

Contemporary value profiles of women and men – Polish pilot survey

Anna Dyląg, Marcin Szafrński

Abstract

This chapter presents the results of a questionnaire survey on value profiles of Polish women and men with special emphasis on creativity. The measurement instrument enabled us to gain some insight into respondents' value content and structure from both the individual and organizational perspectives. The similarities and differences between male and female respondents were analysed according to several research questions: (i) will the survey reflect the value patterns depending on the gender reported by participants? (ii) do Polish men and women differ in terms of their emphasis placed upon specific personal values including creativity? (iii) are there any significant differences between males' and females' perception of values emphasized in the organizations they declared working for? Contrary to other findings on the value profiles of Polish women and men, the current survey did not show any stronger value polarization on the basis of gender as declared by participants. This means that the value profiles were shaped in a similar way no matter whether a respondent was a woman or a man. Interestingly, the results of the survey showed, however, that women placed more emphasis on the vast majority of values compared to men. This tendency was visible both at the individual and organizational levels. This general higher value recognition declared by women is discussed with respect to eudaemonic versus hedonic life orientations. Creativity also appeared among the values on which female respondents significantly placed more emphasis than men, but only in organizational contexts.

Key words: men, women, values, creativity

Introduction

For the needs of this chapter, the value profiles of Polish women and men are analysed with a special respect to creativity treated as a possible psychological correlate of innovativeness. Values are thought of as important entities for many disciplines, including philosophy, economics, psychology, sociology, political science, and related areas. Values have been extensively studied at different levels of analysis - from the cultural/societal (e.g. Inglehart and Welzel, 2005; Hofstede, 1980; Boski, 2010; Czapiński, 2013), through organizational (Hofstede and

Hofstede, 2007; Bugdol, 2006) to the individual (e.g. Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992). Value surveys reflect ongoing scientific effort in explaining changes in the contemporary cross-cultural world. The common dimensions of values that may help to shed some light on differences among cultures and economies seem one of the most important issues within this field of study. It should be noted, however, that the results obtained at the level of population (global, regional, national, etc.) are always biased toward a central tendency, cutting off the extremes. Also, culture can be seen as a phenomenon which manifests in two higher dimensions and can be measured from two perspectives (Boski, 2010, p. 47–48): objective (environment, economy, social institutions) and subjective – as mental programming that is shared among members of the same group and differentiates from members of other groups (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2007, p. 17). In this typology values fall into the category of subjective entities. In this paper we will concentrate on the values from a psychological perspective.

8.1. Research initiatives on values

8.1.1. World Value Survey (R. Inglehart and C. Welzel)

The importance of values as research topics is reflected in the World Value Survey which is a broad project seeking to help scientists and policy makers understand changes in the beliefs, values and motivations of people throughout the world. It should be noted, however, that the main experts for these studies are political scientists with their sharp focus upon the societal level of analysis and the historical development of the countries studied. The data of the WVS is available to political scientists, sociologists, social psychologists, anthropologists and economists who have used these data to analyse such topics as economic development, democratization, religion, gender equality, social capital, and subjective well-being. These data have also been widely used by government officials, journalists and students, and groups at the World Bank have analysed the linkages between cultural factors and economic development (see: www.worldvaluessurvey.org). The World Values Survey Association is governed by the Executive Committee, the Scientific Advisory Committee, and the General Assembly under the terms of the Constitution. WVS is a global network of social scientists studying changing values and their impact on social and political life since 1981. As written on the website, the WVS is the only scientific study covering the full range of global variation, from very poor to very rich countries, in all of the world's major cultural zones. The WVS is the largest non-commercial, cross-national, time series investigation of human beliefs and values ever executed, currently including interviews with almost 400,000 respondents.

Inglehart-Welzel Cultural Map

The analysis of the WVS data conducted by Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel asserts that there are two major dimensions of cross-cultural variation in the world:

1. Traditional values versus Secular-rational values, and
2. Survival values versus Self-expression values.

With help of this theoretical model, the authors can locate societies along these two dimensions in four types (see Table 8.1).

Table 8.1. Value types in Inglehart-Welzel Cultural Map

Opposite types	
<p><i>1. Traditional values</i> importance of religion, parent-child ties, deference to authority and traditional family values</p>	<p><i>2. Secular-rational values</i> the opposite preferences to the traditional values; less emphasis on religion, traditional family values and authority</p>
<p><i>3. Survival values</i> emphasis on economic and physical security; it is linked with a relatively ethnocentric outlook, low levels of trust and tolerance</p>	<p><i>4. Self-expression values</i> high priority to environmental protection, growing tolerance of foreigners, sexual minorities and gender equality</p>

Source: based on www.worldvaluessurvey.org [accessed 10.07.2014].

The value types identified by Inglehart and Welzel (2005) may be looked upon as consequences of socioeconomic development in the societies studied. They hypothesize that an increase in standards of living promotes a transit from the development country stage via industrialization to a post-industrial knowledge society. Countries tend to “move” in the direction from poor (survival and traditional values) to rich (secular-rational and self-expression values). In societies where survival values are dominant, general needs and efforts related to self-protection and security are present. Physical and economic survival is a must, thus members of such cultures may seem distant and suspicious. In traditional values national pride is emphasized and a nationalistic outlook is present. People who embrace these values place high importance on hierarchy and formal authority which give little space to individual autonomy; they reject divorce, abortion, euthanasia and suicide. In societies where secular-rational values are present, preferences opposite to traditional values are emphasized. These societies place less emphasis on religion, traditional family values and authority. Divorce, abortion, euthanasia and suicide are seen as relatively acceptable. In countries where self-expression values are present, higher needs arise which are reflected in an emphasis on high individual autonomy and tolerance, care for the environment and a need for participation in decision-making in economic and political life.

With regard to the findings of the WVS experts, Poland represents a region which can be described as traditional. In the European database on innovativeness, the Polish economy is characterized as a very weak inventor (with the only exception being the Warsaw region and Mazovia province – see EUROSTAT;¹

¹ Eurostat, www.ec.europa.eu [accessed 10.07.2013].

Nowak, 2012; Dyląg and Łącała, 2015). Despite the steady economic growth of Poland since its transformation, Poles are in the majority pessimists (data from 2005, see Boski, 2010, p. 285), highly dissatisfied with the political situation in the country, and displaying a low level of trust toward political participation. The strongest and most stable source of satisfaction for Poles are family life, children, and friends (Boski, 2010, p. 286). In a world ranking of 177 countries based on such indicators of quality of life as: NGP per cap., HDI (objective well-being), SWLS (subjective well-being measured by the Diener scale), life satisfaction (measured by the Veenhoven scale) and the role of religion (participation in religious events and child raising based on religion in %) – Poland ranked in 37th place. The leaders were Norway, Iceland, Australia, Ireland and Sweden. European countries which ranked lower than Poland were, for instance: Estonia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Latvia, Croatia, Bulgaria, Romania, Russia and Belarus (Boski, 2010, p. 288).

8.1.2. Cultural and organizational values (G. Hofstede)

One of the most widely cited studies on organizational and culture specific values was conducted by G. Hofstede in his pioneer works in the years 1968–72. Hofstede used data collected in 50 resident countries of the IBM corporation (later 53 + 16 added postcommunist countries, see Boski, 2010, p. 92), on 116,000 employers, including management. His typology of value orientations initially included 4 dimensions, with one added later (Hofstede and Hofstede 2007, p. 35–36; see the table below).

Some criticism (from the Polish perspective) of Hofstede's model was raised by Boski (2010, p. 126). His critique is mainly related to the lack of a comprehensive theory underlying the typology. A theory would help to explain the differences observed and predict future trends. Also – as Boski highlights – Hofstede may show some ethnocentrism himself while discriminating between cultures, suggesting that one may be “better” (strong, healthy, or effective) than another (“worse” – weak, unhealthy, or less effective); such interpretations are made in favour of Dutch culture (promoted as the optimum compared, for instance, to the American one, although both profiles show almost the same pattern).²

Poland in Culture Compass survey

It is possible to look into Hofstede's profile of a country of interest via the website resources (www.geert-hofstede.com, accessed 15.07.2014). It says that if we explore Polish culture through the lens of the proposed model, we get a good overview of the deep specific drivers “relative to other world cultures” (ibid.). When one clicks “Poland” a description appears which includes a diagram and a detailed written

² It may be important to mention here that G. Hofstede's nationality is Dutch, and P. Boski spent several years in Africa which strongly influenced his view on cultures and values.

characterization of Polish culture. As the model has been improved, the structure of the model has changed. The dimension of LTO is replaced by two new ones: pragmatism and indulgence; hence the model is referred to as the 6-D model (six dimensions). The tool and the website itself have been developed by The Hofstede Centre in collaboration with the *itim international*, a culture consultancy that offers a “new cultural survey” (Culture Compass). It is a tool that helps to describe and better understand hidden patterns of behaviour affecting members of a given culture (meaning country).

Table 8.2. Hofstede’s typology of cultural dimensions

Dimension	Description
<i>Power Distance Index (PDI)</i>	Refers to the issue of equality and power distribution in a group or society, it is defined as the extent to which the less powerful members of society expect and accept that power is not distributed equally.
<i>Individualism (IDV)</i>	Addresses the issue of “interdependence” and is described by the degree to which people feel linked and dependent on each other and view the whole society as a cohesive group. In strongly individualistic cultures people are supposed to look after themselves and their direct family exclusively, while in collectivist societies people feel they belong to one group, take care of each other and expect loyalty in exchange.
<i>Masculinity (MAS)</i>	This is described as a strong emphasis on competition, achievement and success, with success being defined by the winner/best in field; this approach is a paradigm of the educational system, and in fact is starts in schools (and continues as organizational behaviour in workplaces or as a set of key values in organizational culture).
<i>Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI)</i>	The extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations and have created beliefs and institutions that help them to avoid this feeling; for instance, they tend to take actions that are rational, under control and planned in advance.
<i>Long Term Orientation (LTO)</i>	A dimension added to the initial 4-D model in 1991 as a result of additional international study among students with a survey instrument developed together with Chinese professors (it was also a result of inspiration from Far Eastern countries and their Confucian philosophy); it is described as an ability to work hard long term (emphasize on persistent work engagement), even at the expense of private life; while consumption, free time, and relax are not valued; it was applied in 23 countries.

Source: G. Hofstede, J. Hofstede (2007), *Kultury i organizacje*, Warszawa: PWE; P. Boski (2010), *Kulturowe ramy zachowań społecznych*, Warszawa: PWN–Scientifica SWP, pp. 91–126.

Poland is described as country characterized by (cited from www.geert-hofstede.com):

- high on PDI – meaning that it is a hierarchical society in which people accept that power is not distributed equally and there is a hierarchical order (everybody accepts his or her place with no further justification). Hierarchy in an organization is seen as reflecting inherent inequalities, centralization is popular, subordinates expect to be told what to do and the ideal boss is a benevolent autocrat,

- high on IDV – Poland is an individualistic society. This means there is a high preference for a loose social framework in which individuals are expected to take care of themselves and their immediate families only. The employer/employee relationship is a contract based on mutual advantage, hiring and promotion decisions are supposed to be based on merit only, management is the management of individuals. The Polish culture however, carries a “contradiction” – although highly individualistic, the Polish need a hierarchy. This combination (high score on power distance and high score on Individualism) creates a specific “tension” in this culture, which makes the relationship delicate but intense and fruitful once you manage it (managers are advised to establish a second “level” of communication, having personal contact with everybody in the structure, enabling the impression that “everybody is important” in the organization, although unequal),
- rather high on MAS – Poland is a masculine society. In masculine countries people “live in order to work,” managers are expected to be decisive and assertive, the emphasis is on equity, competition and performance, and conflicts are resolved by fighting them out,
- very high on UAI (the highest score in the entire profile) – in Poland there is a very high preference for avoiding uncertainty. Countries exhibiting high uncertainty avoidance maintain rigid codes of belief and behaviour and are intolerant of unorthodox behaviour and ideas. In these cultures there is an emotional need for rules (even if the rules never seem to work) time is money, people have an inner urge to be busy and work hard, precision and punctuality are the norm, innovation may be resisted,³ security is an important element in individual motivation,
- pragmatism (PRA) – Poland’s (low) score in this dimension means that it is more normative than pragmatic culture. People in such societies have a strong concern with establishing the absolute Truth; they are normative in their thinking. They exhibit great respect for traditions, a relatively small propensity to save for the future, and a focus on achieving quick results,
- indulgence (IND) – with a low score in this dimension Polish culture is one of restraint (the opposite pool). Societies with a low score in indulgence have a tendency to cynicism and pessimism. Also, in contrast to indulgent societies, restrained societies do not put much emphasis on leisure time nor do they control the gratification of their desires. People with this orientation have the perception that their actions are restrained by social norms and feel that indulging themselves is somewhat wrong.

Additionally, as a cross-cultural survey is also available via Culture Compass (ibid.), it may be worthwhile conducting a short analysis of Polish–Norwegian⁴

³ This reference is important while keeping in mind the very low innovativeness of the Polish economy.

⁴ Polish-Norwegian cooperation is one of the key point in the current grant.

comparison with respect to 6-D model (see Table 8.3). Norway was the leader in the mentioned above world ranking of 177 countries with respect to their reported quality of life.

Table 8.3. Polish-Norwegian culture comparison survey based on Hofstede's 6-D Model

Dimension	Poland	Norway
Power Distance Index (PDI)	68	31
Individualism (IDV)	60	69
Masculinity (MAS)	64	8
Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI)	93	50
Pragmatism (PRA)	38	35
Indulgence (IND)	29	55

Source: based on www.geert-hofstede.com [accessed 20.07.2014].

There are some clear differences between Polish and Norwegian cultures in such dimensions as MAS, UAI and PDI. The remaining scores seem similar, i.e. individualism or pragmatism. The low score in masculinity in Norway is the most striking result – it has been interestingly interpreted in the Culture Compass report (ibid.)

(...) Norway is the second most feminine society (after Sweden). This means that the softer aspects of culture are valued and encouraged such as levelling with others, consensus, “independent” cooperation, and sympathy for the underdog. Taking care of the environment is important. Trying to be better than others is neither socially nor materially rewarded. Societal solidarity in life is important; work to live and do your best. Incentives such as free time and flexibility are favoured. Interaction through dialogue and “growing insight” is valued and self-development along these terms encouraged. Focus is on well-being, status is not shown. An effective manager is a supportive one, and decision making is achieved through involvement.

Alongside cultural and national values there has been an effort focused upon organizational or corporate values (which are also viewed as collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one organization from others; Hofstede and Hofstede, 2007, p. 47). Hofstede believes that both cultures and organizations share values, which are deeper and more stable elements of life than practices (practices are more tangible than values). Polish researcher M. Bugdol concludes that organizational values are believed to influence economic and social outcomes. “They correspond with income, productiveness and innovativeness. They can strengthen loyalty, social relations and enrich organizational potential. Values ethical in nature are important not only in management (or leadership), but also support the decision making process both on the management side as well as clients: an increasing number of consumers are aware not only of the price of the product and/or its quality, but also the meaning of the ethical values it stands for” (Bugdol, 2006, p. 149).

8.1.3. Values important in Polish society – Social Diagnosis (J. Czapiński)

Values important to Poles have been regularly studied in an ongoing broad national survey called “Social Diagnosis” (Czapiński, 2013). According to the official description of the project (available online at www.diagnoza.com), Social Diagnosis focuses on conditions and quality of life in Poland, both in the economic and psychological senses. A group of researchers studies such issues like income, material wealth, savings and financing as well as education, medical care, problem-solving, stress, psychological well-being, lifestyle, pathologies, engagement in the arts and cultural events, use of new communication technologies and many others. In this sense the project is interdisciplinary, drawing on the work of the main authors of the Social Monitoring Council (Rada Monitoringu Społecznego) and a team of experts appointed by the Council. The Social Diagnosis is based on panel research, the authors return to the same households every few years, with the first sample being taken in the year 2000. The following took place three years later, and since then the data has been collected and reports have been published every two years. The results of the Social Diagnosis reveal both the current state of Polish society and the ways it has changed over the last ten years. In this respect it is a unique and rich source of information that we decided to refer to for the purposes of this paper.

The survey of values is organized by the authors of Social Diagnosis as a panel study conducted with the help of a relatively short list of items. They do not refer to any specific theoretical approach however, neither to underlying concepts (such as value hierarchy or dimensions). The leading criteria for selecting values were brevity, simplicity of questions, and ease of providing answers (Czapiński, 2013, p. 228). For the needs of his study the author uses a questionnaire which combines 13 specific values and one non-specific item. Since all of the 13 values are commonly accepted, the respondents’ choices have been limited to three most important to them (described as conditions for a happy life). The instruction for respondents is as follows: [please indicate] “what in your opinion is the most important condition of a successful, happy life (please first read through all the answers and then choose no more than three, by crossing the appropriate boxes),” see Czapiński, 2013, Annex 8.1, Individual questionnaire (p. 446). The list of items is presented in the table below.

Table 8.4. List of values derived from the Social Diagnosis 2013

1. MONEY	8. HONESTY
2. CHILDREN	9. KINDNESS AND BEING RESPECTED
3. SUCCESSFUL MARRIAGE	10. FREEDOM
4. WORK	11. GOOD HEALTH
5. FRIENDS	12. EDUCATION
6. PROVIDENCE, GOD	13. STRONG PERSONALITY
7. CHEERFULNESS, OPTIMISM	14. OTHER

Source: J. Czapiński (2013), “Individual quality of life and lifestyle,” [in:] *Social Diagnosis 2013*, Warsaw: The Council for Social Monitoring, p. 446.

As presented above, the list includes a mix of different value types (“commonly accepted,” Czapiński, 2013, p. 228), including economic, religious, family and work-related items, as well as those which can serve as an assessment of individual health. There are also items on selected psychological characteristics of an individual and her or his environment. It is not clear however, how respondents interpret the items and how to interpret them at a higher level, for instance using a dimensional approach. The absence of a theoretical framework enables many alternative explanations for the results, leaving space for competing interpretations.

The results of the value section of *Social Diagnosis 2013* show that – compared to earlier periods of analysis – the value system of Poles remains quite stable. Values of increased importance were friends (a percentage of indications more than double the amount of 2000) and education (although their impact on the quality of Poles’ life in general seem undervalued). Values placed upon money and God showed decline, which is interpreted as a result or correspondence of the rapid increase in the Poles’ affluence on the one hand and the general decline in the frequency of religious practices and prayer on the other. Similarly to all the previous years, the following values are indicated as important conditions of a happy and good life: health, successful marriage (a slight decline was noted in the number of indications), children (also a fall in the number of indications, which had already started in 2011), and work. The values indicated least often are freedom, strong personality, education, kindness and being respected (see Czapiński, 2013, p. 228).

Many alternative interpretations of results are presented, as the author states that personal value systems depend on various factors like culture, social environment, life events and conditions, status, education, age, etc. For instance, the importance of selected values may correspond with their absence or deterioration (e.g. good health), troubles in life (God, money) or the opposite – as desired life events, such as happy marriage or children. For instance, the importance of children in a value system depends above all on such socio-demographic factors as: (a) relationship – whether someone is in a relationship, (b) gender – whether a respondent is a woman, and c) age – is the respondent between 25–44 years old. As the results of a regression analysis showed, those who placed most importance on value of marriage were themselves married, relatively young, better off and better educated, while those choosing friendship more often than others were wealthy, unmarried and better educated.

Comparison of value systems with respect to gender shows that women appreciate family values, health and religion as well as kindness and peer respect, while men value work, money freedom and a strong character. In addition, younger respondents more than the elderly value a successful marriage, friends, education and freedom. Such outcomes may reflect a traditional view on the social roles of women and men – and remain contrary to our findings, where no “typical” gender related pattern of values has been found (see below).

8.2. The Schwartz value model as a theoretical framework for own research

In recent decades the most widely used approaches to study values were these offered by M. Rokeach (1973), G. Hofstede (1980) and S. Schwartz (1992). Schwartz developed his model with the intention of avoiding such limitations of the previous ones as absence of integrated value theory, data driven approach, and cultural bias (see Spini, 2003). Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, p. 551) defined values as “concepts or beliefs, about desirable end states or behaviours, that transcend specific situations, guide selection or evaluation of behaviour and events, and are ordered by relative importance.”

Schwartz proposed a universal taxonomy of values that distinguishes among 10 value types. These categories are: Achievement, Benevolence, Conformity, Tradition, Universalism, Power, Security, Hedonism, Stimulation and Self-direction. Each value type contains several common values (see Figure 8.1). These values stem from a need to cope with three universal requirements, thus they can be recognized cross-cultural. These requirements relate to: (1) the needs of the individual as biological organisms, (2) requisites of coordinated social interaction, and (3) requirements for the smooth functioning and survival of groups (see Dyląg et al., 2013).

<p>OPENESS TO CHANGE</p> <p><u>Stimulation</u> (a varied life, an exciting life)</p> <p><u>Self-direction</u> (creativity, curiosity, freedom, choosing own goals, independence)</p> <p><u>(some) Hedonism</u> (pleasure, enjoying life)</p>	<p>SELF-TRANSCENDENCE</p> <p><u>Universalism</u> (protecting the environment, a world of beauty, unity with nature, broad-minded, social justice, wisdom, equality, a world at peace, inner harmony)</p> <p><u>Benevolence</u> (helpful, honest, forgiving, loyal, responsible, true friendship, a spiritual life, mature love, meaning in life)</p>
<p><u>(some) Hedonism</u> (pleasure, enjoying life)</p> <p><u>Power</u> (social power, authority, wealth, preserving my public image, social recognition)</p> <p><u>Achievement</u> (successful, capable, ambitious, influential, intelligent, self-respect)</p>	<p><u>Conformity</u> (politeness, honouring parents and elders, obedient, self-discipline)</p> <p><u>Tradition</u> (devout, accepting portion in life, humble, moderate, respect for tradition)</p> <p><u>Security</u> (clean, national security, social order, family security, reciprocation of favours, healthy, sense of belonging)</p>
<p>SELF-ENHANCEMENT</p>	<p>CONSERVATISM</p>

Figure 8.1. Simplified Schwartz model of values – 4 dimensions (capital letters), 10 value types (underlined), and 56 single values

Source: D. Spini (2003), “Measurement equivalence of 10 value types from the Schwartz value survey across 21 countries,” *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 34(1), p. 6.

According to Schwartz, the 10 value types can be grouped along four higher order (opposed) dimensions, organized along two main axes: I. “openness to change” versus “conservation” and II. “Self-enhancement” and “Self-transcendence.” The dimension of “Openness to change” includes stimulation and self-direction, as well as some hedonism. These values motivate people to follow their own emotional and intellectual impulses in a rather unpredictable way; change seems more attractive to them than stability. We believe that this dimension is strongly emphasised in individual and organizational value orientations toward innovativeness – at least at the first or initial stage of the innovative process. According to the NESTA approach (see NESTA, 2008a, p. 6), two main stages to innovation may be recognized: (1) generation – which encompasses the creativity, problem-solving and decision-making involved in the development of an innovation, and (2) adoption – the process of becoming aware of an innovation and implementing it within a market or organisation.

The dimension of “Conservatism” contains values on tradition, conformity and security. Such values direct people towards certainty, maintaining stable relations and preserving the status quo. The dimension of “Self-enhancement” includes values on power, achievement and some hedonism (this value is related to both “Openness to change” and “Self-enhancement”). This set of values motivate people to concentrate on their own personal goals and interests (even at the expense of others). The dimension of “Self-transcendence” contains values on universalism and benevolence and refers to the extent to which values motivate people to transcend selfish concerns and promote the welfare of all humans as well as of nature (Schwartz, 1992, p. 44).

In this model values belong to 10 separate categories, forming a circular continuum (with some values overlapping two dimensions, like hedonism). As stated by Schwartz (1994, p. 25): “the motivational differences between value types are continuous rather than discrete, with more overlap in meaning near the boundaries of adjacent value types.” As a result, values that are in opposition in the structure are competing and have consequences that are incompatible with each other (Schwartz, 1994).

In addition, the theory identifies a central motivational goal which is specific for each separate value type. In conclusion, it seems that Schwarz value model might well serve our need for a comprehensive, validated theoretical value structure, also with respect to future research on innovativeness (see Spini et al., 2003).

8.3. Research on values

Main goal of the present research was to identify value profiles of Polish women and men with respect to creativity. Guiding research questions referred to similarities and differences among values recognized by female and male respondents

as the most and least important, at the individual and organizational level of analysis. Research questions were formulated as follows: (i) will the survey reflect value patterns depending on the gender reported by participants? (ii) do Polish men and women differ in terms of their emphasis placed upon specific personal values, including creativity? (iii) are there any significant differences between males' and females' perception of values manifested in organizations they declared working for?

8.3.1. Data and sample

The dataset that served for the needs of this paper has already been analysed (see Dyląg et al., 2013). The previous research referred to the perceived value discrepancy in relation to positive and negative work related well-being. Initially empirical data were gathered from a sample of 342 females (69.7%) and 149 males (30.3 %) white-collar workers who participated in the study (total N = 491). All respondents were employed in Polish public and private organizations from various industry sectors including education, healthcare, sales, etc. The mean age of respondents was about 36.5 (SD = 10.3), ranging from a minimum of 21 to a maximum of 64 years old. The response rate was almost 60% (58.6%). During the course of data analyses, ratings from 11 respondents were excluded, leaving 480 results in total.

8.3.2. Measure and results

The data was collected and analysed with the help of questionnaire including 33 value items, based on the original work of Schwartz (1992). The list of items as well as the rating scale were modified by the authors, and all changes have been described in the mentioned above publication (Dyląg et al., 2013). The list of values used in the questionnaire is presented in tables below. Respondents were asked to evaluate importance of a given value for themselves (part A of the questionnaire), and for the organization they worked for (part B). The 6-point rating scale gave the possibility to indicate values most important for respondents (max score plus 4 – key values), as well as values opposite to their value system (min score minus 1 – opposite).

The results of our study are presented from two perspectives (or at two levels of analysis): individual and organizational. Individual values refer to items that are reported as important for each person (see Table 8.5). The organizational level of analysis pertains to the values perceived by respondents as widely manifested and important in the organizations they work for (see Table 8.6).

The individual values most important for women were: 1) self-respect, 2) meaning in life, 3) health, and 4) honesty. Female respondents also highly ranked inner harmony, loyalty, equality, wisdom, and responsibility. The values they ranked as least important were social power, authority, and sacrifice. Interestingly these

Table 8.5. Values – individual level, comparison of means with respect to sex

Values	Values important for individual A		Value women	Value men	Sign at least at level of
	M	SD	M (N = 336)	M (N = 144)	p < .05
1. Equality	3.19	.89	3.26	3.01	*
2. Inner harmony	3.29	.79	3.34	3.19	
3. Social power	1.48	1.1	1.41	1.63	*
4. Spiritual life	2.24	1.13	2.31	2.04	*
5. Sense of belonging	2.72	.94	2.89	2.53	*
6. An exciting life	2.15	1.1	2.17	2.08	
7. Meaning in life	3.37	.76	3.47	3.12	**
8. Wealth	2.36	.93	2.36	2.35	
9. Self-respect	3.41	.77	3.49	3.22	**
10. Creativity	2.8	.89	2.82	2.72	
11. Respect for tradition	2.49	1.0	2.54	2.35	
12. Self-discipline	2.73	.87	2.77	2.62	
13. Distance	2.47	.90	2.48	2.44	
14. Social recognition	2.78	.88	2.86	2.59	*
15. Wisdom	3.15	.77	3.23	2.97	**
16. Authority	1.56	1.1	1.51	1.69	
17. Social justice	2.75	.90	2.84	2.52	**
18. Independence	3.1	.83	3.16	2.98	*
19. Loyalty	3.27	.73	3.34	3.11	*
20. Ambition	2.77	.91	2.9	2.67	
21. Choosing own goals	3.05	.82	3.09	2.96	
22. Health	3.41	.78	3.46	3.29	*
23. Capability	2.93	.77	2.99	2.8	*
24. Honesty	3.36	.78	3.43	3.21	*
25. Preserving one's public image	3.13	.85	3.19	2.99	*
26. Obedience	2.78	.85	2.83	2.34	*
27. Help	2.98	.76	3.01	2.89	
28. Enjoying life	3.1	.92	3.14	2.99	
29. Responsibility	3.17	.74	3.22	3.05	*
30. Curiosity	2.7	.87	2.75	2.6	
31. Forgiving	2.62	.86	2.68	2.49	*
32. Success	2.86	.83	2.92	2.75	*
33. Sacrifice	1.63	1.26	1.56	1.79	

Note: 1) scale ranging from -1 (min) to +4 (max),
 2) bold highlights cases in which male respondents scored higher than females.

Table 8.6. Values – organizational level, comparison of means with respect to sex

Values	Values important in organization B		Value women	Value men	Sign at least at level of
	M	SD	M (N = 336)	M (N = 144)	p < ,05
1. Equality	2.56	1.18	2.61	2.43	
2. Inner harmony	2.38	1.1	2.4	2.34	
3. Social power	2.04	1.16	2.06	1.95	
4. Spiritual life	1.45	1.23	1.5	1.33	
5. Sense of belonging	2.16	1.06	2.2	2.07	
6. An exciting life	1.5	1.12	1.43	1.64	
7. Meaning in life	2.49	1.07	2.64	2.19	**
8. Wealth	2.34	1.10	2.35	2.31	
9. Self-respect	2.79	1.00	2.88	2.6	**
10. Creativity	2.64	1.02	2.74	2.39	**
11. Respect for tradition	2.16	1.15	2.24	1.98	**
12. Self-discipline	2.69	0.96	2.75	2.52	**
13. Distance	2.16	1.03	2.2	2.07	
14. Social recognition	2.68	0.98	2.78	2.39	
15. Wisdom	2.82	0.96	2.91	2.58	
16. Authority	2.16	1.14	2.21	2.04	
17. Social justice	2.36	1.12	2.37	2.34	
18. Independence	2.65	0.95	2.72	2.53	*
19. Loyalty	2.69	1.10	2.73	2.61	
20. Ambition	2.75	0.97	2.83	2.54	**
21. Choosing own goals	2.29	1.11	2.35	2.19	
22. Health	2.81	1.05	2.87	2.7	
23. Capability	3.11	0.87	3.19	2.88	**
24. Honesty	2.9	1.07	2.96	2.76	
25. Preserving one's public image	2.94	0.97	3.03	2.7	**
26. Obedience	3.06	0.87	3.13	2.84	**
27. Help	2.63	0.95	2.65	2.59	
28. Enjoying life	2.26	1.22	2.26	2.32	
29. Responsibility	3.09	0.87	3.17	2.87	**
30. Curiosity	2.33	1.05	2.37	2.23	
31. Forgiving	2.11	1.10	2.14	2.07	
32. Success	2.91	0.96	3	2.69	**
33. Sacrifice	2.17	1.20	2.19	2.06	

Note: 1) scale ranging from -1 (min) to +4 (max),
2) bold highlights cases in which male respondents scored higher than females.

were the only values reported by male respondents as more important compared to women's ratings (the differences between men and women obtained statistical significance only on social power, but not on authority or sacrifice). In general, women seem to emphasize these values more compared to men, rating the vast majority of values higher as a rule (except 3 items).

The profile of the most important individual values reported by male respondents shows a similar pattern to female rankings. It consists of such items as 1) health, 2) self-respect, 3) honesty and 4) inner harmony. Later they ranked meaning in life, loyalty, responsibility, and equality. The least important values are the only three items men ranked higher than female respondents – social power, authority and sacrifice. In general, men showed less emphasis on the values compared to women.

The value of creativity (individual level), as declared by women, fell into the category of “very important” with an average score of 2.82 (close to point 3 on the rating scale), but has not been indicated as a key value (point 4, maximum on the rating scale). Although it was ranked higher by female respondents than by men, the difference is not statistically significant.

Comparing the overall individual value profiles of men and women, significant differences between the subsamples were found in 19 items out of 33, while non-significant occurred in 14 cases. Interestingly, women declared a significantly higher emphasis on such traditionally males' values as success or independence (plus a non-significant difference on “authority,” meaning that both genders evaluated this item similarly). In relation to innovativeness, an absence of statistically significant differences was found not only in creativity, but also in such values as curiosity, enjoying life, or an exciting life. These items belong to two value types called hedonism and stimulation, and together with “choosing own goals” (self-direction type of values), they represent the dimension of “openness to change” (see Figure 8.1). This combination of values may somehow be linked to innovativeness (or at least to the process of idea generation). However, as the organizational context may stimulate or inhibit individual behaviours (including innovativeness), the second part of our research was focused on respondents' perception of values manifested in their work environment.

The organizational values perceived by women as the most important in their workplace were 1) capability, 2) responsibility, 3) obedience, and 4) preserving one's public image. As the least important in the organizations they work for female respondents reported exciting life, spiritual life, social power, and forgiving. In general, it can be noted that –compared to the individual values assessment provided by female respondents –organizational values received lower ratings.

The organizational values perceived by men as most important in their workplace were capability, responsibility, obedience, and honesty. This almost entirely reflects the profile of organizational values provided by female respondents.

Creativity was indicated by women as “very important” in their work environment. The average calculated for female respondents (2.74) was significantly higher than the average obtained for men (2.39). According to this result, from the

perspective of female respondents creativity is treated as very important for their workplaces, while male respondents perceived creativity as an important organizational value, but neither highly important nor a key issue for their workplaces.

Interestingly, only two items are seen by male respondents as emphasised higher in organization compared to females. These are an exciting life and enjoying life – both representing the dimension of openness to change (hedonism and stimulation types of values). None of them showed statistical significance, however. The values of the least importance perceived in organization by male respondents were spiritual life, exciting life, social power, and respect for tradition. Considering statistical significance, 14 out of 33 items showed significant differences with regard to gender and values.

8.4. Discussion

The results of our survey are an inspiring starting point towards further studies on gender determined innovativeness. Comparing men's and women's evaluation of values revealed some interesting results, including creativity. First, as a general tendency it appeared that women value values more than men, both at the individual and organizational level. In the vast majority their ratings were higher than those declared by male respondents. Women reported placing more emphasis on personal values and perceiving their work environment as more value-oriented than men did. This may be interpreted in several ways. For instance, it may mean that men remain more critical than women towards themselves as well as while evaluating their workplaces. On the other hand women appeared more "value oriented" in general, which was also noted by Czapiński (2013). Czapiński explains this difference as a eudaemonic attitude (or life orientation) which characterises the majority of women compared to the hedonistic – more "male like" – attitude. While hedonism may be explained as attempts to maximize pleasant events and the positive aspects of life, eudaemonism refers to a "wiser" existence which is led by "real" values (like honesty, relations and forgiveness). Czapiński (2013, p. 185) describes eudaemonists as happier and healthier, more family and relation oriented, less focused on money and excitement; the chance of a woman being a hedonist is 1/3 that of a man. Hedonists, who are oriented towards pleasure turn out more often than eudaemonists to consider money and freedom as conditions for a successful life.

Second, there was no difference found between female and male respondents in reference to creativity, but only at the individual level of analysis. This may be interpreted, as showing that creativity remains equally important to men and women. There was however, significantly higher emphasis perceived by female respondents on creativity in their workplaces, compared to the assessment provided by men. It may be interpreted that women perceive their work environment as more favourable towards creativity than men do. Two alternative mechanisms may be helpful

in explaining this observation (and, in general, all findings focused upon values). Following Boski (2010, p. 161), it is worth highlighting that there is always an issue of affirmative versus compensative mechanisms playing a role in evaluating values. Unlike more tangible organizational practices (norms and behaviours), values remain a somewhat idealistic vision of an optimum situation, which is usually far from the reality members of an organization live every day. Hence, a compensation mechanism, which refers to the states or characteristics that are ranked highly while in fact they are missing in an organizational or people's life, is a possible explanation of many value surveys, including the results presented above. Although our study require further analyses, the role of women in innovation processes and policy (including creativity stage) is certainly worth considering.

Third, we have not found any of typical gender related pattern of values, meaning that the value profiles of men and women were similar in shape, which was demonstrated in the case of individual values. While Czapiński showed that women gave more respect to social and family-related aspects of life, and men appeared more work-related and oriented toward strength and goals (2013) our findings do not correspond with these outcomes. Quite the contrary, the profile of the most important individual values reported by male respondents showed many similarities to women's rankings, including such items as health, self-respect, honesty, and inner harmony. Men also highly ranked meaning in life, loyalty, responsibility, and – interestingly - equality. They pointed to such “traditional male values” as social power or authority at the lowest level in their entire profile (this rating, however, was the only exception in which they rated any values higher than women). Interestingly, we would have thought that “sacrifice” is more a “female” than “male” value, although men reported this item as more important for them personally than women did. In general, the results of our studies do not reveal any deeper differences in values with respect to sex. It seems difficult, on the basis of our data, to identify values typical of women that would be contrary to values typical for men.

Finally, it may be worthwhile mentioning the role of the organizational context in relation to individual well-being and innovativeness. This way of thinking represents an empirical approach often referred to as “a person – environment fit.” For instance in the NESTA project (2008a, b) the main focus of the project experts is placed upon the relationship (and on causality in the future) between subjective well-being and innovativeness (and creativity). After the literature review they stated that, despite a limited body of evidence and an absence of identified mechanisms, it is highly recommended that such a relationship should be investigated in order to better stimulate innovativeness. In the study by Sagiv and Schwartz (2000) the authors presented several mechanisms that might moderate relationships between value priorities and subjective well-being (which in turn may influence innovativeness, NESTA 2008a, b). Their conclusion is that no particular value type is inherently ‘healthy’ (e.g. self-direction or stimulation) or ‘unhealthy’ (e.g. tradition, conformity or security). “Rather, particular values contribute to positive or negative well-being depending on whether they are congruent with the values emphasized in particular environments” (p. 195). In the previous publication of the first author of this paper

and her colleagues (Dyląg et al., 2013) the same theoretical framework has been used (based on Schwartz's value typology). It has been found that the better the fit (in terms of perception) between person and her or his work environment, the higher the chance for positive work-related well-being (as work engagement), and the lower the risk of negative outcomes (as job burnout). Work engagement has been shown to be a crucial characteristic of effective organizations (Bugdol, 2006) and productive teams (Torrente et al., 2012). This means that studies on the psychological determinants of innovativeness (and creativity) may benefit from employing a multilevel and interactional approach, also using values. It is highly recommended to lead such studies at several levels: individual, team, and organization, as well as within the individual – environment congruity paradigm.

8.5. Limitations to the study

The results presented above should be treated with caution for at least two major reasons: (a) this analysis was meant as an exploratory pilot study, and (b) the sample was not equal in terms of percentage of male and female respondents (sample consisted of 2/3 of women while only 1/3 was represented by men). In order to overcome the second limitation of our research, an appropriate statistical analysis was conducted which showed that there was no impact of the sample gender composition on the study outcomes. This means that there is a low probability that the results of this study demonstrate a value profile dominated by “female pattern” values (which in fact has not been found, although the general tendency of female respondents to “value the values” more than men did was visible).

Also, the argument may appear that the two levels of analysis (individual and organizational) have been mixed in one approach, which was given by Boski as a serious limitation in such study design (see Boski, 2010, p. 185). It may be worth considering an interactional perspective while investigating creativity (see Zhou et al., 2009). The authors examined the influence of social networks and conformity values on employees' creativity. The results they obtained showed that a proper match between personal values and network ties may be critical to understanding this phenomenon.

Literature

- Boski, P. (2010), *Kulturowe ramy zachowań społecznych*, Warszawa: PWN–Scientifica SWPS.
- Bugdol, M. (2006), *Wartości organizacyjne*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Czapiński, J. (2013), “Individual quality of life and lifestyle,” [in:] *Social Diagnosis 2013*, Warsaw: The Council for Social Monitoring, pp. 166–277.
- Dyląg, A., Jaworek, M., Karwowski, W., Kożusznik, M., Marek, T. (2013), “Discrepancy between individual and organizational values: Occupational burnout and work engagement among white-collar workers,” *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, Vol. 43, pp. 225–231.

- Dyłał, A., Łącała, Z. (2015), „Regionalne zróżnicowanie innowacyjności. Uwarunkowania psychospołeczne,” [in:] M. Trojak (ed.), *Zróżnicowanie rozwoju ekonomicznego Polski*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.
- Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*, Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, J. (2007), *Kultury i organizacje*, Warszawa: PWE.
- Inglehart, R., Welzel, Ch. (2005), *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- NESTA (National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts) (2008a), “Innovation and Well-being,” Working Paper (September).
- NESTA (2008b), *Measuring Innovation: Policy Briefing*, London.
- Nowak, P. (2012), „Poziomy innowacyjności polskiej gospodarki na tle krajów UE,” *Prace Komisji Geografii i Przemysłu* Nr 19, Warszawa–Kraków.
- Rokeach, M. (1973), *The Nature of Human Values*, New York: The Free Press.
- Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S.H. (2000), „Value priorities and subjective well-being: Direct relations and congruity effects,” *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 30, pp. 177–198.
- Schwartz, S.H., Bilsky, W. (1987), “Toward a universal psychological structure of human values,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 53, pp. 550–562.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1992), “Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries,” [in:] M. Zanna (ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 25), Orlando, FL: Scientific Press, pp. 1–65.
- 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*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 85–119.
- Spini, D. (2003), “Measurement equivalence of 10 value types from the Schwartz value survey across 21 countries,” *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 34 (1), pp. 3–23.
- Torrente, P., Salanova, M., Llorens, S., Schaufeli, W.B. (2012), “Teams make it work: How team work engagement mediates between social resources and performance in teams,” *Psicothema*, Vol. 24(1), pp. 106–112.
- Zhou J., Shin S.J., Brass D.J., Choi Jae P., Zhang, Z.X. (2009), “Social networks, personal values, and creativity: Evidence for curvilinear and interaction effects,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 94(6), pp. 1544–1552, Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School of Business.