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Complex and diverse as the conceptualizations of the value phenomena are, the reviewer is confronted with varied types of studies on values not easily amenable to meaningful grouping. As stated earlier, the field of values is an area of investigation in all the disciplines of social science and also Philosophy. Consequently, the studies on values exhibit a great deal of variation both with respect to conceptualizations and methodology (Dukes, 1955; Winthrop, 1959; and Albert, 1968).

The present study seeks to realize its objectives, however, in a predominantly psychological framework.
obtaining its basic data from the responses of the individuals. Dukes (1935) finds the psychological studies on values to be falling into one or more of the following categories:

1. Measuring the values of groups of individuals and relating the results to other data concerning the group.
2. The origin and development of values within the individual.
3. The influence of an individual's values on his cognitive life.

Part of the present investigation, concerned with the cultural similarities and differences in value orientations, relates itself in a general way to the studies dealing with the group differences in value orientations somewhat corresponding with the first category of Dukes' classification.

* It should, however, be remembered that while the Dukes' classification has the advantage of grouping the studies as belonging to three areas of human behaviour, it does not imply any similarity in conceptionalization or methodology in the studies belonging to any given area.
The study of group differences in the value orientations has been mainly approached through the Allport-Vernon "Study of Values" (Dukes, 1955). The "Study of Values" measures six basic value orientations: theoretical, economic, political, religious, social, and esthetic (Allport and Vernon, 1931). This Scale has been employed in the area of group differences to identify the sex differences in values (e.g., Spoerl, 1952); to identify the differences in values of persons with different academic interests (e.g., Harris, 1934; Wier, 1940); to identify the differences in values of persons with different vocational interests (e.g., Sarbin and Berdie, 1940); and to study the influence of religion on values (e.g., Pugh, 1951).

More relevant to the present investigation, however, are the studies dealing with the values of modern complex societies. An important study in this area is that of Gillespie and Allport (1955). Gillespie and Allport had subjects from America, South Africa, New Zealand, Egypt, Mexico, France, Italy, Germany, Japan, and Israel, write an autobiography of the future—"From now to 2000 A.D." Besides, the subjects answered a questionnaire. The results indicated both similarities and differences
between groups. There were frequent references made by the majority of subjects to parents, siblings, future mates, and offspring, thus showing that family formed a basic frame of reference. Values such as honesty, reliability, decency, and integrity figured prominently with reference to what they would impart to their children. Interest in the future achievements of science was also shown by all the subjects. The majority of the subjects also regarded war as preventable and unnecessary.

One of the striking differences between the groups was that the American subjects liked variety more than any other group did. Another notable difference was that the American subjects showed little concern with such social problems as poverty, delinquency, race relations compared to subjects from new nationalist groups.

Dansiger (1958), in his study on white and non-white South African students, found the non-white subjects placing a great deal of emphasis on political values and also on the goal of helping their own communities in other ways; whereas the white subjects emphasized success in their career, in their family life, in the cultivation of certain personal qualities,
and personal exploits. These results were interpreted to mean that while the white subjects were concerned with private issues, the non-white subjects were predominantly concerned with political and social issues.

However, a major systematic psychological effort in the direction of understanding the values associated with the global conception of good life or life-philosophy or Weltanschauungen is that of Morris. The "Ways to Live" document of Morris, which consists of 13 Ways-of-Life, is based on an extensive analysis of the major religio-ethical systems of the world (Morris, 1956a, 1956b). By employing the "Ways to Live" Scale, the values of college students of various nationality and cultural groups have been studied. Morris (1956b) has presented a comparative treatment of the values of students of America (U.S.), India, China, Canada, Japan, and Norway. Factor analyses done independently for the American, Indian, and Chinese students' ratings on the "Ways to Live" yielded essentially the same five value dimensions for each of these groups. The positive content of these dimensions may be summarized as follows (Morris, 1956b, pp. 32-34):
Factor A: Social Restraint and Self-Control  
(represented most strongly by Items 1 and 10)

The stress is upon responsible, conscientious, intelligent participation in human affairs. And, again the emphasis is upon the appreciation and conservation of what man has attained rather than upon the initiation of change.

Factor B: Enjoyment and Progress in Action  
(represented most strongly by Items 12 and 5)

The stress is upon delight in vigorous action for the overcoming of obstacles. The emphasis is upon the initiation of change rather than upon the preservation of what has already been attained. The orientation is outward to society and to nature.

Factor C: Withdrawal and Self-Sufficiency  
(represented most strongly by Items 11 and 2)

The stress is upon a rich inner life or heightened self-awareness. The self rather than society is the focus of attention.
Factor D: Receptivity and Sympathetic Concern
(represented most strongly by *ways 13 and 9*)

The stress is upon receptivity to persons and to nature. The source of inspiration comes from outside the self, and the person lives and develops in devoted responsiveness to this source.

Factor E: Self-Indulgence or Sensuous Enjoyment
(represented most strongly by *ways 8 and 4*)

The stress is upon sensuous enjoyment, whether this enjoyment be found in the simple pleasures of life or in abandonment to the moment.

The identification of essentially the same five factors in different cultural groups enabled Morris to conclude that the evaluation of conceptions of good life (embodied in the "Ways to Live") is done in terms of the five independent value dimensions.

According to Morris' (1956b) data the American students' value pattern was found to be predominantly oriented to 'enjoyment and progress in action'. Central to their value pattern, however, was also the desire to be flexible and many-sided. A comparison with the
value patterns of the Indian and Chinese students showed that the American students expressed less restraint than the Indian students, and less commitment to social causes than did the Chinese or Indian students. The Indian students' value pattern was found to be predominantly characterized by 'social restraint and self-control'. The recognition of the need for the reconstruction of their society was also clear in their value pattern. There was also emphasis on integrating the cultivation of the self with outward actions. The value pattern of the Chinese students, like that of American students, was found to be oriented to 'enjoyment and progress in action'; but, in contrast to the American pattern, active social concern also formed an important aspect of the Chinese pattern. The Japanese students' value pattern appeared to be similar to that of the Indian students. The Norwegian pattern occupied a middle-of-the-road position between cultural extremes. The Canadian value pattern appeared to be similar to that of the American students.

Morris' data suggested that, in general, the western students to be more self-centred and the Asiatic students more society-centred. Historical-societal conditions, Morris suggests, are chiefly responsible for the
differential emphasis on the self and society. The problems faced by the eastern countries and the western countries at the time the ratings were obtained were different and, therefore, the differences in their major preoccupations.

Vimla Agrawal (1959), using a questionnaire containing nine Ways-of-Life developed along the lines of Morris' "Ways to Live" document, found the Indian students placing emphasis on self-restraint, moderation, and integration of action, enjoyment, and contemplation. The Indian students appeared to express a need to preserve the cultural heritage of the country and at the same time liked to reconstruct the present society. Thus, the findings generally constitute a confirmation of Morris' findings about the value pattern of the Indian students.

Kilby (1963), using a modified version of the "Ways to Live" Scale, surveyed in 1959-60 the values of the American and Indian college students, and found virtually the same value patterns for these groups as those evidenced in Morris' 1956 study.

Morris (1971) obtained responses to the "Ways to Live"
Scale from the American college students of 1970 with a view to contrasting their value orientation with that of the 1950 American students reported in his Varieties of Human Value (1956b). He found little change in the basic value orientations of these two generations of American college students, but the 1970 students appeared to be less 'tradition-orientated' than the 1950 students. The ratings on the "Ways to Live" and the written comments taken together indicate that the 1950 and 1970 students differed primarily in strategy, in operative rather than in conceived values.

Ando (1960) studied through the "Ways to Live" the values of Philippine students and found their value pattern to be predominantly characterized by 'social restraint and self-control'. A comparison of the Philippine students' value pattern with that of the Indian students', identified by Morris in his Varieties of Human Value (1956b), revealed an essential similarity between the two groups. Contrary to the popular notions, the Philippine value pattern differed very much from that of the American students.

Misumi and Ando (1964) obtained Japanese students' responses to Japanese translation of Morris' "Ways to Live"
and compared with the value orientations of 1949 Japanese students reported by Morris (1956b). They found the trend of change in the Japanese value pattern to be away from 'withdrawal and self-sufficiency' and increasingly towards 'self-indulgence or sensuous enjoyment'. However, Tanaka and Kosukegawa (1968) challenged the general applicability of the findings of Misumi and Ando (1964) and produced some evidence indicating the importance of the religious affiliations of the subjects in explaining the ratings on the "Ways to Live" Scale.

Arab students' responses were obtained by Prothro (1968) to Morris' "Ways to Live" Scale. In general, the Arab students preferred ways involving activity, group participation, and self-control. They rejected ways centred on receptivity, contemplation, carefree enjoyment, and solitary living. Prothro characterized the Arab students' value orientation as "active extraversion coupled with a moderating self-restraint."

The studies reviewed here, particularly those employing Morris' "Ways to Live" Scale, clearly indicate that there is a possibility of both similarities and differences existing in the value patterns of different
cultural groups. While there are studies by Morris (1956b), Agrawal (1959), and Kilby (1965) on the values of the Indian students towards the broad schemes of life, there seems to be no study devoted to investigate primarily the similarities and differences in the value patterns of Hindus, Muslims, and Christians—the three major religio-cultural groups in the Indian context. Consequently there is a need to understand the values of these three groups from a comparative standpoint. The present investigation is in part directed towards meeting such a need.

(ii) Intercultural Value Compatibility

The present investigation also attempts to study the value-oriented compatibility and incompatibility operating in intra- and intergroup interactional contexts of the three religio-cultural groups—Hindus, Muslims, and Christians. The methodological framework called the 'Compatibility Model' adopted here permits indirect measurement of compatibility and incompatibility. The ratings obtained independently on each of the 'Desirability Scale' and the 'Attributability Scale' are related through the Model to derive compatibility and incompatibility. The Model and the two Rating Scales are developed in the present investigation.
Considered in isolation, the Attributability Scale seems to generate data similar to those obtained in stereotype studies. Both types of data enable obtaining descriptions of groups; but the description of your obtained would be in terms of a list of adjectives in case of stereotype studies, and in terms of value orientations in the Attributability Scale. Further, a five-point rating scale is used in this scale, and also, the value orientations used in the Attributability Scale to obtain descriptions of groups do not permit a direct comparison between the data obtained on this scale and the stereotype studies.

One could conceive some relationship between the value compatibility data of the present investigation and the data gathered through the various forms of social distance scales; both enable an understanding of intergroup acceptability. The studies employing social distance technique present a stimulus, simple such as, race or nationality (e.g., Bogardus, 1943) or complex such as, combinations of race, occupation, religion, and nationality (e.g., Triandis, 1960) and ask of the respondents to indicate the social relationships to which the given group or person is acceptable. On the basis of the responses of a given respondent group.
towards a referent group, the social distance that the respondent group has towards the referent group is worked out. It is found that the social distance is determined by race, occupation, and nationality (Triandis, 1960, 1961; Triandis and Triandis, 1962; Triandis, et al., 1965), and also by similarity and difference in belief, or value-congruence and value-incongruence, between the respondent and the stimulus person (Rooschach 1961; Stein, et al., 1965; and Rooschach and Mezai, 1966). It may, however, be recalled that the race, religion, belief or value etc., are all part of the stimulus situations presented and the subjects report directly the acceptability of the specified stimulus group.

On the other hand, as stated earlier, the value-oriented compatibility and incompatibility in the ingroup and outgroup interactional contexts is obtained indirectly in the present investigation. Identification of compatibility and incompatibility also permits an understanding of intergroup acceptability pattern as will be shown in the chapter on 'Materials and Methods'. Therefore, in contrast to the social distance studies, the intergroup
acceptability pattern is identified indirectly in the present investigation.

Methodologically, then, insofar as the 'Compatibility Model' permits the measurement of intergroup acceptability indirectly, the present investigation makes a departure from the previous social distance studies on the intergroup acceptability.