovenian students respectively. It seems therefore, that the next factor analysis, concentrated on only two-factor solution, is entirely justified. These two factors could be regarded as the most general latent dimensions of the structural hierarchy of values, occupying the top level of hierarchical structure seen on the Figure 1. We can also reasonably assume, that both factors will be fair approximations of highest order factors ("Ersatz-factors"), which would be obtained if secondary or tertiary factor analyses would take place. Accordingly, the first two factors in each case were extracted and then rotated by varimax method. The loadings of the factors are presented in Table 4.

---- Insert Table 4 about here ----

By closer inspection we can clearly recognize the correspondent psychological meanings of both factors. In both cases, the first factor saturated the pro-social, societal, moral, self-actualizing, and traditional values, while the second factor correlated with the values connected to social power, success, achievement, and hedonism. Both factors resemble very well the macrocategories being found in other studies, namely the apollonian and dionysian category of values (Musek, 1993a, 1993b, 1994, 1995). For both samples therefore, we can reasonably interpret the first factor as the factor of apollonian values, and the second as the factor of dionysian values. At the most general level of value hierarchy, both Japanese and Slovenian subjects obviously share similar value orientations. The similarity of the value structure is rather striking. The values being most representative for each factor respectively are the same in Japanese and in Slovenian sample.

There are, however, some exceptions that are of interest as possible indicators of cultural differences between our samples. Some of values are differently located in the space of

two factors. For instance, the value SELF-FULFILLMENT, which is closer to apollonian dimension in Slovenian sample, has substantive loading with dionysian dimension in Japanese. Similarly, the religious value FAITH IN GOD is located within the apollonian cluster by Slovenian and within dionysian cluster by Japanese. Finally, it seems that cultural and cognitive values like CULTURE, ART, TRUTH, WISDOM are more firmly connected with dionysian dimension in Slovenian sample. It is quite possible, that, due to the different cultural background, the values mentioned above have "dionysian", self-assertive and self-promoting meaning for Slovenian students, but, in the same time, more "apollonian", pro-social and societal meaning for Japanese.

General discussion and conclusions

The results of the present study confirmed the relevance of the hierarchical model of value structure being proposed elsewhere (Musek, 1993a, 1993b, 1994, 1995). Factor analyses being performed in the present study revealed the meaningfulness of at least three levels contributing to the explanation of the value-structure hierarchy above single-value level: the level of middle-range categories of values, the level of the value-types and level of the macrocategories of values. Thus, the structural hierarchy of values, which has been discovered in our previous research, was clearly confirmed also in the case of Japanese subjects.

The main goal of the present study has been the comparison of two structural hierarchies of values that have been drawn from two groups of subjects, the Japanese and the Slovenian. The results of our study confirmed the underlying hypothesis that the cross-cultural similarity of value structure increases with the level of the generality of that structure. The higher being the level of generality of value categories, the greater is their similarity and thus the cross-cultural consistency. The results of this study are therefore in concordance with the theory of the universality of the basic structure of value categories (Musek, 1993; Sagiv and Schwartz, 1995; Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987, 1990). However, the discovery that the basic structure of value system is commonly shared by wide range of different nations and cultures is not controversial to the well-established cross-cultural differences being found in numerous investigations (Bond, 1988, 1991; Bond, Leung and Schwartz, 1992; Chinese Culture Connection, 1987; Fiske, 1991, 1992; Hofstede, 1980 1983; Hofstede and Bond, 1988; Kagitçibasi, 1970; Leung and Bond, 1989; Leung, Bond and Schwartz, 1995; Sagiv and Schwartz, 1995; Schwartz, 1994; Smith and Schwartz, 1997; Smith, Trompenaars and Dugan, 1993; Triandis, 1990, 1995; Triandis et al., 1972). It seems that these differences increase with decreasing level of generality of the value universe. Different cultures differ in conceiving how single values are correlated and grouped into primary categories of values, but converge in conceptualizing how these categories could be further associated into higher level dimensions. Searching the culture-free dimensions of values we can find them in the macrolevels of the hierarchical order of the value universe.

References

Brown, R. and Herrnstein, R. (1975). *Psychology*. London: Methuen.

English, H. B. and English, A. C. (1972). A comprehensive dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytical terms. Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc.

Bond, M. H. (1988) Finding universal dimensions of individual variation in multicultural studies of values: The Rokeach and Chinese Value Surveys. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 6, 1009-1015.

Bond, M. H. (1991) Chinese values and health: A cross-cultural examination. *Psychology and Health*, 5, 137-152.

Bond, M. H., Leung, K. and Schwartz, S. H. (1992) Explaining choices in procedural and distributive justice across cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*, 5, 27, 211-225

Chinese Culture Connection (1987) Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 18, 143-164.

Doi, T. (1973). *The anatomy of dependence*. New York: Harper-Row.

Fiske, A. P. (1991) The cultural relativity of selfish individualism: Anthropological evidence that humans are inherently sociable. In M. S. Clark (ed.), *Prosocial Behavior, Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 12, 176-214.

Fiske, A. P. (1992) The four elementary forms of sociality: Framework for a unified theory of sociality. *Psychological Review*, 99, 689-723.

Hofstede, G. (1980) *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly-Hills: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1983) Dimensions of national cultures in fifty countries and three regions. In J. Deregowski, S. Dzuirawiec and R. Annis (eds.), *Expiscations in cross-cultural psychology*. Lisse, Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Hofstede, G. and Bond, M. H. (1988) The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organization Dynamics*, 16, 4-21..

Hui, C.H., & Triandis, H. (1986) Individualism-collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17, 222-248.

Kagitçibasi, C. (1970). Social norms and authoritarianism: A Turkish-American comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 4, 157-174.

Kagitçibasi, C. (1996). The autonomous-relational self: A new synthesis. *European Psychologist*, 1, 180-186

Kashima, Y., and Callan, V. (1994) The Japanese work group. In H. C. Triandis (ed.) *Handbook of industrial/organizational psychology*, 2nd ed, Vol 4, pp. 609-646. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.

- Kim, M. S., Hunter, J. E., Miyahara, A., Horvath, A. M., Bresnahan, M. and Yoon, H. J. (1996) Individual versus culture-level dimensions of individualism and collectivism: Effects on preferred conversational styles. *Communication Monographs*, 63, 29-49.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951) Values and value orientations in the theory of action. In: Parsons, T. & Shils, E. (Eds.) *Toward a general theory of action*. Cambridge (Massachusetts), Harvard University Press.
- Krech, D., Crutchfield, R. S. and Ballachey, E.L. (1962). *Individual in society*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leung, K. and Bond, M. H. (1989) On the empirical identification of dimensions for cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20, 133-151.
- Leung, K., Bond, M. H. and Schwartz, S. H. (1995) How to explain cross-cultural differences: Values, valences and expectancies? *Asian Journal of Psychology*, 1, 70-75.
- Markus, H. and Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implication for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- Markus, H. and Kitayama, S. (1994). A collective fear of the collective: Implications for selves and theories of selves. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 568-579.
- Musek, J. (1982). *Personality*. Ljubljana, DDU Univerzum.
- Musek, J. (1993a) *Personality and values*. Ljubljana, Educy, (in Slovene).
- Musek, J. The universe of human values: a structural and developmental hierarchy. *Studia Psychologica* (Bratislava), 1993b, 35, 4-5, 321-326.
- Musek, J. (1995) The changes in mentality and value orientation of Slovenian people during the transition period. In V. Rus (Ed.) *Slovenia after 1995* (pp 87-106). Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences, (in Slovene).
- Musek, J. (1997a) The impact of transitional change on value-system in Post-communist Europe. *Foreign Psychology/Innostrannaya Psikhologia* (Moscow), 1997, 8, 17-22.
- Musek, J. (1997b) The impact of transitional changes on value systems in Post-communist Europe: The implications for the higher education reform processes. *Perspectives in Higher Education Reform*, , Vol. 6, 15-22.
- Musek, J. Political and religious adherence in relation to individual values. *Studia Psychologica* (Bratislava), 1998, 40, 1-2, 47-59.
- Nakagawa, M., Lamb, M. E. and Miyaki, K. (1992) Antecedents and correlates of the strange situation behavior of Japanese infants. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 41, 132-178.
- Pegar Kuščer, M. (1999) Cross-cultural differences in value orientations of students. Doctoral Dissertation. Ljubljana: University of Ljubljana.
- Popović, B. (1973). *Introduction into the psychology of morality*. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.

- Sagiv, L. and Schwartz, S. H. (1995) Value priorities and readiness for outgroup social contact. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 437-448.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1991) The universal content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994) Beyond individualism-collectivism: new dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitçibasi, S. C. Choi and G. Yoon (eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory application and methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 3, 550-562.
- 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.
- Smith, P. B. and Schwartz, S. H. (1997) Values. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall and C. Kagitçibasi (eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*, 2nd edn, Vol 3. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Smith, P. B., Dugan, S. and Trompenaars, F. (1996) National cultures and managerial values: A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27, 231-264.
- Smith, P. B., Dugan, S. and Trompenaars, F. (1997) Locus of control and affectivity by gender nad occupational status: A 14 nation study. *Sex Roles*, 36-51-77.
- Smith, P. B., Dugan, S. and Trompenaars, F. (1996) National cultures and managerial values: A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27, 231-264.
- Smith, P. B., Dugan, S. and Trompenaars, F. (1997) Locus of control and affectivity by gender nad occupational status: A 14 nation study. *Sex Roles*, 36-51-77.
- Smith, P. B., Trompenaars, F. and Dugan, S. (1995) The Rotter locus of control scale in 43 countries. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30, 377-400.
- Smith, P. B. and Bond, M. H. (1998) *Social psychology across cultures*, 2nd edn. London: Prentice-Hall Europe.
- Smith, P. B. and Schwartz, S. H. (1997) Values. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall and C. Kagitçibasi (eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*, 2nd edn, Vol 3. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Smith, P. B. and Schwartz, S. H. (1997) Values. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall and C. Kagitçibasi (eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*, 2nd edn, Vol 3. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Triandis, H. C. (1990) Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. J. Berman (ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989*. N37, 41-133.

Triandis, H. C. (1995) *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Triandis, H. C., Kilty, K. M., Shanmugam, A. V., Tanaka, Y. and Vassiliou, V. (1972) Cognitive structures and the analysis of values. In H. C. Triandis (ed.), *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: Wiley.

Biography

Janek Musek

Born 1945, graduated 1968, PhD in Psychology 1975. Since 1971 occupied assistant and teaching positions at the University of Ljubljana (Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts and Sciences): assistant professor for General Psychology from 1977, associate professor from 1981, full professor (ordinarius) from 1988.

Appointments: Head of the Department of Psychology (1981-1983), Vice Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (1984-1986), Vice Rector of the University of Ljubljana (1996-1997). Main research domains in personality and cognitive psychology, recent research areas including personality factors of symbolism, decision making, values, self-concept, consciousness and spiritual development. Published more than 20 scientific books and textbooks and about 200 scientific articles.