Type and Values over Generations

Vesa Routamaa
University of Vaasa

Katri Heinäsuo
University of Vaasa

Abstract

Values develop in the course of time, sometimes over years. In their youth, people are open to the environment's impact. Moving away from home often starts an independent life, and values may change. Comparing values of students with those of older adults may uncover differences in values between generations. Developing a career, feeling the influence of one's own family, taking on economic responsibilities, and other factors may also effect the development of the psychological preferences. This paper reports a study of relationships between psychological type and values, analyzed in the context of generational difference. The value structure of first-year business students in Finland (n=293) were compared with that of adults (n=165), taking type into consideration. Type was assessed with the MBTI®, values with the Schwartz Value Survey. The factor structure of the generations' values with this Finnish sample was consistent with previous studies. Type showed consistent relationships with values and some generational changes, especially Hedonism.

Introduction

Value types and values from a cross-cultural perspective have awakened great interest in recent years (e.g., Abramson & Inglehart, 1995; Hofstede, 1980, 1982, 1991; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Schwartz, 1992, 1994, 1997; Schwartz & Bardi, 1997; Schwartz & Ros, 1995; Smith & Schwartz, 1997; Inglehart, 1997; Triandis, 1990, 1995). In different cultural contexts, values have different weights, but the relationship between types and values is similar (Routamaa & Pollari, 1998). Potential value differences across generations related to type within a culture have not been studied. Why could there be differences? First, many remarkable changes occur throughout one's life, e.g., school studies, marriage, family, children leaving home, and retirement. Second, according to type theory (Jung, 1921/1971; Myers et al, 1998) the personality strengthens when the tertiary and inferior functions develop as one ages. Many strange things happen at certain ages. Divorce may ensue when the couple "grows in separate directions," with the "midlife crisis," with changes in occupation in later years, or in "the wild years of the fifties." When our shadow functions develop, our values or needs may change more and faster than in preceding years. For these reasons, we propose that systematic changes in values occur along with aging. In this paper, the basic question is, Do values change across generations while keeping the relationships between values and type constant?

In Schwartz's theory (1992, 1994), values group together to form "value types". These are described in Table 1.

The MBTI was used to indicate personality type. The Schwartz Value Survey was administered to assess values and then factor analyzed to test its applicability in the Finnish context.

Sample

Participants included 295 business students at the University of Vaasa who started their studies in autumn 2004 and 185 adults working in various organizations. Student ages ranged between 18 and 27, with a mean of 22. The data were collected from the students at their first lecture, where they filled out both of the research questionnaires. The type was known for 293 students and the values of all of them.

The employees were from diverse organizations with an age range of 28 to 59; the mean age was 42. All had participated in management training courses organized by one of the authors (V.R.). At the beginning of each training course, participants filled out the research forms. The type was known for 165 and values for 174.

Method

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program was used for the statistical analyses and SRTT for the type tables. The results are based on the mean differences between groups, generations and types. The statistical tests included T-test and oneway ANOVA. The research questionnaires used in this study were MBTI Form F (a Finnish research version) and a Finnish translation of the Schwartz Values Survey (1992). The current study focused on the relationship between values (value types), gene-

Table 1. Types of Values and Sub-Values of the Study

- **Power**: Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources (social power, authority, wealth, preserving my public image)
- **Achievement**: Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards (successful, capable, ambitious, influential)
- **Hedonism**: Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself (pleasure, enjoying life)
- **Stimulation**: Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life (daring, a varied life, an exciting life)
- **Self-direction**: Independent thought and action choosing, creating, exploring (creativity, freedom, independence, curiosity, choosing own goals)
- **Universalism**: Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature (broad-mindedness, wisdom, social justice, equality, a world at peace, a world of beauty, unity with nature, protecting the environment)
- **Benevolence**: Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact (helpful, honest, forgiving, loyal, responsible)
- **Tradition**: Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self (humble, accepting my portion in life, devout, respectful of tradition, moderate)
- **Conformity**: Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms (politeness, obedience, self-discipline, honoring parents and elders)
- **Security**: Safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self (family security, national security, social order, clean, reciprocation of favors)

rations, and psychological type. Other background variables such as sex, family, education, occupation, branch, and position in organization were not analyzed.

Results

Value type structures

The empirically obtained value types of this study are presented in Table 2, showing the value types, single values making them up, and the alpha coefficient. All the alpha coefficients were sufficient (< 0.5 or better). This indicates that the structures of the value types are reliable for Finland and are consistent with Schwartz's research.

Table 2. Value Types and their Alpha Coefficient

Value	*Single*	*Alpha*
Benevolence	Helpful, honest, forgiving, loyal responsible, true friendship, a spiritual life, mature love	0.78
Self-direction	Creativity, curiosity, freedom, choosing own goals, independence	0.66
Universalism	Protecting the environment, a world of beauty, unity with nature, broad-mindedness, social justice, wisdom, equality, a world at peace	0.80
Achievement	Successful, capable, ambitious, influential, intelligent	0.81
Security	Clean, national security, social order, family security, reciprocation of favors, health, sense of belonging	0.65
Conformity	Politeness, honoring parents and elders obedience, self-discipline,	0.67
Hedonism	Pleasure, enjoying life	0.69
Stimulation	A varied life, daring, an exciting life	0.77
Tradition	Devoutness, accepting one's portion in life, humbleness, moderation, respect for tradition	0.58
Power	Preserving one's public image, social recognition	0.75

MBTI-type distributions and generations

Tables 3 and 4 show the type distributions of the student and employee samples. In both groups, all types are represented.

In the student sample, the most common types were ESTJ's (19.5%), ENFP's (13.3%) and ESFJ's (8.9%). The least common types were INFJ's (0.7%), INTP's (2.1%) and INFP's (2.4%).

Table 3. Type Distribution of the Student Sample

N = 293

ISTJ	**ISFJ**	**INFJ**	**INTJ**
N = 20	N = 12	N = 2	N = 7
% = 6.83	% = 4.10	% = 0.68	% = 2.39
■■■■■■■	■■■■	■	■■
ISTP	**ISFP**	**INFP**	**INTP**
N = 20	N = 10	N = 7	N = 6
% = 6.83	% = 3.41	% = 2.39	% = 2.05
■■■■■■■	■■■	■■	■■
ESTP	**ESFP**	**ENFP**	**ENTP**
N = 20	N = 25	N = 39	N = 20
% = 6.83	% = 8.53	% = 13.31	% = 6.83
■■■■■■■	■■■■■■■■■	■■■■■■■■■■■■■	■■■■■■■
ESTJ	**ESFJ**	**ENFJ**	**ENTJ**
N = 57	N = 26	N = 12	N = 10
% = 19.45	% = 8.87	% = 4.10	% = 3.41
■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■	■■■■■■■■■	■■■■	■■■

	N	%
E	209	71.33
I	84	28.67
S	190	64.85
N	103	35.15
T	160	54.61
F	133	45.39
J	146	49.83
P	147	50.17
IJ	41	13.99
IP	43	14.68
EP	104	35.49
EJ	105	35.84
ST	117	39.93
SF	73	24.91
NF	60	20.48
NT	43	14.68
SJ	115	39.25
SP	75	25.60
NP	72	24.57
NJ	31	10.58
TJ	94	32.08
TP	66	22.53
FP	81	27.65
FJ	52	17.75
IN	22	7.51
EN	81	27.65
IS	62	21.16
ES	128	43.69
Sdom	77	26.28
Ndom	68	23.21
Tdom	93	31.74
Fdom	55	18.77

Note: ■ = 1% of sample.

For the working adults, the most common types were ESFJ's (17.6%), ESTJ's (15.2%) and ESFP's (12.1%). The least common types were INFP's and INTP's (both 1.2%), INFJ's, INTJ's, ISTP's and ENFJ's (each 2.4%) and ISFP's (3%).

Table 4. Type Distribution in the Working Adult Sample

N = 165

ISTJ N = 13 % = 7.88 ■■■■■■■■	**ISFJ** N = 12 % = 7.27 ■■■■■■■	**INFJ** N = 4 % = 2.42 ■■	**INTJ** N = 4 % = 2.42 ■■
ISTP N = 4 % = 2.42 ■■	**ISFP** N = 5 % = 3.03 ■■■	**INFP** N = 2 % = 1.21 ■	**INTP** N = 2 % = 1.21 ■
ESTP N = 9 % = 5.45 ■■■■■	**ESFP** N = 20 % = 12.12 ■■■■■■■■■■■■	**ENFP** N = 17 % = 10.30 ■■■■■■■■■■	**ENTP** N = 6 % = 3.64 ■■■■
ESTJ N = 25 % = 15.15 ■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■	**ESFJ** N = 29 % = 17.58 ■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■	**ENFJ** N = 4 % = 2.42 ■■	**ENTJ** N = 9 % = 5.45 ■■■■■

	N	%
E	119	72.12
I	46	27.88
S	117	70.91
N	48	29.09
T	72	43.64
F	93	56.36
J	100	60.61
P	65	39.39
IJ	33	20.00
IP	13	7.88
EP	52	31.52
EJ	67	40.61
ST	51	30.91
SF	66	40.00
NF	27	16.36
NT	21	12.73
SJ	79	47.88
SP	38	23.03
NP	27	16.36
NJ	21	12.73
TJ	51	30.91
TP	21	12.73
FP	44	26.67
FJ	49	29.70
IN	12	7.27
EN	36	21.82
IS	34	20.61
ES	83	50.30
Sdom	54	32.73
Ndom	31	18.79
Tdom	40	24.24
Fdom	40	24.24

Note: ■ = 1% of sample.

Value differences in generation level – Students versus Working Adults

Table 5 presents the t-test comparison for the groups for each value type.

Significant differences appear on six of the ten value types, providing evidence that the values of young people and working adults differ. The most important value type for the younger people was Hedonism (5.20); for adults it was Benevolence (5.51). The second important value for students was Benevolence (5.14); for adults, Security (5.16). Security was the third important value for young people (5.03). For adults the third-ranking value type was Self-direction (4.97). In general, Benevolence, Security, Self-direction, Universalism, Conformity and, Tradition were more important for working adults. For students, the more important value types were Hedonism, Achievement, Stimulation, and Power. In Finland, Security is a very important value type for both young and old. This may account for the fact that Finnish people are not very entrepreneurial (cf. Routamaa, 2001; Routamaa, Hautala & Rissanen, 2004; Routamaa, Rissanen & Hautala, 2004). The risks of entrepreneurship are viewed as too great.

Table 5. Value Types and Mean Differences of Students and Working Adults

Value type	1 = Students 2 = Working Adults	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T-test Sig. (2-tailed)
Benevolence	1	295	5.14	0.88	0.000
	2	174	5.51	0.76	
Self-direction	1	295	4.88	0.93	0.322
	2	174	4.97	0.91	
Universalism	1	295	4.34	1.04	0.000
	2	174	4.94	0.95	
Achievement	1	295	4.58	1.09	0.000
	2	174	4.09	1.12	
Security	1	295	5.03	0.86	0.123
	2	174	5.16	0.83	
Conformity	1	295	4.44	1.08	0.475
	2	174	4.51	1.10	
Hedonism	1	295	5.20	1.18	0.000
	2	174	4.47	1.20	
Stimulation	1	295	4.24	1.40	0.004
	2	174	3.88	1.21	
Tradition	1	295	2.94	1.10	0.000
	2	174	3.63	1.13	
Power	1	295	3.32	1.18	0.000
	2	174	2.83	1.11	

Value Differences between Generations at the Type Level – Does Psychological Type Explain More Variance?

Table 6 presents the mean scores for each group separately and the combined groups, for each psychological type within each value type.

If we compare not only generations but also personality types, we find additional differences. Significant differences between generations at the type level were found for ISTJ's, ISFJ's, ESTP's, ESFP's, ENFP's, ENTP's, ESTJ's, ESFJ's and ENFJ's. These differences appear in all value types except for Self-direction. Self-direction did not differ between the generations. Self-direction may be more related to type than are other value types.

For ISTJs, all value types except Hedonism were rated higher among the working adults than among the students. Statistically significant differences appeared in the value types of Benevolence, Universalism, Security, Conformity, and Tradition. ISFJ's showed differences between the generations in two value types, Universalism and Tradition. These were ranked higher by the working adults as were all the other values except Achievement and Hedonism. For ESTP students, Hedonism ranked higher than for the adults. ESFP and ESFJ students were the same. For ESFP students, Achievement and Stimulation showed higher rankings than for the adults. Among ENFPs, differences between generations appeared in four value types: Achievement, Stimulation, Tradition, and Power. These value types except Tradition were rated higher by ENFP students than by ENFP adults. ENTP students and adults had one statistically significant mean difference: Conformity, which was surprisingly rated higher by the students than by the adults. ESTJ students and adults showed differences in Universalism, Traditions, and Power. Universalism and Tradition were rated higher by adults while for students, Power ranked higher. ESFJ students appreciated more Hedonism and Power and adults more Universalism and Tradition. ENFJ types showed differences in three value types: Universalism, Achievement, and Power. Universalism was more appreciated by adults, and Achievement and Power by students.

Table 6. Mean Differences of the MBTI-Types, Generations and Values

		Benevolence		Self-direction		Universalism		Achievement		Security	
		N	M	N	M	N	M	N	M	N	M
ISTJ	all	31	4.75	31	4.44	31	4.00	31	4.30	31	4.83
	1	20	4.43*	20	4.25	20	3.76*	20	4.26	20	4.59*
	2	11	5.35*	11	4.78	11	4.43*	11	4.36	11	5.26*
ISFJ	all	24	5.49	24	4.53	24	4.50	24	3.83	24	5.26
	1	12	5.32	12	4.45	12	3.78*	12	3.87	12	5.17
	2	12	5.67	12	4.60	12	5.22*	12	3.80	12	5.36
INFJ	all	6	5.65	6	5.20	6	5.42	6	2.90	6	5.12
	1	2	5.19	2	4.20	2	5.00	2	3.50	2	4.93
	2	4	5.88	4	5.70	4	5.63	4	2.60	4	5.21
INTJ	all	11	4.73	11	4.67	11	4.16	11	4.44	11	4.43
	1	7	4.71	7	5.03	7	4.09	7	4.80	7	4.41
	2	4	4.75	4	4.20	4	3.80	4	3.80	4	4.46
ISTP	all	24	4.61	24	4.53	24	3.95	24	4.36	24	4.77
	1	20	4.66	20	4.59	20	3.99	20	4.36	20	4.80
	2	4	4.38	4	4.25	4	3.75	4	4.35	4	4.61
ISFP	all	15	5.34	15	4.85	15	4.30	15	3.96	15	4.95
	1	10	5.33	10	4.82	10	4.19	10	3.94	10	4.97
	2	5	5.38	5	4.92	5	4.53	5	4.00	5	4.91
INFP	all	9	5.15	9	4.69	9	4.60	9	3.84	9	4.87
	1	7	5.14	7	4.66	7	4.5	7	3.91	7	4.90
	2	2	5.19	2	4.80	2	4.94	2	3.60	2	4.79
INTP	all	8	4.61	8	5.00	8	4.70	8	4.23	8	4.07
	1	6	4.67	6	4.97	6	4.52	6	4.37	6	3.86
	2	2	4.44	2	5.10	2	5.25	2	3.80	2	4.71
ESTP	all	28	5.21	28	4.96	2	4.53	28	4.87	28	5.45
	1	20	5.08	20	4.77	20	4.34	20	4.86	20	5.36
	2	8	5.52	8	5.43	8	5.00	8	4.90	8	5.68
ESFP	all	44	5.55	44	5.04	44	4.80	44	4.16	44	5.39
	1	25	5.45	25	5.08	25	4.65	25	4.594	25	5.46
	2	19	5.68	19	4.99	19	4.99	19	3.60	19	5.29
ENFP	all	56	5.37	56	5.21	56	4.78	56	4.18	56	4.82
	1	39	5.27	39	5.18	39	4.64	39	4.36*	39	4.82
	2	17	5.60	17	5.26	17	5.10	17	3.76*	17	4.82
ENTP	all	25	5.18	25	5.46	25	4.45	25	4.82	25	4.75
	1	20	5.26	20	5.42	20	4.48	20	4.89	20	4.90
	2	5	4.85	5	5.64	5	4.35	5	4.52	5	4.17
ESTJ	all	78	5.18	78	5.02	78	4.38	78	4.91	78	5.27
	1	57	5.07	57	4.92	57	4.18*	57	5.00	57	5.28
	2	21	5.46	21	5.28	21	4.92*	21	4.64	21	5.27
ESFJ	all	55	5.58	55	4.60	55	4.74	55	4.20	55	5.24
	1	26	5.55	26	4.51	26	4.47*	26	4.40	26	5.21
	2	29	5.61	29	4.69	29	4.99*	29	4.03	29	5.27
ENFJ	all	15	5.62	15	5.04	15	4.78	15	4.52	15	5.05
	1	12	5.52	12	5.13	12	4.55*	12	4.87*	12	5.21
	2	3	6.00	3	4.67	3	5.67*	3	3.13*	3	4.38
ENTJ	all	19	5.44	19	5.65	19	5.10	19	5.41	19	5.19
	1	10	5.15	10	5.32	10	4.96	10	5.26	10	4.97
	2	9	5.76	9	6.02	9	5.25	9	5.58	9	5.43

Note: 1 = Students, 2 = Working Adults

Table 6. Mean Differences of the MBTI-Types, Generations and Values (cont.)

		Conformity		Hedonism		Stimulation		Tradition		Power	
		N	M	N	M	N	M	N	M	N	M
ISTJ	all	31	4.35*	31	4.66	31	3.09	31	3.13	31	3.21
	1	20	3.93*	20	4.98	20	2.88	20	2.77*	20	3.15
	2	11	5.14*	11	4.09	11	3.45	11	3.78*	11	3.31
ISFJ	all	24	4.64	24	4.44	24	2.96	24	3.63	24	2.56
	1	12	4.38	12	4.83	12	2.81	12	3.12*	12	2.43
	2	12	4.90	12	4.04	12	3.11	12	4.15*	12	2.68
INFJ	all	6	4.38	6	3.33	6	2.94	6	3.93	6	1.87
	1	2	3.88	2	2.75	2	1.83	2	3.30	2	1.90
	2	4	4.63	4	3.63	4	3.50	4	4.25	4	1.85
INTJ	all	11	3.61	11	4.41	11	3.55	11	2.56	11	2.96
	1	7	3.79	7	4.57	7	3.95	7	2.37	7	3.03
	2	4	3.31	4	4.13	4	2.83	4	2.90	4	2.85
ISTP	all	24	4.26	24	5.15	24	4.25	24	3.05	24	3.25
	1	20	4.44	20	5.25	20	4.27	20	3.01	20	3.15
	2	4	3.38	4	4.63	4	4.17	4	3.25	4	3.75
ISFP	all	15	4.12	15	4.50	15	3.93	15	3.04	15	2.85
	1	10	4.03	10	4.80	10	4.07	10	3.00	10	2.84
	2	5	4.30	5	3.90	5	3.67	5	3.12	5	2.88
INFP	all	9	4.47	9	5.17	9	3.52	9	3.62	9	2.49
	1	7	4.36	7	5.50	7	3.62	7	3.60	7	2.34
	2	2	4.88	2	4.00	2	3.17	2	3.70	2	3.00
INTP	all	8	3.47	8	5.00	8	3.83	8	2.15	8	2.65
	1	6	3.54	6	5.25	6	4.00	6	2.20	6	2.73
	1	2	3.25	2	4.25	2	3.33	2	2.00	2	3.00
ESTP	all	28	4.56	28	5.57	28	4.93	28	3.38	28	3.61
	1	20	4.60	20	5.70*	20	4.88	20	3.24	20	3.69
	2	8	4.47	8	5.25*	8	5.04	8	3.73	8	3.40
ESFP	all	44	4.61	44	5.32	44	4.49	44	3.33	44	3.26
	1	25	4.69	25	5.74*	25	4.99*	25	3.22	25	3.51
	2	19	4.50	19	4.76*	19	3.83*	19	3.46	19	2.21
ENFP	all	56	3.77	56	5.32	56	4.68	56	2.58	56	2.87
	1	39	3.81	39	5.59	39	4.94*	39	2.37*	39	3.14*
	2	17	3.68	17	4.71	17	4.08*	17	3.06*	17	2.25*
ENTP	all	25	4.38	25	5.16	25	5.09	25	2.62	25	3.02
	1	20	4.63*	20	5.40	20	5.10	20	2.63	20	3.27
	2	5	3.40*	5	4.20	5	5.07	5	2.56	5	2.00
ESTJ	all	78	4.95	78	4.73	7	4.15	78	3.39	78	3.61
	1	57	4.91	57	4.77	57	4.18	57	3.19*	57	3.82*
	2	21	5.05	21	4.62	21	4.05	21	3.91*	21	3.05*
ESFJ	all	55	4.75	55	4.81	55	3.61	55	3.62	55	2.92
	1	26	4.78	26	5.42*	26	3.62	26	3.34*	26	3.25*
	2	29	4.72	29	4.26*	29	3.61	29	3.87*	29	2.63*
ENFJ	all	15	4.37	15	5.17	15	4.16	15	2.88	15	3.07
	1	12	4.48	12	5.33	12	4.28	12	2.82	12	3.47*
	2	3	3.92	3	4.50	3	3.67	3	3.13	3	1.47*
ENTJ	all	19	4.86	19	4.63	19	4.77	19	2.85	19	3.78
	1	10	4.78	10	4.30	10	4.43	10.	2.52	10	3.88
	2	9	4.94	9	5.00	9	5.15	9	3.22	9	3.67

Note: 1 = Students, 2 = Working Adults

Discussion and Conclusions

While the type distributions of the two groups were nearly identical, the generations showed many differences in values. Young people, especially certain types, were motivated by Achievement and Power more than were older people, who have already managed some success in these realms. Students may see these as good motivational rewards. Alternately, bad experiences in working life or changing needs may lessen the attractiveness of Achievement

and Power at a later age. We may assume that people's values become a more serious as they age. (See Appendices 1-10.)

For ISTJs the means for all the value types increased across the generations except Hedonism, which declined, though not significantly. This may suggest a strengthening of the second, third, and fourth preferences. Regarding ISFJ, the greater interest in Universalism and Tradition than existed in the student years may be explained as resulting from a more highly developed auxiliary, extraverted feeling. For some types, for example ESTP, interest in Hedonism is stronger at a younger age than later. Is it the serious working life and adults' responsibilities that weaken one's pursuit of pleasure? An interesting detail appears in the relationship between ENTP and Conformity. ENTPs show no changes except in this value type: it declined. In the transition from student to working adult, ENTPs may become less concerned with fitting in and more daring, to become their more natural selves. Although the differences are not significant, INFJ seem to go in the opposite direction, as they get older, seeking more pleasure (Hedonism) and excitement (Stimulation).

This study found many differences between psychological type and value types. Value types such as Self-direction and Security do not differ between generations. Hedonism was where the greatest difference between generations was found. In contrast, there were differences suggesting how the types behave at different ages. Some types seem to gain freedom from environmental pressures. Other types seem to settle in the groove with age and adult responsibilities. Some changes may be due to ongoing preference development. A larger sample of all types and more age groups may serve the very interesting possibility of analyzing the relationships in greater detail.

References

Abramson, P. R., & Inglehart, R. (1995). *Value change in global perspective*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

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

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: Macmillan.

Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Collier-Macmillan.

Jung, C. G. (1921/1971). Psychological types (H. G. Baynes & R. F. C. Hull, Trans. Vol. 6). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Markus, H. R.,&Kitayama, S. (1994).A collective fear of the collective: Implications for selves and theories of selves. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *20*, 568-579.

Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L., & Hammer, A. L. (1998). Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (3rd ed.). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Partridge, P. H. (1971). *Consent and consensus*. New York: Praeger..

Routamaa, V. (2001). Laying the Foundation for New Venture Creation: Assessing Regional Entrepreneurship Potential. In A. Miettinen & H. Klandt (Eds.) FGF Entrepreneurship-Research Monographien. Band 25. Josef Eul verlag GmbH: Lohmar, Germany.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

Routamaa, V., Hautala, T. & Rissanen, A-L. (2004). Hunting for Female Entrepre neurs—Entrepreneurial Capacity and Gender, Proceedings of 49th ICSB World Conference Johannesburg, South Africa.

Routamaa, V. & Pollari, A-M. (1998). Leadership Styles in the Cultural Context—A Comparison of Finnish and South African Managers. Proceedings of the Psychological Type and Culture–East and West: Third Multicultural Research Symposium, January 9-11, 1998, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Routamaa, V., Anna-Leena Rissanen & Tiina Hautala (2004) *New Venture Creation: Assessing Regional Entrepreneurship Potential*. Pro ceedings of The 8th International Conference on Global Business & Economic Development *Guadalajara, Mexico, January 7-10, 2004.*

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). New York: Academic Press.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (pp. 85-119). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Schwartz, S. H. (1999). Cultural value differences: Some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Journal*, *48*, 23-47.

Schwartz, S. H.,&Bardi, A. (1997). Influences of adaptation to communist rule on value priorities in Eastern Europe. *Political Psychology, 18*, 385-410.

Schwartz, S. H., & Ros, M. (1995). Values in the West: A theoretical and empirical challenge to the individualism-collectivism cultural dimension. *World Psychology, 1*, 99-122.

Smith, P. B. & Schwartz, S. H. (1997). Values. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (Vol. 3, 2nd ed., pp. 77-118). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989* (pp. 41-133). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.