Interpreting Kahle's List of Values: Being Respected, Security, and Self-Fulfillment in Context

Alex Thompson

Faculty Sponsor: Timothy Gongaware, Department of Sociology and Archaeology

ABSTRACT

This study explores the validity of Kahle's List of Values through a qualitative exploration of the meanings individuals attach to the component values. This paper specifically explores the values of security, being respected, and self-fulfillment as defined by a sample of undergraduate students. Using the diary-interview method, fourteen undergraduates from a Midwestern university wrote subjective definitions of each value label. These definitions were clustered and analyzed through qualitative content analysis. While there are patterns to the diversity, there is significant variance among respondent interpretations of each value. Consequently, no single inclusive definition could be derived for any of the values examined. The definitional patterns as well as their implications for the design of the List of Values and further associated research are explored.

INTRODUCTION

While it has been a staple of social scientific investigation for over a century, the study of cultural values is an ever-evolving practice reliant on continual improvement. Beginning in the latter part of the 20th century, value studies were largely explorations of value salience. During this period, there was an influx of survey tools aimed at measuring the relationship between disparate cultural value internalization and individual behavior. However, researchers often employed cursory understandings of values and the methods by which to measure them accurately. Williams (1979) points out:

> The term 'values' has been used variously to refer to interests, pleasures, likes, preferences, duties, moral obligations, desires, wants, goals, needs, aversions, attractions, and many other kinds of selective orientations. (P. 16)

Therefore, a lack of uniformity in measurement has been a long-standing issue in this body of research.

It is upon this divergence between value salience survey tools in regards to their representation of values that I focus in the current study. While instruments such as the Rokeach (1973) Value Survey and Schwartz (1987) Value Survey provide respondents with clear definitions of the measured values, Kahle's (1983) List of Values only provides value labels and not definitions of them. This becomes significant when considering that meanings individuals attach to cultural values have been found, in previous research contexts, to be strongly correlated with such factors as one's gender (Prince-Gibson and Schwartz 1998; Struch, Schwartz, and Van Der Kloot 2002), sexual orientation (Broad et. al. 2004), and food preference (Allen et. al. 2000). More generally, Waters (1990) and Hechter (1993) have established that individuals lack a complete awareness of what their values are or what they mean to them. Such findings begin to call the design of the List of Values into question.

Drawing from the results of 14 diary-interviews, previous literature, and symbolic interactionism, I question the validity of Kahle's List of Values. I propose that a researcher cannot assume analogous respondent definitions of or approaches to broad cultural value labels. To accurately measure cultural values, I propose a move away from approaching them as fixed shared symbols. Rather, to be a valid measure, tools such as the List of Values may need to control for the various meanings individuals attach to them.

THE LIST OF VALUES

Drawing from and simplifying Maslow's (1954), Feather's (1975), and, most significantly, Rokeach's (1973) earlier developed tools for measuring value salience, Kahle (1983) and others (Veroff et. al. 1981) developed the List of Values (LOV). The LOV is based on Kahle's (1983) Social Adaptation Theory, positing that an "individual actively filters societal and cultural demands, refining and redefining values in the process, in order to enhance their adaptive worth" (p. 49). The LOV is posited to contain the nine core American values: self-respect, security, warm relationships with others, self fulfillment, a sense of accomplishment, being respected, a sense of belonging, fun and

enjoyment, and excitement (Beatty et. al. 1985:186).Concerned primarily with market research, Kahle created the LOV in order to measure cultural values as a determinant of consumer behavior.

Corresponding with its original purpose, the LOV has been used in recent years in various market research contexts (Keng et. al. 2000; Kim 2005; Bloemer and Dekker 2007). Elsewhere, it has been used to investigate the relationship between value internalization and juvenile delinquency (Goff and Goddard 1999), "at risk" lifestyles (Sjoberg and Engelberg 2005), and alcohol consumption (Shim et. al. 2005; Shim and Maggs 2005). Respondents within these studies, and others utilizing the LOV, are provided with a list of the nine values listed above and asked to either rank or rate the importance of each within their daily life.

The individual's highest ranked or rated value is their "dominant value" and determines the "value segment" into which he or she will be placed (Beatty et. al. 1985: 186; Kahle et. al. 1986:406). Those within the same value segment are thought to harbor similar beliefs, attitudes, activities, purchasing habits, and the like (Kahle 1983). With the respondents' respective value segments measured and assigned, marketers can then explore correlations between value segments, demographic characteristics, and dependent variables. A potential problem exists, though, in considering the validity of the data and conclusions yielded within these studies through the use of the LOV.

Unlike the Rokeach (1973) Value Survey (RVS) upon which it is based, Kahle's List of Values does not dictate that respondents be given definitions of the values they are asked to reflect upon (Kahle 1986). For example, in addition to asking a respondent to rank the importance of the value of "Self-Respect," the RVS additionally provides the respondent with "self-esteem" as a descriptor. The lack of such descriptors in the LOV may mean that it is an invalid measure of value salience.

Without a descriptor to establish a common approach to each value, each respondent to the LOV may not be rating the same set of values. As Kamakura and Novak (1992) point out, they may be rating their own subjective interpretations of them instead:

> The implications are potentially important because, if certain values have multiple interpretations, the classification of individuals into value segments on the basis of the single most important value may be misleading. (P.121)

Lindesmith and colleagues (1999) propose that this possibility for an array of interpretations exists because of the way in which we attach meaning to the symbolic world. Specifically, they state:

> The meaning of an object or a word is determined by the responses that are made to it; that is, meaning is a relationship and not an essence. It is easy to fall into the habit of locating a word's meaning in the word itself. But, […] meanings arise out of group activities, and they come to stand for relationships between actors and objects. (P. 77)

Such a symbolic interactionist approach guides this exploration of respondent interpretation of Kahle's (1986) List of Values.

As with every symbol, cultural values do not possess meaning outside of the individual social actor. The subjective meanings we attach to the objective world develop within our unique interactions. Within them, "step by step, values and meanings get generalized and expressed in standardized symbols" (Schubert 2006:65) such as the nine values within the LOV. As such, I propose that while cultural values, as Rokeach (1973:24) states, "are transmitted and preserved in successive generations through one or more of society's institutions," individuals attach varying meanings to their symbolic representations. Not only does this have significant bearing on the methods used to measure cultural values, but also on formal and informal discourse referencing them.

In the following pages, I explore data gathered in the fall of 2008 through diary interviews of 14 randomly selected undergraduate college students at a Midwestern public university. Each participant was asked to write a subjective definition of each value making up the List of Values. These definitions were subjected to a content analysis in order to explore the degree of similarity between each respondent's interpretations of each value. This study sought to challenge Kahle's assertion that "definitive conclusions [cannot] be reached about the relative importance of common meanings that might be important for certain individuals or groups of individuals" (1983:282). As the trends found in the respondents' writings are explored below, the first step is taken towards reaching these "definitive conclusions."

METHOD

The participants in this study were drawn in the fall of 2008 from a randomly generated list of 300 undergraduate students attending a mid-sized, public, Midwestern university of approximately 9,000 undergraduate students. A telephone invitation was successfully extended to 291 students. Of those invited to take part in the study, 25 initially agreed to participate.

The final usable data set was composed of responses from 14 randomly chosen undergraduate students (8 women; 6 men). The respondents included 5 freshman, 1 sophomore, 2 juniors, and 6 seniors. The students' majors

were located within the colleges of Business Administration (4), Liberal Studies (5), and Science and Health (5). The sample was predominately made up of Caucasian students (13) reared within the Midwestern United States. Participant religiosity, measured by frequency of religious service attendance, was predominantly low to moderate (9) but also included high (2) and no service attendance (2). Reported religious affiliations included Protestant (5), Catholic (2), Agnostic (2), Unspecified Other (2), Evangelical (1), and Unaffiliated (1). Participant social class, measured by parent education level and home town population, principally fell between middle and working class.

Each participant was invited to attend a mass or one-on-one informational meeting in order to receive participation materials and to provide informed consent. Each student was provided with a leather legal pad portfolio and pen to be used during the project, and then kept afterwards as an incentive. They additionally received an overview of the study objectives, a demographic survey, and an instructional form.

The "diary-interview" method allowed for the subjective respondent input needed for this investigation (Zimmerman and Wieder 1977; Lofland et. al. 2006:19). Following this method, each respondent was given ten days to write a one paragraph definition for each of the nine values on Kahle's (1986) LOV. This journaling period was chosen in order to provide the participants with a flexible schedule while ensuring that a level of continuity could develop in their approach to the topic.

To assist them in creating a detailed definition for each value, the respondents were provided with prompting questions. Among these were: "What is a 'real world' example?" and "How might you explain it to a young child?" More specificity was likely needed here, however, because the validity of the resulting data set was somewhat weakened by disorganized respondent writings and a lack of compliance to the prescribed approach. Multiple respondents provided one word and incomplete sentences and/or answered the prompting questions without providing any further explanation.

Following the journaling period, each participant anonymously returned his or her entries to a designated drop box. The final usable data set of 14 student responses was subjected to a thorough content analysis. This process was facilitated by the qualitative data analysis computer software NVivo 8. The process began with the development of broad data categories in "open coding" of each value (Berg 2004:278). Recurring definition components in sentences or word groups were labeled, grouped, and subdivided. The outcome of this process was distinct categories containing homogenous student definitional components for each value (Berg 2004).

RESULTS

The results from this study show significant variance between respondent portrayals of each value. In their descriptions, each student drew upon distinct and varying themes in unique approaches to each concept. The overall result, then, was that while discrete definitional patterns arose for each concept, no single inclusive definition could be derived for any value on the List of Values. The remainder of this paper explores patterns in the primary themes, which emerged for each of three values on the LOV: being respected, security, and self-fulfillment.

These three values have been chosen from among the nine in the LOV because they are among those not present, as written, within the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS), the primary tool drawn from for theoretical support in the development of the LOV (Rokeach 1973; Beatty et. al. 1985). Within the RVS, "being respected" is worded as "social recognition," "security" is worded as both "family security" and "national security," and "self-fulfillment" is worded as "inner harmony" (Rokeach 1973:28; Beatty et. al. 1985:190). As is explored below, beginning with "being respected," this change in wording may also have meant a change in respondent interpretation of the measured value.

Being Respected

The major theme throughout the respondents' descriptions of "being respected" was what previous researchers have termed as *treatment according to fair procedures* (c.f. Simon and Sturmer 2003). Student responses often referenced one being courteous, nice, kind, or empathetic in their attempts to define being respected. As one female stated:

> Being respected is being treated fairly and sincerely, not interrupting someone, not saying things to hurt someone's feelings, and treating others how you want to be treated.

In her description, and that of others, an often-reported corollary of being respected was being listened to or listening to another. Elsewhere another woman stated this quite well in asserting that being respected is "the motivator for being treated with dignity, having your opinions listened to, and commanding uninterrupted attention." However, while students broadly viewed being respected as *treatment according to fair procedures*, their opinions diverged regarding whether this fair treatment is an ascribed right or an achieved privilege.

Being Respected as an Ascribed Right. Three female respondents described being respected as treatment afforded to all individuals. These definitions were grounded in, as one freshman wrote, “treating others how you want to be treated.” The senior woman's response below encapsulates this idea:

> I would define it as treating a person well, whether or not they agree with that person or not. By treating the person well, I mean behaving with them politely, and believing they deserve kind treatment and opportunities in life just as anyone else.

Her definition not only demonstrates the perception of being respected as connected with reciprocity and empathy but also demonstrates the conception of this value as treatment according to fair procedures. This entire conceptualization of being respected seems to be based on the awareness of a supposed truth that, “Everyone wants their peers, family, elders, and more to respect and show that respect for them,” as a female underclassman wrote.

Being Respected as an Achieved Privilege. Conversely, a majority of the participants described being respected as an achieved privilege. This notion can be seen in a male upperclassman’s assertion that someone “cannot expect it, you can only earn it.” Colwell (2007) found respect defined similarly, as deserved when an individual possesses qualities which the other values. Drawing from them each in creative and unique ways, the students in this study cited respecting others, status attainment, role fulfillment, and cognitive originality as the major ways in which an individual earns the privilege of being respected. A female upperclassman simplified this complicated web of pathways to being respected in admitting “one can be respected in many ways.”

Being respected was, at various points, described as treatment earned during interactions with others. One man wrote: “I think of this as a two way street. In order for you to receive respect, you should have to give it.” Since, according to this subset of students, this treatment must be achieved, it may be lost as well. A female underclassman explained: “If you are bossy or aggressive, people may act like they respect you but really don’t.” However, one man contradicted this opinion in describing an occasional necessity to “aggressively pursue the complete respect of others.” Consequently, it seems that a delicate balance of aggression and passivity must be achieved for one to be respected.

An alternative conception, presented by five males, of achieved respect was as “something that is extended to an individual because of accomplishments,” as one upperclassman wrote. Another upperclassman referenced status positions of “reverence or honor” and others alluded to parents, mafia leaders, school bullies, teachers, and professional athletes. One student described this requirement for accomplishments or status as “people treating you appropriately given your age, statuses, merits, etc.” He went on to write, “being respected means others treat you how they would want to be treated if they were you, had accomplished the same things you have.” Being respected is viewed in one way, then, as treatment bestowed onto someone because of their occupancy within an achieved and valued status position. Alternately, others described this treatment as earned through one’s actions.

In describing what it means to be respected, three female students referenced the fulfillment of role requirements as a significant prerequisite. Fiske and colleagues (2002) discuss respect in this way, as distinct from liking and primarily conferred onto and individual because of their perceived competence. While a sophomore reported that respected individuals are those who “go about their business in a reasonable and intelligent way,” a freshman reported “being respected means people look to you as being a good role model.” So, while there is an underlying agreement that respect is something conferred on to those meeting their role expectations, the degree to which this is necessary is not clear; at least within this study.

Finally, in defining being respected, three female respondents referenced possessing, what I refer to as, cognitive originality as one condition for such treatment. An upperclassman wrote that this pertains to “many different things including ideas, beliefs, [and] thoughts.” Another upperclassman extended this definition in describing being respected as “when someone values you for your ideas, as outrageous as they may be.” The underlying thread within these responses was that an individual can earn respectful treatment through confidence in a unique perspective of the world.

Security

The common thread seen throughout student descriptions of “security” is recurrent reference to safety. Due to the high frequency with which the word “safety” is used and the way it is often substituted for security, it seems the students view the two concepts as synonymous. A male upperclassman illustrates this trend with his assertion that the “first thing that comes to mind when I hear the word security is safety. I would define security as being safe and free of dangers.” Drawing upon this idea, three students expressed security as a type of macro safety.

These students described security, as has been found in other investigations (Maslow 1954; Padgett 2007; Aujoulat et. al. 2008), as characterized by comfort, protection, preparation, and stability throughout one’s life. This seems appropriate given Maslow’s notion of safety, from which Kahle drew, as a universal need for protection and stability in regards to one’s body, health, employment, resources, morality, and property (Maslow 1954). A female

underclassman expressed this as “a feeling of knowing for sure you are safe or prepared” and a male upperclassman as “being able to feel comfort and stability in the environment.” However, such inclusive definitions were not seen throughout the responses. A proportion of the student respondents specifically referenced personal, financial, and/or relationship security.

Personal Security. Within the general idea of security as safety, one way in which students conceptualized security was as protection from physical harm. This definition is in line with what Arias and Rodrigues (2006) term *personal security,* and is well demonstrated by a freshman female’s response:

> To me security is being safe and feeling safe. [It] is how you feel tucked in at night in bed with the nightlight on and knowing mom and dad are there to protect you. Security is being protected, it means you are not in harm’s way and you are safe. A good example is when walking home late at night it is a good idea to walk with someone, that is your security.

This predominant focus on security as feeling and taking measures to be protected from physical harm is the primary focus of this conceptualization of security. In discussing this, other students referenced “the security of our president,” a necessity to “lock your doors,” and reliance on the ability to “call the police and expect them to arrive within a normal amount of time.” This idea of, as a male upperclassman wrote, “being safe and free of dangers” arose alongside that of financial security.

Financial Security. Financial security, explored in depth by Litt (2004) and Tosi (2005) was a commonly referenced theme in student descriptions of security. “I immediately think of financial security in the sense of having bills paid, an emergency fund, and being able to purchase necessities,” wrote a female upperclassman. As such, students often, tacitly, reference stability, protection, and solvency in their descriptions of financial security. Or, as senior male put it, security is “where a sound, safe, and stable financial and career future is ensured.” This conception of security as financial protection and forethought was also complimented by other students’ references to relationship security.

Relationship Security. Relationship security, characterized by sensitive and responsive treatment, comfort, and support (Diamond and Hicks 2005), was referenced by four females students and one male as a chief component of security. A female described this as “having people in your life you can count on for support, and [to be] accountable in times of need.” As in her response, relationship security was largely described as being in a respectful relationship characterized by comfort and a feeling of mutual protection. A female underclassman chose to focus specifically her relationship with her family “as a security system in my life because they protect me.” This overall conceptualization is quite similar to one component of Rokeach’s (1973) original conception of security, “family security,” characterized as “taking care of loved ones” (28).

Self-Fulfillment

The students’ definitions of self-fulfillment, what Maslow (1954:91-92) referred to as “the tendency for [man] to become actualized in what he is potentially,” conformed to three conceptualizations of the concept. These include self-fulfillment as overall situational happiness, as high self-esteem resulting from altruistic acts, and as an unspecified emotional state subsequent to the accomplishment of goals of varying number and significance. One man’s assertion that “the definition of this value really varies,” becomes apparent in exploring these interpretations further.

Self-Fulfillment as Happiness and Contentedness. One way in which the respondents described self-fulfillment was as happiness and contentedness with life. “This is about how you feel inside,” wrote a female underclassman, “it is a good feeling about being truly happy and having everything you want right then and there.” As this woman referenced, this subset of the respondents wrote of self-fulfillment as being synonymous with happiness. Or as a male upperclassman put it: “If you were to ask someone if they are happy with what they are doing, and they say yes, they are self-fulfilled.” This conception conforms to Rokeach’s definition of self-fulfillment as “inner harmony” characterized by “freedom from inner conflict” (Rokeach 1973:28).

Self-Fulfillment as High Self-Esteem through Altruism. An additional student characterization of self-fulfillment was of this concept as high self-esteem resulting from altruistic acts, as described below in a male underclassman’s description:

> [Self-fulfillment] makes me think of feeling good about yourself at the end of the day. I would say a real world example would be opening a door for a person or any sense of helping someone.

Students describing self-fulfillment in this way alluded to, as in the above passage, volunteer work, donation, and making a difference within their community. This definition is in line with Britt and Heise’s (1992) assertion that only social actions, not those self-directed, are self-fulfilling. Out of such acts, the students reported an increase in self-esteem, in their approval and liking of themselves (Blascovich and Tomaka 1991). A female underclassman reported being “satisfied, happy with yourself. Being self-fulfilled means to me that you are completely confident,

comfortable, and happy within your own self." In this sense, the type of altruism described by the students is that outlined by Weisbrod (1990): altruism directed towards self-gratification.

Self-Fulfillment as the Accomplishment of Goals. The final major theme, which arose in student definitions of self-fulfillment, was the description of this concept as an emotion out of the realization of goals. A female upperclassman described it in such a way:

> Self-fulfillment can be defined as striving toward your dreams and challenging yourself to achieve difficult goals. An example of that is college. Self-fulfillment can be attained by passing difficult classes and eventually acquiring a degree.

In this case, she expresses self-fulfillment as an unspecified emotional state reached in the process of striving for and achieving difficult personal goals. As one woman's description illustrates below, however, others students extended this to the accomplishment of the entirety of an individual's goals.

> Self-fulfillment is living everything the way you want to not the way others want you to. Examples of this [are] getting the career you always wanted to, traveling wherever you want, and doing everything you want to before you die.

Under this view, one can be self-fulfilled, according to an upperclassman male, "when all their goals and aspirations in life have been met." Self-fulfillment, then, rather than being viewed as a fixed emotion resulting from fixed conditions, was described by some as an unspecified emotional state resulting from the realization of goals of varying significance and number.

DISCUSSION

Although this study is limited by a relatively small sample size of undergraduate students drawn from a single university, its implications are considerable and far reaching. The meanings undergraduate students communicated for the symbolic representations of cultural values varied significantly. As is explored first in a reconsideration of being respected, this is not only apparent in the results from this study but also in those of previous research.

In the current exploration, "being respected" was defined broadly by the undergraduate sample as fair treatment characterized by normative interpersonal interaction. This was viewed by some as an ascribed human right and by others as achieved through one's treatment of others, status attainment, role fulfillment, or cognitive originality. Somewhat disparately, within the Rokeach Value Survey, being respected is conceived of as "social recognition" characterized by admiration (Rokeach 1973:28). Elsewhere respect has been characterized as treating another in accordance with their perceived value (Lawrence-Lightfoot 2000) and as liking by other in-group members (Branscombe et. al. 2002; Simon and Sturmer 2003).

The participants within this study, as they have in previous research, defined "security" as largely synonymous with safety. The respondents referenced comfort, protection, preparation, and stability in their efforts to describe this concept. However, the life realms within which these conditions were necessary, in order for one to feel secure, varied greatly. While a number of students communicated security as a macro phenomenon, characterizing all of one's life, others showed a great deal of specificity. A majority of the students wrote expressly of personal, financial, and/or relationship security. While relationship security is quite similar to Rokeach's (1973) "family security," the other sub-themes found within this study do not include what Rokeach felt to be the other half of security, "national security" described as "protection from attack" (Rokeach 1973:28).

The definitions produced for "self-fulfillment," by the current student sample, were distinct, variant, and both coincide with and stand in opposition to previous conceptualizations. Self-fulfillment was described, in this study, in three discrete manners. It was presented as overall situational happiness, high self-esteem resulting from altruistic acts, and as an unspecified emotional state subsequent to the accomplishment of goals. While Britt and Heise's (1992) conclusion, that only social actions are self-fulfilling, supports the altruistic interpretation, it also opposes that involving goal accomplishment on the grounds that self-directed action decreases self-fulfillment. Additionally, Yankelovich's (1981) conception of self-fulfillment, as respect and material support received from one's community in exchange for their loyal work to support it, failed to arise in any form within this study.

CONCLUSIONS

While this study is only the first step in reaching what Kahle (1986) referred to as: "definitive conclusions […] about the relative importance of common meanings that might be important for certain individuals or groups" in cultural value measurement, it is one step in the right direction (p. 282). The results from this study raise the possibility that Kahle's (1983) List of Values is not made up of fixed symbols with collectively held meanings. Rather, these cultural values seem to conform to the penchant of all symbols to be assigned unique meanings within individuals' diverse interactions. While there are some patterns to the diversity – each person's definition is not

mutually exclusive of others' – there is not a single, simple definition that is common to all the respondents. As such, Kahle's (1983) List of Values, in its reliance on like respondent approach to cultural value labels, may not be a measure of respondent evaluation of nine cultural values. This tool may, more accurately, be a measure of respondent evaluation of the meanings they attach to symbolic representations of nine cultural values. This revelation has considerable significance for the design of the List of Values.

Given the diverse interpretations, presented here, of the values making up the List of Values, it may be necessary to redesign the list to mirror similar tools. Akin to Kahle's LOV, the Schwartz (1987) Value Survey (SVS) utilizes a rating approach, is aimed at measuring value salience, and was modeled after Rokeach's (1973) Value Survey. However, the two diverge in design in one significant way. The SVS provides respondents with clear definitions of each value they are asked to rate (Hitlin and Piliavin 2004). Though the SVS has yet to be explored for validity in the way that the LOV has been here, its design may possibly allow for a measure of control over the issue of subjective respondent interpretation that, as found in the present study, may afflict the LOV.

The results from this study also begin to call for a broad appreciation for the subjectivity inherent in cultural values in general. These concepts are often treated as possessing meaning outside of the individual. However, considering the abundant and potentially divergent meanings individuals associate with cultural values, this may not be the case. Consequently, within discourse, formal and informal alike, references to "security," "respect," or any such concept may inadvertently produce instances of miscommunication and conflict. These and other conclusions in this study, though, are as of yet preliminary speculation requiring confirmation through extensive future investigations.

Future research on the validity of Kahle's List of Values should focus on acquiring a larger, representative sample from which generalizable data can be obtained. However, a larger sample will likely require an alternate approach from that utilized here. While the method used within this study was feasible due to a small sample size, within a larger study of this nature, it may be cumbersome. As such, the results from this investigation may assist in the creation of a quantitative tool more appropriate to a larger sample. Alternately, if an interview method is utilized, a more traditional approach should replace that used here. The data in the present study was somewhat restricted by semi-incoherent respondent writings and a lack of conformity to the prescribed approach. Lastly, future explorations should consider the modest correlation, which arose in this data set between a student's sex and her/his description of security and being respected.

As it has been since its inception, the study of cultural values is complicated by issues of measurement uniformity, conceptualization, and respondent interpretation. Researchers, such as Kahle (1983), have drawn from preceding investigative revelations in an attempt to overcome these difficulties and to create valid measures of the significance of cultural values within our social world. I do not propose that Kahle's List of Values should no longer be utilized. On the contrary, I propose that this tradition of successive advancements in value research continue. As Kahle (1983) wrote in closing the foundational piece for the List of Values, "for the social scientist who wants to research on, replicate, or advance what we have learned, these data provide a starting place" (p. 283). Following further investigation, the List of Values may be made a more valid measure of value salience through accounting for subjective respondent interpretation of cultural value labels.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Dr. Timothy Gongaware, the Department of Sociology and Archaeology at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, and the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse Undergraduate Research Grants Program for making this study possible.

REFERENCES

Allen, Michael W., Marc Wilson, Sik Hung Ng, Michael Dume. 2000. "Values and Beliefs of Vegetarians and Omnivores." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 140(4): 405-422.

Arias, Enrique D. and Crinne D. Rodrigues. 2006. "The Myth of Personal Security: Criminal Gangs, Dispute Resolution, and Identity in Rio de Janeiro's Favelas." *Latin American Politics and Society* 48(4):53-81.

Aujoulat, Isabelle, Renzo Marcolongo, Leopoldo Bonadiman, and Alain Deccache. 2008. "Reconsidering Patient Empowerment in Chronic Illness: A Critique of Models of Self-Efficacy and Bodily Control." *Social Science & Medicine* 66:1228-1239.

Beatty, Sharon E., Lynn R. Kahle, Pamela Homer, and Shekhar Misra. 1985. "Alternative Measurement Approaches to Consumer Values: The List of Values and the Rokeach Value Survey." *Psychology & Marketing* 2(3):181-200.

Berg, Bruce L. 2004. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences.* 5th ed. Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.

Blascovich, Jim and Joseph Tomaka. 1991. "Measures of Self-Esteem." Pp. 115-160 in *Measures of Personality and Social Psychology Attitudes."* New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Bloemer, Josee and David Dekker. "Effects of Personal Values on Customer Satisfaction." *International Journal of Bank Marketing* 25(5):276-291.

Branscombe, Nyla, Russell Spears, Naomi Ellemers, and Bertjan Doosje. 2002. "Intragroup and Intergroup Evaluation Effects on Group Behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 28:744-753.

Britt, Lory and David R. Heise. 1992. "Impressions of Self-Directed Action." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 55:335-350.

Broad, Kendal L., Sara L. Crawley, and Lara Foley. 2004. "Doing 'Real Family Values': The Interpretive Practice of Families in the GLBT Movement." *The Sociological Quarterly* 45(3):509-527.

Colwell, Brian. 2007. "Deference or Respect? Status Management Practices Among Prison Inmates." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70(4):442-460.

Diamond, Lisa M. and Angela M. Hicks. 2005. "Attachment Style, Current Relationship Security, and Negative Emotions: The Mediating Role of Physiological Regulation." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 22(4):499-518.

Feather, Norman T. 1975. *Values in Education and Society.* New York: Free Press.

Fiske, Susan, Amy J. Cuddy, Peter Glick, and Jun Xu. 2002. "A Model of (Often Mixed) Stereotype Content: Competence and Warmth Respectively Follow from Perceived Status and Competition." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82:878-902.

Hechter, Michael. 1993. "Values Research in the Social and Behavioral Sciences." Pp. 1-28 in *The Origin of Values* edited by Michael Hechter, Lynn Nadel, and Richard Michod. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Hitlin, Steven, Jane Allyn Piliavin. 2004. "Values: Reviving a Dormant Concept. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 359-393.

Kahle, Lynn R. ed. 1983. *Social Values and Social Change: Adaptation to Life in America.* New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.

Kahle, Lynn, Sharron E. Beatty, Pamela Homer. 1986. "Alternative Measurement Approaches to Consumer Values: The List of Values (LOV) and Life Styles (VALS)." *Journal of Consumer Research* 13: 405-409.

Kamakura, Wagner A. and Thomas P. Novak. "Value-System Segmentation: Exploring the Meaning of LOV." *The Journal of Consumer Research* 19(1):119-132.

Keng, Kau Ah, Kwon Jung, Soo Jiuan, Jachoen Wirtz. 2000. "The Influence of Materialistic Inclination on Values, Life Satisfaction, and Aspirations: An Empirical Analysis." *Social Indicators Research* 49(3): 317-333.

Kim, Hye-Shin. "Consumer Profiles of Apparel Product Involvement and Values." *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management* 9(2):207-220.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, Sarah. 2000. *Respect.* Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Lindesmith, Alfred R., Anselm L. Strauss, and Norman K. Denzin. 1999. *Social Psychology.* 8th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Litt, Jacquelyn. 2004. "Women's Carework in Low-Income Households: The Special Case of Children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder." *Gender and Society* 18(5):625-644.

Lofland, John, David Snow, Leon Anderson, Lyn H. Lofland. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth\Thompson Learning Inc.

Maslow, Abraham H. 1954. *Motivation and Personality.* New York: Harper.

Padgett, Deborah K. 2007. "There's no Place Like (a) Home: Ontological Security Among Persons with Serious Mental Illness in the United States." *Social Science & Medicine* 64:1925-1936.

Prince-Gibson, Eetta and Shalom Schwartz. 1998. "Value Priorities and Gender." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 61:49-67.

Rokeach, Milton. 1973. *The Nature of Human Values.* NY: The Free Press.

Schubert, Hans J. 2006. "The Foundation of Pragmatic Sociology: Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead." *Journal of Classical Sociology* 6(1):51-74.

Schwartz, Shalom H., Wolfgang Bilsky. 1987. "Toward a Psychological Structure of Human Values." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 53: 550-62.

Shim, Soyeon and Jennifer L. Maggs. 2005. "A Psychographic Analysis of College Student's Alcohol Consumption: Implications for Prevention and Consumer Education." *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal* 33(3): 255-273.

Simon, Bernd and Stefan Sturmer. 2003. “Respect for Group Members: Intragroup Determinants of Collective Identification and Group-Serving Behavior.” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 29:183-193.

Sjoberg, Jennart and Elisabeth Engelberg. 2005. “Lifestyles and Risk Perception Consumer Behavior.” *International Review of Sociology* 15(2): 327-362.

Struch, Naomi, Shalom H. Schwartz, and Willem A. Van Der Kloot. 2002. “Meanings of Basic Values for Women and Men: A Cross-Cultural Analysis.” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 28 (1): 16-28.

Tosi, Antonio. 2005 “Re-Housing and Social Reintegration of Homeless People: A Case Study from Milan.” *Innovation* 18(2):183-203.

Veroff, Joseph, Elizabeth Douvan, and Richard Kulka. 1981. *The Inner American.* New York: Basic Books.

Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options Choosing Identities in America.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Weisbrod, Burton, A. 1990. “Toward a Theory of the Voluntary Non-Profit Sector in a Three Sector Economy.” in *The Nonprofit Organization: Essential Readings,* edited by David L. Geis, Steven Ott, and Jay M. Shafritz. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Williams, Robin M. 1979. “Change and Stability in Values and Value Systems.” Pp. 15-46 in *Understanding Human Values: Individual and Societal,* edited by Milton Rokeach. New York: Free Press.

Yankelovich, Daniel. 1981. *New Rules: Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down.*New York: McGraw-Hill.

Zimmerman, Don H., D. L. Wieder. 1977. “The Diary-Interview Method.” *Urban Life* 5: 479-98.