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INTRODUCTION

In 1954 a linguistic anthropologist Kenneth Pike introduced new terms “emic” and “etic” suggesting that these two perspectives can be applied for the study of cultural systems. As it was defined by Pike, “emic” refers on the intrinsic cultural distinctions that are meaningful to the members of the society just as phonemic analyze should be used in the study of a language’s sound system. The native members of the society are the only judges of accuracy in this case. Some data is emic if and only if it is in accord with the perceptions and understandings considered appropriate by the insider’s culture. On the other way, the etic perspective relies on concepts and categories that are meaningful to the outside observers. Thus, scientists and other specialists in the field are the only judges of accuracy of etic data. Although the emic and etic categories may largely overlap the contrast between these two perspectives will help to deepen understanding of the extent to which some basic knowledge are shared and understood similarly across different cultures. The approach of emic/etic have been applied in a growing number of fields — including education, medicine, philology, psychiatry and of course psychology.

1. The concept and content of values

Personal values are cognitive constructs that explain an individual’s preferred life goals, principles and behavioral priorities. According to Milton Rokeach (1973, p. 5), “a value is an enduring belief of that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence”. ‘Preferable’ means that one goal is preferred to something else, so that the values have a hierarchical order. ‘Mode of conduct’ refers in Rokeach research to the 18 instrumental values and ‘end-state’ refers to the 18 terminal values. Based on his approach, Shalom Schwartz and Wolfgang Bilsky (1987, 1990) generated a conceptual definition of values that incorporates the five formal features of values mentioned in the literature. Values are (1) concepts or beliefs; (2) they pertain to desirable end states or behavior; (3) transcend specific situations; (4) guide the selection or evaluation of behavior and events; and (5) are ordered by their relative importance. Therefore, they made the theoretical assumption that values are cognitive representations of three types of universal human requirements. These three universal requirements to which all individuals and societies must be responsive are (a) the needs of individuals as biological organisms, (b) requisites of coordinated social interaction, and (c) survival and welfare needs of groups. If these three requirements are represented cognitively, they take the form of values. The crucial aspect that distinguishes the Schwartz Value System (SVS) from other approaches is that it expresses the motivational goal
Empirical evidence supports the existence of ten distinct types of values: Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-Direction, Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, Conformity, and Security (Schwartz, 1992). The relative importance attributed to each of these value types constitutes the individual’s system of value priorities. These ten motivational types are organized into two dimensions based on the evidence that compatible types are in close proximity and competing value types emanate in opposing directions from the center. The first dimension is called openness to change versus conservation. This dimension opposes values emphasizing one’s own independent thought and action against those emphasizing submissive self-restriction, which prefer an unchanging life and stability. The second dimension is called self-transcendence versus self-enhancement. Self-transcendence refers to promoting welfare of others but self-enhancement refers to valuing and hence promoting personal interests even at the expense of others.

Most of the theory and research on personal values has concentrated primarily on environmental influences on values (Knafo & Schwartz, 2001), and only few studies have attempted to integrate biological (endogenous) and environmental bases of personal values. Personality is produced by complex biological processes that form the intermediaries between heritable traits and desired goals. Thus integration of personality with social reality may be seen through personal values. McCrae & Costa (1996) claimed that personal values are prototypical “characteristic adaptations” which result from the interaction of personality and environment and they manifest certain core components — “basic tendencies”. Although these basic tendencies are unaffected by the environment (McCrae & Costa, 1999), the personal values cannot manifest anywhere else but in a culturally conditioned environment. Unlike personality traits, values are influenced by social experience and nurture and thus may be subject to change. Thus, beside reflecting basic dispositions, values are strongly influenced by social experience and nurture.

In most previous studies, only positive aspects of values were studied, because most theories define values as desirable. The term “values” itself has a positive connotation and it is more difficult to express principles one seeks to avoid. However, it is clear that human behavior is not restricted to only the process of approaching something and it is obvious that avoidance of negative aspects of life may be motivating as well. Many theorists in this area believe that there is a set of brain structures that cause humans to move towards things they desire and avoid things that they do not like. For instance Jeffrey Gray (eg 1981) proposes that human behavior is based on the interaction of two basic systems in the brain: Behavioral Approach System is the approach motivation system and Behavioral Inhibition System is the avoidance motivation and causes one to avoid undesirable situations. Thus, in addition to positive aspirations there are many objectives and modes of behavior that people want to avoid. The “Encyclopedia of Ethics” (concept of value, Bond, 2001; p. 1745) defines it: “There is an important distinction to be made between something that
is valuable as an end (something worth having, getting, or doing for its own sake), and something that is valuable as a means of acquiring, keeping, preserving, or doing something that is valuable for its own sake or valuable as an end. This will include the avoidance, prevention, or removal of something evil (something bad for some living being or beings). (We could call this “disvalue” or “negative value”, if we needed a term).” On the value circle (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990; Schwartz, 1992) the value types with different importance should be opposites but these opposite values on the circle represent only the variation of the importance that individuals attribute to particular goals. There is some evidence (Vyrost, Stainton Rogers, Stainton Rogers & Lovaš, 1997) that the importance ratings of the antonyms of Rokeach Value Survey single values (Negated Rokeach Values) can not be understood as simply the opposites of (positive) values. For instance it was good to give high rating to Loving but Cold was also acceptable; it was important to avoid Ambition but Aimlessness was also disliked.

2. The aims of studies

The most important aim of the research project was to apply both emic and etic knowledge on research of Estonian personal value structure and content. In the Study I, we reported the structure of values derived from Estonian language, which belongs to the Balto-Fennic group of Fenno-Ugric languages. The Estonian language is closely related to the Finnish language in its vocabulary and grammatical structure and differ remarkably from other European languages.

In the Study II we studied the interrelationship between values or guiding principles which people desire and the ones they want to avoid in their lives. The simple question was stated — what is the relationship between the positive and negative values?

Followed studies (Study III, IV and V) were the utilizations of different ideas related to social desirability, values and lying. Although personal values are central concepts in understanding individuals, there is still little research evidence how they are related to specific parenting practices. We assumed that specific personal values would be related to specific parenting practices and that there would be significant differences in the parenting practices and personal values of the parents of institutionalized adolescents and the parents of non-institutionalized adolescents.

Since society successfully instills desirable behavior and values in people, the tendency for individuals to portray themselves in a generally favorable light may be also relevant topic of research. The purpose of the Study IV was to investigate the relationship of socially desirable responding with consensual validity, using the measure proposed by Hofstee (2003) as an index of social
desirability responding (SDR). We also examine whether social desirability (SD) (either of self- or peer-reports) is a moderator of consensual validity.

Among of the most avoided negative values is Deception (Lying). It is expected that lying has universally negative value because of the damage to social cohesion. Presenting socially desirable image to others depends also on the target of desirable self-presentation (to whom respondent tries to present him/herself), hereby it is important to investigate the explicit stereotypes of persons giving consciously wrong impression of themselves. We assessed global stereotypes about liars worldwide (Study V). The main intention of the study was to sketch the pattern of beliefs across the world, with a view to understand international similarities and may be differences in the stereotype of liar.

3. Summary of methods

Development of the Estonian Value Inventory (EVI).

The initial phase of research involved in the construction of an exhaustive list of value describing words was the scanning of The Orthological Lexicon of the Estonian Language (Kull & Raiet, 1976). The criteria to select prototypical value terms from a dictionary were quite loose — we wanted to be sure that any important concept was not neglected. Two researchers independently scanned the lexicon and searched “principles that may be important to approach or to avoid”. This selection procedure resulted in 560 words representing terms in the Estonian vocabulary potentially able to describe human values. The agreement between two judges (kappa index) was 0.82. This list was obviously too large for analysing and had to be reduced to a more manageable size. To reduce the data set to the manageable size, ten recruited native speakers of Estonian language were asked to be the ‘experts’. All these experts were from the University of Tartu, and seven of them were psychologists, one sociologist, one cultural anthropologist, and an expert on Estonian language and literature. All words were rated on the extent to which they described values or guiding principles, which they believed to be important to achieve or important to avoid in peoples lives. The rating scale was keyed from ‘applies very well’ to ‘does not apply at all’. All clearly synonymous terms, as well as archaic and dialect words were eliminated from the list. On the basis of the experts’ ratings the initial list was reduced to 43 avoided principles and 78 approached principles. These terms were judged by at least 90% of the judges to represent core Estonian value vocabulary.

In Study III we measured parenting practices with a specially constructed questionnaire (QTP — Questionnaire of Rearing Tasks for Parents; Rink, K., Ott, Schlee, & Wittrock, 2000). The questionnaire should cover all different aspects of rearing activities that parents could engage in during the child-rearing
process: Communication, Setting limits, Social norms, Psychological environment, Physical safety and Free-time.

Personality was measured (Study IV) with Estonian version (Kallasmaa, Allik, Realo, & McCrae, 2000) of the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992) consisting of 240 items forming 30 facet scales and 5 domain scales (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness) and social desirability with the Estonian version of Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (in Study IV; BIDR-6; Paulhus, 1991). The 88 judges independently rated the social desirability of each of the 240 NEO-PI-R items. Based on these ratings we computed the social desirability ratings for each 240 single items.

In Study II and III personal values were assessed with the Estonian Value Inventory (EVI, Study I).

4. The lexical analysis of Estonian personal values vocabulary: the content and structure

Each language probably categorizes various aspects of reality and personal aspirations in slightly different ways. Reasons that may come from different socio-economical and political backgrounds may have implication on the shared knowledge. It is very likely that beside the relatively universal etic set of values captured by Shalom Schwartz created Schwartz Values Survey (SVS), a more specific set of values exists for a given culture. Thus is reasonable to start investigating emic knowledge from more indigenous sources using natural language.

An alternative model of the personal value construct is described in Study I and Study II. Based on lexical analysis of Estonian value describing vocabulary, we suggested the existence of six dominant themes around which these value-related words could be grouped: Benevolence — this subscale stressed complaisance and helpfulness in everyday transactions, consideration to cultural standards and inhibition disruptive emotions and behaviors (for example: “helpfulness”, “kindness”); Self-Enhancement consisted of items emphasizing power, economic and emotional success and promoting them to others (“power”, “successfulness”); Broadmindedness items largely represented tolerance of other peoples’ behavior, opinions and beliefs (“tolerance”, “creativity”); Hedonism associated with items that seem to stress the importance of experiencing pleasure and fun in life (“excitement”, “entertaining”); Conservatism consisted of items emphasizing dislike of change, wish that things should stay as they are and the preservation of traditional Estonian values (“industry”, “order”, “poise”) and Self-Realization items focused on respect for oneself and the realization of personal capabilities (“self-improvement”, “experience”). These distinctive groups were not completely independent of one another; they
shared a positive manifold of assertive values. Thus it can be concluded that the
value-describing lexicon is thematically confined. The Estonians strive for
values that can be divided into six themes (cf Study I). In order to compare the
most powerful etic measure SVS questionnaire, with our emic measure, we
performed a multiple regression analysis to predict six EVI subscales from ten
SVS value types and vice versa. Benevolence, Self-enhancement, Broad-
mindedness, and Hedonism were relatively predictable from the SVS data and
Conservatism and Self-realization variance is less predicted on the basis of SVS
data. There was no simple and direct correspondence between EVI and SVS
factors. Results (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995) demonstrate that the constructs mea-
sured by SVS appear to generalize across languages and cultures and its univer-
sal content and structure in different cultural contexts has been confirmed. But
besides the relatively universal set of values captured by SVS, a more specific
set of values may exist for a given culture. Results from the Study I indicate that
the five EVI subscales are similar to the SVS motivational types: self-enhance-
ment was relatively well predictable from Power and Achievement, Hedonism
was adequately represented in the SVS Hedonism and Stimulation, Conser-
vatism combines Conformity and Security, the EVI’s benevolence includes
contents of SVS Benevolence, and Broadmindedness resembles Universalism.
The actual use of language refers to the fact that in Estonia, the subject of self-
realization holds a more important position and compared to SVS do not have
their representation in SVS. Thus we can conclude that these six factors overlap
with the Schwartz (1992) motivational value-types, though there was no exact
isomorphism between them (cf Study I).

Furthermore, in the Study II, we focused on the question whether the oppo-
sites of positive, desired personal values are independent or share the same
evaluative space with desired values. In order to make data comparable to the
constructs measured by the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS), 43 negative values
were ignored during the Study I. In Study II we explored the structure and
content of these 43 avoided principles and personal values.

Based on the evidence, that value researchers have silently assumed that
negative values add nothing substantial to positive values and can be described,
if at all, as desirable goals with the opposite sign, we tried to investigate the
interrelationship between values or guiding principles which people desire and
the principles they want to avoid in their lives. In order to reveal the relationship
between personal values and avoided principles we tried to map the last
mentioned onto the same factor space as the one derived from the analysis of
positive values. Our results give support that, in general, the positive and
negative evaluative processes underlying personal values actually are not
completely separable — thus they are not functionally independent. The desired
values and the avoided principles (we call them negative values) share the same
evaluative space, although they belong to different compartments. The picture is
slightly different on the level of single items — negative values do not form
conceptually opposite space and they do not mirror positive values. From this
perspective, the positive and negative values are not completely interchangeable. In addition to a moderate correlation between them, both positive and negative components had their unique component. From our perspective, investigating negative values is best seen as a challenging variant of standard ways of assessing personal values rather than totally new demand.

5. Parenting Practices, Socially Desirable Responding and Lying

In every particular culture, the socialization has the influence to the expression of values that individuals should desire. Other people are the sources of value socialization — most values are learned from parents, adults who are not relatives, peers and the media (Rowe 1994). Therefore, the parents are among the most important socialization agents to be studied. We assumed that the values that are personally important to them are most probably also transferred to their children and related thus to parenting practices (Study III). Since values vary as a function of the culture/society — society may successfully instill desirable behavior in people. Social desirability is the tendency for individuals to portray themselves in a generally favorable light. If individuals have enough motivation to manage their public impression, they may report different levels of personality traits and personal values too (Study IV). In extreme cases people deliberately lie about themselves, they may con others into thinking they are someone or something they are not. This way, lying is communication with the intention of creating a false belief. Although self-deception is also possible, it is most often done by one person to one or more others. Lies can be motivated by nothing other than the creation of a false (usually favorable) image. According to this, there is evidence that people in all cultures believe that behaving that way, liars experience fear, shame, or cognitive difficulties (Bond & Robinson, 1988; Ekman, 2001). Thus the same characteristics may appear in the worldwide stereotype of the liar (Study V).

The results show that there is a meaningful pattern of correlations between some personal values and parenting practices — we found a systematic relation in the current research project. Values emphasizing selfish concerns and pleasure, even at the expense of others (Self-enhancement and Hedonism), have a negative correlation to all parenting practices. Values that transcend personal interests and promote welfare of others (Benevolence and Broadmindedness) — almost all have positive correlations with parenting practices. Not all parenting activities were similarly correlated with the personal values of the parents — social norms and free time did not have any statistically significant correlations. The magnitude of correlations between personal values and parenting practices was $| .33 |$, which we consider relatively moderate. These weak or moderate
associations may be evoked due to the problem that values may be too abstract to influence behavior directly (Homer & Kahle 1988).

There is a growing concern about delinquency and antisocial behavior, what may be related to different values acquired. Hirschi’s (1969) theory of social control pointed out that delinquency is associated with the person’s value system. Thus, parent’s personal values may through parenting practices have a direct effect on a child’s future. Parents of institutionalized adolescents rated Benevolence and Conservatism higher and broadmindedness lower than parents of noninstitutionalized adolescents. This may lead to the conclusion that in the case parents of institutionalized adolescents feel more deprived of values Benevolence and Conservatism in selection or evaluation of their behavior than parents of non-institutionalized adolescents. However, the findings may be to an extent affected by institutionalisation itself. The self-reports of institutionalised adolescents parents may have been produced in a socially approved manner, since due to the problems with their child, they may be more motivated to present themselves as more caring parents. Seem that in this case some personal values are also more desirable than others.

Social desirability is generally defined as the tendency for subjects to respond test items in a manner that consistently present the self in a favorable light (Holden & Fekken, 1989). A potential source of inaccuracy in self-reports of personality, attitudes and behavior is a tendency of some respondents to engage in social desirable responding. Some of researches concentrate on the underlying structure of the social desirability (eg Paulhus, 1991; Damarin & Messick, 1965; Sackheim & Gur, 1978), some on the content of the construct (eg Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964; Edwards, 1957). The most frequently used method in social psychology is to include social desirability (SD) scales in other inventories. The extent to which SD responses add nontrait variance to value is typically estimated by the correlation between the variable of interest and one or more SDR measure. In this way the scores of the scales are used to detect those who attempt to present themselves in a favorable light. This may cause problems in validity, because SD itself may be a personality variable that has a substantial component of individual differences. Several studies have shown that traditional social desirability measures may fail at controlling for SDR (eg Borkenau & Ostendorf, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 1983). One possible solution is to apply peer ratings (or ratings by knowledgeable others). Using data from other person, we can approximate the true score with the ratings made by knowledgeable observers. Reports by acquaintances, although based on ordinary social perception just like self-reports, constitute an important validity criterion because their informational basis, as well as the category breadth of the trait descriptors, is at least comparable to those of the self-reports.

There are reason to suspect that the previous results may not represent the truth about the influence of SDR on the on the consensual validity of trait measures. It has been implicitly assumed that only self-reports may be biased by
SDR, and that peer-reports are essentially free of any such biases. The Study IV aims to revisit the issue by using an index of SDR proposed by Hofstee (2003): the sum of items weighted by their respective social desirability values. Based on the results we may conclude that the measure of SDR proposed by Hofstee (2003) called in our research SDI, has several benefits over the traditional measures — it measures directly the degree to which a respondent consistently agrees with socially desirable items and disagrees with undesirable items. While correcting for the SDR may normally remove some valid variance from the scales, in the Study IV it did more good than harm to the consensual validity. Hereby computing the SDI would be useful in most criterion validity studies using different questionnaires.

Personal values are strongly related with the conception of what is desirable in a culture and it is expected that a relationship exists between the SD measures and values even in non-motivational conditions. Some values are more strongly prescribed in a particular context, and some marginally important values are less strongly affected by social expectations. Thus, there may be a certain values that are more inclined to present a false level or disproportionately favorable light. How do we know whether these impressions are accurate or not? One possible solution is to apply peer ratings (or ratings by knowledgeable others). The following data are from our ongoing research project that concentrates on the level of consensus in personal values between individual’s self-reports and other–reports in two different experimental conditions — applying for dreamed job and standard condition. The basis idea behind this kind of study is that people can use values to present themselves to other people in a social desirable way. Low agreement between self- and other-evaluation may indicate the influence of socially desirable responding. The correlations between the self-reports and other-reports are reported in Table 1.

**Table 1. Correlations between Self- and Other-reports in Two Different Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Honest (N = 193)</th>
<th>Applicants (N = 156)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-realization</td>
<td>.25 ***</td>
<td>.24 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enhancement</td>
<td>.51 ***</td>
<td>.32 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>.42 ***</td>
<td>.18 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>.45 ***</td>
<td>.45 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td>.46 ***</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmindedness</td>
<td>.29 ***</td>
<td>.32 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Boldfaced correlations between two samples are statistically \( p < .05 \) different. * \( p < .05 \); ** \( p < .01 \); *** \( p < .001 \).
Almost all correlations with the standard instruction tended to be higher than in the “dream job” condition (except Broadmindedness). The most identifiable personal value was Self-enhancement, the least Self-realization. Not surprisingly — correlations with the standard instruction tended not significantly differ or to be higher than in the “dream job” condition. There was one exception: Broadmindedness, where the correlation between the self- and other-reports was higher in the applicant sample but not significantly.

The low agreement in Self-realization in both conditions may indicate that others have limited knowledge of personal values that focus on respect for oneself and the realization of personal capabilities. In the same ongoing research project we investigate the number of dimensions of SD bias — self-criterion residual analysis (SCR) was applied for the both samples. Different criteria for choosing appropriate factor solution suggested two-factor solution: one marked by the residuals of Self-enhancement and Hedonism values, the other marked by the residuals of Self-realization, Conservatism, Broadmindedness and Benevolence values. Thus, like residual scores of personality and intelligence data, SDR in case of personal values form also two-dimensional space, labeled by their content egoistic and moralistic bias.

The extreme case of giving socially acceptable responses may involve lying (Study V). People in all cultures believe that liars experience fear, shame, or cognitive difficulties (Bond & Robinson, 1988; Ekman, 2001). Associating these psychological states with the same nonverbal cues (Keltner, Ekman, Gonzaga, & Beer, 2003), people worldwide are led to a common stereotype of the liar’s behaviors. Every culture, associates lying with actions that deviate from the local norm. Stereotypes include averting gaze and also references to the liar’s nervousness, speech disturbances, and torso movements. However, a large Western research literature shows that judgments of deception are frequently wrong. So if they do not reflect the real lying behavior, why these stereotypes exist? According to our normative hypothesis, we suppose, that the stereotypes about lying are designed to discourage lies. They are not intended to be descriptive, rather, they embody a worldwide social norm. Through socialization children learn that they should be ashamed when they lie to their parents, and liars should feel bad. Stereotypes of the liar capture and promote these prescriptions and that way they provide social control. This social control works through internal feelings of shame and guilt and lying will make the child feel bad, that the child’s lies will be transparent. Though designed to discourage deception, these stereotypes in fact promote deceit. In describing the liar as deeply affected, they ignore deceivers’ abilities to self-rationalize (Bok, 1999). In predisposing perceivers to miss lies, stereotypes reduce the likelihood of deceit being punished. Although these beliefs about liars imply noble sentiments but actually they are counterproductive.
6. Conclusions

As taken all together, the main conclusions of this dissertation are the following:

- During the lexical analysis of Estonian vocabulary, six factors emerged and were labeled as Benevolence, Self-enhancement, Broadmindedness, Hedonism, Conservatism, and Self-realization (Study I).
- These six factors were only partially interchangeable with the constructs measured by SVS — moderate correlations imply an imperfect correspondence: each theme was related to many categories on the other questionnaire (Study I).
- A significant general structure of EVI refers to the same two-dimensional level of higher-order values described by Schwartz in 1992 — the first dimension is called openness to change versus conservatism, the second self-transcendence versus self-enhancement (Study I).
- Investigating the interrelationship between principles which people desire and what they want to avoid in their lives we found that in general level positive and negative values form two opposite domains that are not completely independent. (Study II).
- The analysis of specific single negative values did not mirror the structure of positive values: they formed a single general negativity factor, which had no significant loadings on any of the six positive value factors (Study II).
- The results in comparison of parenting practices and values indicate that benevolence was positively associated with all parenting practices, but Self-enhancement and Hedonism had negative correlations with all parenting practices. Parents of institutionalized adolescents rated Benevolence and Conservatism higher and broadmindedness lower than parents of non-institutionalized adolescents (Study III).
- Self-peer and peer-peer agreement rose significantly for most studied personality traits when SDI was controlled in both self- and peer-reports. As compared to BIDR scales, the SDI detected faking on personality scales somewhat better. Tour argument is that the SDI is a measure of evaluativeness of a person description, and that people agree more on descriptive than on evaluative aspects of a target’s personality traits (Study IV).
- Study V revealed one dominant pan-cultural stereotype — liars avert gaze everywhere.
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SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN

Eesti väärustuste sõnavara leksikaalne analüüs ja seos sotsiaalselt soovitava vastamise ja kasvatusstiilidega


Seni on Shalom Schwartz'i väärustuse küsimustikku (Schwartz Value Survey — SVS) transporditud ühest kultuurist teise, seda sellele jõudja peale surudes (etic lähenemine). Üks võimalus, mis on oma väärustulikust demonstreeritud isiksuse ja emotsiooonide uurimises, on leksikaalne lähenemine. See lähtub eeldusest, et kõik olulised väärused on jätitud oma jälje keelde ja on seega esindatud seal vastava sõnaga. Mida olulisem on vastav teema neljasse teisesel selges — seda enam ka seda kirjeldavaid väljendeid seal peaks olema. Kuigi isiksuse ja emotsiooonide struktuur paistab olema universaalne ja ühesugune erinevates kultuurides, ei pruugi see kehtida väärustute suhtes, mis on mõjutatud erinevates füüsilistes keskkondades, ajaloost ja majanduslikest tingimustest.

Analüüsi tulemused näitasid, et eesti keeles koonduvad väärusi kirjeldavad sõnad kuude põhilisse rühma: (1) Heasoovlust — see rühm keskendub lähedaste inimeste heaolule, motiveeriv eesmärk on hoida ja saavutada nende inimeste heaolu, kellega me oleme pidevas kontaktis. Püüab olla meeldiv ja avablikkus isik (väärtustab kõrgelt: vastutustuliklikkus, abivalmisus ja avaineloos); (2) Eneseupitamine — keskendub põhiliselt iseenda saavutuste teistele esitamisele, motiveeriv eesmärk on suunatud oma huvidele ja oma isiku esiletevale, seda isegi ise teiste inimeste heaolu arvelt (väärtustab kõrgelt võimu, ambitsioone ja tunnustust); (3) Vaismus — keskendub elu mõtte otsimisele ja seiseharmoonia püüdlustele igapäevaelus, (väärtustab kõrgelt sallivust, loovust, sundimatust); (4) Hedonism keskendub põhiliselt naudingute leidmisele elus ja tunnuste vajadustele rahuldamiselle, arvab et naudingud on kõige olulisemad elus (väärtustab kõrgelt rõhtseterm, seiklemist ja rõõmust elus); (5) Konserveerivus — püüdleb oma elus alalahindlikkusele ja hindab traditsioonilisi väärtusi, ei soovi oma ellu muutusi ja uuendusi, püüab säilitada olemasolevat olukorda (väärtustab kõrgelt ratsionaalsust, töökust ja korda); (6) Eneserealiseerimine —
püüdleb iseseisva mõtlemise ja iseseisva tegevuse poole ning oma võimet täielikule ja igakülgsele realiseerimisele, arvab et elus on kõige aluseks eneseareng (väärtustab kõrgelt eneseteostust, iseseisvust ja enesettäiendamist). Seega võime nentida, et eestlaste püüdlused oma elu juhtimisel on piiritletud kuue põhilise väärtuste grupiga. See muidugi ei tähenda, et eesti keneel olekski ainult kuus üksikut väärtust — tegelikult on need kuus vaid üldistused suurest hulgast üksikutest väärtustest, mis kõik võivad olla kellegile olulised tema elus. Samas saavad kõik need üksikud väärtused olla vaid nende kuue põhiteema arendused — sõnu on palju, kuid teemasid on vähe.


Kuidas lapsevanemad kasvatavad oma lapsi, sõltub paljudeta, milliseid väärtusi nad ise oma elus olulisena on. Sel põhjusel on oluline uurida, kui vanemate väärtushinnangud, kelle lapsed on sattunud erikooli, erinevad tavakoolis käivate laste vanemate väärtushinnangutest. On palju tõendamateriaali, et need on olemas.

Kui algatame eelduse, et inimesed on varmalt valmis jagama ausalt meiega oma isikuseomadusi ja eluväärtusi — siiski on selge, et on olemas mitmeid viise, kuidas sotsiaalne reaalsus võiks mõjutada seda tegemist. Kui inimestele on olulisaks piisavalt motivaatsiooni, siis võivad seda tulemusel tekkida ka muutused teistele isikute olumoodustest ja isiklikest väärtustest. Selle lahkevuse tõkestus on kõige arukam kasutada sotsiaalset reaalsust ehk kuidas inimeste enesehinnangud peakse on selles kolledselt teiste poolt antud hinnangutes. Seda on võimalik realiseerida mitmel moel — näiteks lasta inimesel ise hinnata sotsiaalset enesehinnangut ja sotsiaalist soovitavust ja siis lasta tal ka ennast hinnata, samuti võib võrrelda inimest tundvate mõjuliste isikute hinnanguid selle inimese kohta.

Aärmuslikel juhtudel võivad inimesed oma sotsiaalse „näo” pääsivad väärtustest valetada. Tekkis huvi teada saada, millised on tüüpi mõjulised mõjud, kui aga inimesel inimesel ise hinnata sotsiaalset enesehinnangut ja sotsiaalset soovitavust ja sotsiaalset soovitavust. Kuigi selline arusaam pigem kehastab stereotüüpid arusaama valeta ja kui punastavast ja siliko vältivast indiviidist, ei ole see stereotüüp ilmselt kõikjal sama.

Esitatud uurimustest lähtuvalt on väitekirja põhiseisukohad järgmised:
• Leksikaalne analüüs tulemusena võib välja, et eesti kenele leksikaalne sõnavara hõlmab kuute põhlist teemat, mida nende sisu järgi saab eristada.
kui Heasoolvikkust, Eneseupitamist, Vaimsust, Hedonismi, Konservatiivsust ja Eneserealiseerimist (I uurimus).

• Võrrelduna maailmas tunnustatud etic mõõtmisvahendi (SVS-ga), leidsime, et need kattuvad vaid mõõdukalt. Igal eestikeelsel väärtuste grupil olid seosed SVS-ga, kuid puudus üksühene suhe (I uurimus).

• Üldisel tasemel vastas Eesti väärtuste struktuur pigem Schwartzzi poold 1992 a tuvastatud kõrgele taseme väärtusuumile, kus esimest dimensiooni nimetatakse Avatus muutuseks vs Konservatiivsus ja teist dimensiooni Eneseületamiseks vs Eneseupitamiseks (I uurimus).

• Üritades tuvastada vältitavate printsipide struktuurset paiknemist ihaldatavate väärtuste suhtes, leidsime et üldisel tasemel moodustavad nad tõepoolest vastandid (II uurimus).

• Samas üksikväärtuste tasandil võib väita, et negatiivsed väärtus pole ühega positiivse väärtusega seotud, vaid pigem moodustavad ühe, eraldi-seiswa teema eesti keele leksikonis (II uurimus).


• Kui kontrollida inimeste enese- ja teiste hinnanguid, siis praktiselt kõikide isiksuseomaduste kokkulangevus suurenes. Seega võib väita, et meie poold konstrueeritud sotsiaalse soovitavuse indeks (SDI) mõõdab sotsiaalset soovitavust veidi paremini kui seni tuvastatud BIDR. Meie põhiline argument on, et SDI mõõdab indiviidide kirjeldusele antavat hinnangut ja inimesed nõustuvad enam kirjeldavates kui hinnangulistest isiksuseomadustest aspektides (IV uurimus).

• V uurimuse põhiliseks tulemuseks tulemusiks on see, et on tuvastatud üks kultuurre ületav dominantne stereotüüp valetajate kohta — nimelt oletatakse, et kõik valetajad varjavad oma pilku.
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