Traditionalism, Modernism, Postmodernism - Worldview Analysis in the Context of Values

MIROSŁAWA CZERNIAWSKA
Faculty of Engineering Management
Bialystok University of Technology
45A Wiejska Street, Bialystok 15-351
POLAND

JOANNA SZYDŁO
Faculty of Engineering Management
Bialystok University of Technology
45A Wiejska Street, Bialystok 15-351
POLAND

Abstract: This study aims to diagnose three worldviews were: traditionalism, modernism and postmodernism (all of them relate to the stages of Western culture described by Bauman) and value systems (referring to the Rokeach theory). The constructs were measured according to the Borowiak Questionnaire "How do you view yourself and the world around you?" and the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS). The research was conducted on a sample of 368 Polish students. The authors sought answers to the question of which values – collectivist or individualistic – are associated with the indicated worldviews. It appeared that a worldview and values (giving a desired direction in life) are linked in the following manner: a traditionalist worldview is correlated with collectivist values, modernist and postmodernist worldviews – with individualist values (although these values do not overlap).

1 Introduction

In 2020 WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economic published an article of our authorship [1] which presented the results of the research on the relationship between a worldview and values. Three types of worldviews were taken into account: traditionalist, modernist and postmodernist. They were measured according to the Borowiak Questionnaire "How do you view yourself and the world around you?". Values were analysed from the point of view of Schwartz's model. The author placed nineteen types of values in two bipolar dimensions: conservation – openness to change, and self-transcendence – self-enhancement. The study incorporated the Schwartz Portrait Value Questionnaire (PVQ-R3). In interpreting the relationship between the two constructs, the research involved a more general criterion differentiating values, i.e. individualism – collectivism. In the indicated paper [1] a map of research trends was presented, based on the co-occurrence of the authors' keywords in publications referring to values and worldviews (Figure 2, p. 595), and literature review was made. Becoming

familiar with this information ensures a theoretical and empirical perspective for the research described below.

Also, this paper will focus on analysing the relationship between a worldview and values. However, the study uses a different tool to measure values, i.e. the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS). The authors were interested in whether the results described in the previous article [1] would be confirmed. Therein, the traditionalist worldview is associated with collectivist values, while modernist and postmodernist worldviews are associated with individualistic ones. Due to the fact that in this study the authors undertake the same research problem (although the research is based on a different tool to diagnose the value system), they use excerpts from the earlier article [cf. 1]. These refer to the characteristics of worldviews (p. 596) and the characteristics included in the Borowiak Questionnaire "How do you view yourself and the world around you?" (p. 599). In the same way, the research problem was formulated (p. 599).

Although the relationship between worldview and values is subject to theoretical and empirical

analyses [cf. literature review in: 1], the diagnosis of these constructs and their operationalisation is a binding problem. This study adopts a particular way of understanding worldview and takes into account its historical transformations (traditionalism, modernism and postmodernism). Such an approach arouses interest in social sciences, but empirical works based on such an understanding of worldview are rare. This is mainly due to the lack of tools to measure this construct. The interest in values goes back to antiquity and since then – especially on the grounds of philosophy – many concepts of values have been born. They can be considered according to different categories and thus focus on different aspects. This determines different ways of measuring values. Therefore, it seems advisable to confront different tools for the diagnosis of value systems and determine their relationship with the worldview. This and an earlier article by the authors [1] are devoted to solving this problem (and thus filling the research gap). The aim of the paper is to characterise the traditionalist, modernist and postmodernist worldviews by means of their associated values, as well as to capture the specificity of these relationships by referring to a more general criterion, i.e. individualism – collectivism. The second aim – of methodological nature – is to compare the obtained outcomes with the results described in an earlier publication [1], in which a different tool was used to diagnose value systems.

Values (understood as abstract concepts) and a worldview are to some extent convergent constructs as they are based on the status of beliefs that determine a person's attitude to reality. However, as Bar-Tal [2] notes, the degree of connections between beliefs may vary: some form a large system, some form a small one, and some remain in isolation. Not all beliefs, and not in every domain, need to remain in a necessity relationship. It seems interesting to ask, then, how coherent is the relationship between worldviews and values? It should be noted that the existence of structural ties is emphasized at the definition level: a worldview is a system of beliefs about the world, nature, mankind and human's place in the world, linked to a system of values [3]. Values become in this approach a constitutive element of the worldview. Both constructs are legitimized by their complex genesis, in which cultural, institutional, personal and situational factors play an important role. Their formation is also an important formative task for an individual.

2 Values in the Light of Milton Rokeach's Theory

A value, according to Rokeach [4], is a belief containing an emotional component; it forms a certain system of references within which a person is able to interpret and evaluate reality and, consequently, guide his or her behaviour. "A value is an enduring belief 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" [4]. The author suggests that the total number of values cherished by people is relatively small and, furthermore, wherever they are – all people know the same values. Thus, differences between people do not rest in the recognition of the existence of different values, but in the variation in the level of their acceptance. The different level of acceptance of values necessitates allocating them into certain systems which are understood as "an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance" [4]. A system in which individual values function in a mutually dependent way is characterized by a certain organization. This may lead to situations where a particular individual can indicate values of relatively higher importance, which then – in conflict situations – allows for choosing actions related to these values. An individual value system is a learned organization of rules of choice and conflict resolution [5]. In the course of their development, people learn to integrate isolated values into a hierarchically organized system. Mature people have such complex cognitive processes that they can both estimate the relative importance of values and combine them with other beliefs in worldview issues [more on Rokeach's theory in: 6-8].

3 Traditionalist, Modernist and Postmodernist Worldviews

Three cultural formations – described by Bauman as great stages in Western culture – are considered to be the sources of three specific worldviews: traditionalism, modernism and postmodernism [9-13].

A worldview is identified, as indicated above, with an individual's system of beliefs with regard to the surrounding world as well as phenomena and processes taking place in it. According to Borowiak [10] – the author of the tool used in the described research – these are two types of beliefs: epistemological statements about the nature of truth

and reality, and axiological claims about values that define the subject's own identity. They form a complex cognitive metastructure. Borowiak analysed three great cultural stages (formations): traditionalism, modernism and postmodernism. Each of them creates a dominant worldview (culture's distinguishing feature) which is used by people to constitute their identity, analyse life experiences, justify behaviour and explain events taking place in their world [10, 13; other approaches in understanding worldviews: 14-54]. So what are their characteristics?

Traditionalism – as the name of a cultural trend suggests – was focused on tradition, and especially on its religious aspect. It paid tribute to what was formerly established – timeless, supra-cultural and revealed truth. A moral human was considered somebody who expresses his/her moral virtues, and thus unconditionally accepts and puts into practice commandments of faith and the social order approved by the Church. In modernism, the causative power was attributed to reason, which allows us to reach "one truth". The cult did not revolve around religion, but by science (the wiser know better). Morality is expressed by acting in accordance with knowledge which in turn refers to objective moral values. These were not revealed – as in traditionalism – but could be discovered by a mature person. The importance of man was considered in terms of the effectiveness of his actions: whether he or she was able to pursue rational, conscious and long-term goals so as to deserve fame among future generations. In postmodernism, the existence of objective truth (which was exposed in traditionalism and modernism) was questioned and replaced by the term "convention". Postmodernism referred to irrationalism, cognitive and axiological relativism. The most important value became freedom and related individual autonomy. Man has the right to make an individual choice, seek novelty, change decisions and experience pleasure. It is the right of all people (universalism) and it can be expressed in their own way. However, they are also obliged to express tolerance and political correctness [9-10, 13, 47]. Man does not live to suffer, make sacrifices (traditionalism) or postpone gratuities and constantly strive for success (modernism), but to be happy.

The three worldviews described above differ in chronology: their origins can be traced back to the Middle Ages, the Enlightenment and the 1950s respectively. Nevertheless, they can be the source of epistemological and axiological beliefs (or fragments of them) of modern people. Their

specificity (content) depends, among other things, on the role played in the life of individuals by religious and educational institutions, the media, popular culture and peer groups [55-63].

4 Research Problem and Hypotheses

This study assumes that there is a close relationship between a particular worldview and values. These two constructs should be interrelated due to the fact that they are beliefs containing – at least to some extent – convergent content. People seek a structural organization of beliefs (although this organization varies from person to person, depending on the development of cognitive structures), and the resulting consistency has an important regulatory function. It allows for creating a coherent vision of the world and determines human behaviour in a relatively constant manner. Beliefs constitute a unique kind of tool that helps to understand reality: they are used to formulate views about what the world is and should be [64].

The researcher's intention was to diagnose whether and what types of values included in the Rokeach Value Survey are associated with certain types of worldviews. It is assumed that traditionalist, modernist and postmodernist worldviews have their axiological specificity. In empirical terms, this means that the indicators of each worldview are related to the indicators of values "inscribed" in this worldview on the basis of content-based compliance.

The authors assumed the following relationships:

Hypothesis 1: The traditionalist worldview is positively correlated with collectivist values and negatively correlated with individualist values.

Hypothesis 2: Modernist and postmodernist worldviews are positively correlated with individualistic values and negatively correlated with collectivistic values.

Both the cultural trend of modernism and postmodernism "encourage" people to shape such an axiology in which relatively high importance is attached to individual values which do not necessarily have to be identical. At the same time, it should be emphasized that modernist individualism involved a need for achievement. It created psychological conditions for economic growth by maintaining self-esteem. The emergence of postmodernist individualism is a result of already achieved prosperity. This allowed for the emergence of consumption, freedom and self-creation.

5 Method

Sample group. The survey involved 368 Polish students, out of whom women constituted 80%. The age of respondents oscillated between 20-24 years.

Research tools. The study incorporated the Borowiak Questionnaire "How do you view yourself and the world around you?", on the basis of which the indicators of three worldviews were obtained for each surveyed person: traditionalist, modernist and postmodernist. Each worldview is juxtaposed by 12 statements. The subjects assessed them on a 7-grade scale. The indicators range from 12 to 84 [13].

Value preferences were determined using the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) that forces ranking [65]. The author selected 18 terminal values and 18 instrumental values, placing them on two separate scales. The subjects were required to assess the values by assigning appropriate ranks, where 1 indicated the strongest value acceptance and 18 – the weakest. Based on literature analysis, the authors proposed to divide the 36 values found in the RVS into collectivistic and individualistic [criteria for the classification of values and substantiation of such classification in:7].

The collectivist values were considered as those related to:

- the protection of the welfare of all people and those with whom an individual interacts directly (the welfare of the group to which the individual belongs): "a world at peace" (t17), "equality" (t2), "helpful" (i8), "honest" (i9), "forgiving" (i7), "loving" (i14), "responsible" (i17);
- the security of identity groups and respect for tradition/religion: "family security" (t4), "national security" (t9), "salvation" (t11);
- balanced social views, intrapersonal and interpersonal harmony: "wisdom" (t16), "inner harmony" (t7), "self-controlled" (i18), "clean" (i5) "polite" (i16), "obedient" (i15), "mature love" (t8), "true friendship" (t15).

Individualistic values were linked with:

- social status, prestige and personal (including material) success: "social recognition" (t14), "self-respect" (t12), "sense of accomplishment" (t13), "ambitious" (i1), "a comfortable life" (t1);
- freedom of choice, independence of thought and action, intellectual competence: "freedom" (t5), "independent" (i11), "courageous" (i6), "imaginative" (i10), "broad-minded" (i2), "capable" (i3), "intellectual" (i12), "logical" (i13);
- hedonism and the need for stimulation (interesting, pleasant, exciting life): "happiness" (t6), "cheerful" (i4), "pleasure" (t10), "an exciting life" (t3), "a world of beauty" (t18).

6 Results

In the study described above, the authors sought to verify the thesis that worldviews (visions of the world) imply certain types of values [13, 66]. First, relationships between worldviews were determined. It appeared that the modernist worldview correlates positively with the postmodernist worldview (r=0.35, p=0.000). Thus, it becomes likely that both worldviews are associated with values belonging to the same category. According to the hypothesis, these are individualistic values. Both the modernist and postmodernist worldviews correlate negatively with the traditionalist worldview (r=-0.09, p=0.071 and r=-0.14, p=0.007). One might expect that the latter is associated with a different category of values. According to the hypothesis, these are collectivist values.

To verify the hypotheses, the authors examined the relationships between traditionalist, modernist, and postmodernist worldviews with 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values. Tables 1 and 2 show the averaged indicators of the variables and the results of the statistical analysis. Negative correlations prove that a high indicator of a given personality trait is associated with high value preference, while positive correlations prove the opposite (a high indicator of a given trait is associated with low value preference). Such an interpretation results from measuring values with the use of the ranking method.

Table 1. Traditionalist, modernist, postmodernist worldviews in relation to terminal values

No.	Terminal values / Culture stage		Tradition $\bar{x}$=52.39		Modernism $\bar{x}$=53.77		Postmodernism $\bar{x}$=48.47	
			r=	p=	r=	p=	r=	p=
t1.	A Comfortable Life	$\bar{x}$=9.50	0.20	0.000	-0.06	n.s.	-0.15	0.004
t2.	Equality	$\bar{x}$=11.08	-0.14	0.006	-0.00	n.s.	-0.05	n.s.
t3.	An Exciting Life	$\bar{x}$=13.88	0.24	0.000	-0.10	n.s.	-0.14	0.008
t4.	Family Security	$\bar{x}$=2.83	0.02	n.s.	-0.03	n.s.	-0.03	n.s.
t5.	Freedom	$\bar{x}$=7.10	0.05	n.s.	0.03	n.s.	0.06	n.s.
t6.	Happiness	$\bar{x}$=5.96	0.11	0.031	-0.02	n.s.	-0.12	0.019
t7.	Inner Harmony	$\bar{x}$=8.44	0.04	n.s.	0.05	n.s.	-0.07	n.s.
t8.	Mature Love	$\bar{x}$=5.42	0.04	n.s.	0.09	n.s.	0.06	n.s.
t9.	National Security	$\bar{x}$=11.10	0.07	n.s.	-0.07	n.s.	0.05	n.s.
t10.	Pleasure	$\bar{x}$=11.79	0.25	0.000	-0.05	n.s.	-0.11	0.032
t11.	Salvation	$\bar{x}$=10.95	-0.53	0.000	0.22	0.000	0.35	0.000
t12.	Self-Respect	$\bar{x}$=7.95	0.05	n.s.	0.04	n.s.	0.02	n.s.
t13.	A Sense of Accomplishment	$\bar{x}$=11.09	0.12	0.020	-0.15	0.004	0.01	n.s.
t14.	Social Recognition	$\bar{x}$=12.60	0.21	0.000	-0.17	0.001	-0.10	0.043
t15.	True Friendship	$\bar{x}$=7.08	0.00	n.s.	0.06	n.s.	-0.08	n.s.
t16.	Wisdom	$\bar{x}$=7.21	0.02	n.s.	-0.03	n.s.	-0.05	n.s.
t17.	A World at Peace	$\bar{x}$=11.86	-0.20	0.000	-0.02	n.s.	0.03	n.s.
t18.	A World of Beauty	$\bar{x}$=15.19	-0.03	n.s.	-0.02	n.s.	0.08	n.s.

r – Spearman's rank correlation coefficient

p – level of statistical significance

n.s. – statistically non-significant correlation coefficient

$\bar{x}$ – arithmetic mean of indicators of specific variables (terminal values and three types of worldviews)

rank 1 – highest value preference, rank 18 – lowest value preference

Source: own elaboration.

Table 2. Traditionalist, modernist, postmodernist worldviews in relation to instrumental values

No.	Instrumental values	Culture stage	Tradition $\overline{x}=52.39$		Modernism $\overline{x}=53.77$		Postmodernism $\overline{x}=48.47$	
			r=	p=	r=	p=	r=	p=
i1.	Ambitious	$\overline{x}=8.04$	0.15	0.004	-0.08	n.s.	-0.04	n.s.
i2.	Broad-minded	$\overline{x}=11.83$	0.19	0.000	-0.14	0.005	0.02	n.s.
i3.	Capable	$\overline{x}=12.62$	0.05	n.s.	-0.08	n.s.	0.00	n.s.
i4.	Cheerful	$\overline{x}=9.45$	-0.07	n.s.	0.07	n.s.	-0.04	n.s.
i5.	Clean	$\overline{x}=10.24$	0.03	n.s.	0.05	n.s.	0.03	n.s.
i6.	Courageous	$\overline{x}=9.90$	0.02	n.s.	-0.09	n.s.	-0.00	n.s.
i7.	Forgiving	$\overline{x}=10.13$	-0.28	0.000	0.17	0.001	0.09	n.s.
i8.	Helpful	$\overline{x}=6.90$	-0.20	0.000	0.10	0.041	0.01	n.s.
i9.	Honest	$\overline{x}=5.47$	-0.18	0.000	0.13	0.010	0.00	n.s.
i10.	Imaginative	$\overline{x}=11.87$	0.22	0.000	-0.06	n.s.	-0.00	n.s.
i11.	Independent	$\overline{x}=10.07$	0.16	0.001	-0.05	n.s.	-0.07	n.s.
i12.	Intellectual	$\overline{x}=9.34$	0.20	0.000	-0.25	0.000	-0.03	n.s.
i13.	Logical	$\overline{x}=10.36$	0.18	0.001	-0.14	0.007	0.01	n.s.
i14.	Loving	$\overline{x}=4.52$	-0.12	0.019	0.10	0.048	0.02	n.s.
i15.	Obedient	$\overline{x}=14.61$	-0.20	0.000	0.04	n.s.	-0.04	n.s.
i16.	Polite	$\overline{x}=9.15$	-0.13	0.012	0.17	0.001	-0.01	n.s.
i17.	Responsible	$\overline{x}=5.83$	-0.11	0.032	0.07	n.s.	0.00	n.s.
i18.	Self-controlled	$\overline{x}=10.51$	-0.03	n.s.	0.08	n.s.	0.10	n.s.

r – Spearman's rank correlation coefficient

p – level of statistical significance

n. s. – statistically non-significant correlation coefficient

$\overline{x}$ – arithmetic mean of indicators of specific variables (instrumental values and three types of worldviews)

rank 1 – highest value preference, rank 18 – lowest value preference

Source: own elaboration.

It appeared that people with higher indicators of the traditionalist worldview assigned a higher rank to collectivist values (Tables 1 and 2). These are pacifist and egalitarian values – "a world at peace" (t17) and "equality" (t2) – that is, associated with protecting the broadly understood well-being of people and their position in the social structure. They also express a significantly bigger preference for values that protect the welfare of people with whom an individual interacts directly (the welfare of the group to which the individual belongs): "forgiving" (i7), "helpful" (i8), "honest" (i9), "loving" (i14), and "responsible" (i17). This worldview is associated with values that determine interpersonal harmony: "obedient" (i15) and "polite" (i16). The values listed above are referred

to as moral values. Central to the traditionalist worldview is the value associated with respect for religion, i.e. "salvation" (t11). It had the highest correlation coefficient (r=-0.52). In contrast, people with higher indicators of the traditionalist worldview rank lower the values associated with social status, prestige and personal success (material success): "social recognition" (t14), "a sense of accomplishment" (t13), "ambitious" (i1), "a comfortable life" (t1), as well as independence and intellectual competence: "independent" (i11), "imaginative" (i10), "broad-minded" (i2), "intellectual" (i12), "logical" (i13), and, lastly, hedonism and a need for stimulation (interesting, enjoyable, varied life): "happiness" (t6), "pleasure" (t10), "an exciting life" (t3). All the mentioned values have individualistic character. The obtained results confirm the assumptions included in hypothesis 1: the traditionalist worldview correlates positively with collectivist values and negatively with individualist values. Thus, if one is characterised by higher traditionalism, he or she attaches more importance to collectivist values and less to individualist values.

In turn, the modernist worldview reveals positive relationships with other values (Tables 1 and 2). These are values related to prestige and personal success: "social recognition" (t14) and "a sense of accomplishment" (t13) as well as independence of thought and intellectual competence: "broad-minded" (i2), "intellectual" (i12) and "logical" (i13). As it can be observed, these fall into the category of individualistic values. In contrast, higher indicators of the modernist worldview are associated with lower indicators of moral values, which condition the well-being of loved ones and harmonious relationships: "forgiving" (i7), "helpful" (i8), "honest" (i9), "loving" (i14), and "polite" (i16). "Salvation" (t11), a religious value, was also provided with lower acceptance indicators. The aforementioned values are of a collectivist nature and, as it can be seen, are not part of the modernist worldview. Taking into account the whole configuration of the obtained results, it should be stated that hypothesis 2 has been confirmed: the modernist worldview correlates positively with individualistic values and negatively with collectivistic values.

The analysis of the postmodernist worldview revealed some other solutions in the axiological sphere (Tables 1 and 2). The indicators of this worldview correlated positively with values related to social status and material success: "social recognition" (t14), "a comfortable life" (t1) as well as hedonism and the need for stimulation (interesting, pleasant, varied life): "happiness" (t6), "pleasure" (t10), and "an exciting life" (t3). These are clearly individualistic features. Only one collectivist value was negatively correlated with this worldview: "salvation" (t11). In case of the postmodernist worldview, the number of statistically significant correlations with values were much smaller and there were no correlations with instrumental values, which, as a reminder, are defined as desirable ways of behaviour. However, based on the analysis of terminal values, i.e. goals of human existence, the direction of the correlation included in hypothesis 2 was found: the postmodernist worldview correlates positively with individualistic values. "Salvation", a collectivist and at the same time the religious value, had a negative correlation.

7 Summary and Discussion

The aim of the above presented study was to examine the relationship between two constructs: a worldview and values. The consequence of this relationship is the coherence of beliefs which refers to psychological comfort (reduction of unpleasant tension associated with incompatibility in the system of beliefs). The diagnosed worldviews reflect the essence of three cultural formations: traditionalism, modernism and postmodernism.

The most unambiguous (a number of statistically significant correlation coefficients and their sign) relationships were revealed between values and the traditionalist worldview. According to hypothesis 1, the distinguishing feature of this worldview is a higher preference for collectivist values and a lower preference for individualist ones. Here, significant are the values associated with egalitarianism, elimination of military violence, protection of other people's welfare (including the criterion of morality) and interpersonal harmony (elimination of tensions and conflicts in relations between people). The fact that this worldview is religious by nature manifests itself with its strong association (high correlation coefficient) with the value of "salvation". People with a traditionalist worldview respect less self-centred values as they are linked with social status, prestige and personal success (including material success), hedonism and the need for stimulation (interesting, enjoyable, varied life). Thus, the traditionalist worldview is based on collectivist values, and the We becomes more important than the I. Individualistic values stand in opposition to such worldview.

The axiological characteristics of the other two worldviews are much different, which is consistent

with the content of hypothesis 2. In their case, the "I" becomes more important than the "We". Positive correlations with the modernist worldview are evident in case of values related to social status, prestige and personal success, independence of thought and intellectual competence. Negative correlations were noted for moral values that determine the well-being of loved ones and harmonious relationships. "Postmodernists" ranked higher individualistic values associated with social status and material well-being, hedonism and the need for stimulation (happy, interesting, pleasant and varied life). It is also characteristic that as the indicators of both worldviews grew, the indicators of preference for the "salvation" value decreased.

The axiological differentiation of the traditionalist worldview in relation to modernist and postmodernist worldviews is consistent with the criterion of collectivism – individualism [cf. characteristics of collectivism - individualism 67-77]. It should be noted, however, that in the case of the first worldview, twenty-two (positive or negative) statistically significant correlation coefficients were recorded, in the case of the second – their number dropped to eleven. Only six such coefficients were revealed in the analysis of the relationship between values and the postmodernist worldview and, what is more interesting, they concerned terminal values, that is, the objectives of human existence.

The presented axiological characteristics of the traditionalist worldview proved to be consistent with the ideas promoted within it. As a reminder, the truth is revealed and applies to all people – at all times and in any place. Traditionalism is rooted in religion and is based on values proclaimed by the Church. Therefore, the analysis of behaviour should be based on the "virtue – sin" criterion. The quality of a person is determined by how he or she fulfils his/her obligations towards God and how he or she "stays moral" in his/her earthly life, especially in terms of his/her commitment to the surrounding people. This worldview is "imbued" with community, where interpersonal values (RVS scale of terminal values) and moral values (RVS scale of instrumental values) condition its preservation.

Modernism grew up as an opposition to traditionalism. The truth remained "only one and objective", but the trend also accepted detachment from community. An individual could be autonomous because he or she was intelligent and rational. The focus was placed on intellectual qualities of an individual and they were treated as a panacea for all evil (wiser people know better and can reach objective truth). Human functioning was

evaluated primarily in terms of the criterion "success – failure", which meant that the stress was placed on what a person achieved in life. Self-cantered values became attractive, the realization of which allows for distancing oneself from others and earn their admiration. In the above described research, the authors reveal modernist ideas in terms of preferred values: the respondents attributed greater importance to intrapersonal values which determine personal success (RVS scale of terminal values) and values related to competence and intellect (RVS scale of instrumental values).

In postmodernism, the focus was placed on human happiness in people's earthly lie. In the context of the obtained research results, it should be stated that only in the case of this worldview there was a positive relationship with the values: "happiness", "an exciting life" and "a comfortable life". Importance was attributed not only to autonomy, but even unlimited freedom. Modernist rationalism gave way to irrationalism, objectivity – to relativism (both cognitive and moral). While questioning "one truth", it was accepted that people can differ, express different opinions, live "their own way", create their own axiology and express it. Lack of emphasis on specific ideas (which is the credo of this cultural trend) results in differentiation of value systems (people are dissimilar in axiological terms). It becomes problematic to grasp dependencies at the level of statistical analysis. The obtained research may serve to explain smaller homogeneity of "postmodernist's" value systems by pointing that this worldview correlated (positively or negatively) only with six terminal values. The association between a large number of values and the traditionalist worldview can in turn be explained by the fact that religious institutions clearly promote and emphasize similarities among individuals functioning within a community. This encourages the emergence of homogeneous value systems.

8 Conclusions and Methodological Remarks

This study was devoted to the analysis of the relationship between three worldviews, i.e. traditionalist, modernist and postmodernist (they refer to the stages of Western culture described by Bauman), and the system of values. Values were analysed on the basis of Rokeach's theory and a research tool (RVS) developed by the author was used. The research results can be confronted with those described in an earlier publication [1]. There, Schwartz's theory of values was referred to and his

value measurement tool (PVQ-R3) was applied. Are the conclusions of the analyses in both articles compatible?

In both cases, it was found that [cf. the previous article by 1]:

• the traditionalist worldview is positively correlated with collectivist values and negatively correlated with individualist values;

• the modernist and postmodernist worldviews are positively correlated with individualistic values and negatively correlated with collectivistic values.

Despite the different way of obtaining value preference indicators, the same general conclusions can be drawn from both analyses. It should be emphasised that both tools, the RVS and the PVQ-R3, were constructed by Rokeach and Schwartz under the same theoretical assumptions: values are abstract concepts, they refer to desired goals and behaviours, they are ordered according to their relative importance and transcendent to the situation, and they guide the evaluation and selection of behaviours [4, 78]. However, the RVS and PVQ-R3 differ in the way indicators are derived. Rokeach claimed that the study of values should be based on their relative evaluation (hierarchisation). Thus, a certain number of elements – i.e. abstract concepts – should be placed inside a closed structure. Schwartz, however, abandoned the use of abstract concepts in the PVQ-R3. The respondents were asked to determine (on a scale of 1-6) to what extent they were similar to the person characterized in each statement. The assessed statements (57 in total) made it possible to identify nineteen types of values (respectively recalculated indices of 57 statements yielded indices of nineteen types of abstract values) which were located in two dimensions: openness to change – conservatism, and self-enhancement – self-transcendence [79-80]. Both the pool of values included in the RVS and the pool of value types included in the PVQ-R3 allow for selecting collectivist and individualistic values [80]. This classification makes it possible to characterize worldviews and show their axiological collectivism (traditionalist worldview) or axiological individualism (modernist and postmodernist worldview). The specifics of axiological individualism in the modernist and postmodernist worldview can also be described. However, by using the PVQ-R3, we rely on a more general model of values. The model takes into account motivational conflicts at the intraindividual, interindividual and cross-cultural levels (the system of values is seen more dynamically) and emphasises

the structural organisation of value systems (identification of dimensions and types of values).

To gain a full insight into the relationship between worldview and values it is desirable to use other tools in measuring these constructs. Scheler's phenomenological approach seems particularly interesting [81]. It became an inspiration for the construction of a tool to measure values by [82-83] (Scheler's Values Scale allows for diagnosing five types of values: hedonistic, utilitarian, vital, spiritual and sacred; they have a hierarchical structure). Scheler maintained that the modern era can be characterised mainly by a change in people's attitude to values – an upheaval of values. It consisted in the degradation of higher values in favour of lower values. This approach in the interpretation of values seems to be helpful in the analysis of worldviews, especially when the emphasis is placed on their chronology. The results of this research will be presented in the next publication. It should be emphasised that the use of different tools allows for a better insight into value systems and a more complete description of them. It also makes it possible to show the worldview context of the value system.

Empirical research based on such an understood and diagnosed worldview and such understood and diagnosed values (various tools for measuring values) are not known in the literature. Their importance lies in the fact that they allow for penetrating the essence of human beliefs relating to the concept of the social world (the entire social system, as well as institutions) and the concept of human being (including the concept of one's own person), the concept of social bonds and the rules of undertaking social activity. Beliefs underlie the perception and interpretation of political and economic phenomena (which is particularly visible in the processes of political transformations), criteria of justice recognised by people (e.g. distributive justice), equity, rights, principles and forms of life (e.g. civil and political rights), traditionalism in the cultural and religious sphere. They stimulate human behaviour in various spheres – including the business sphere – which manifests itself in differentiated entrepreneurship, the need for achievement, competitiveness, tolerance for change, mental openness and emotional independence. These behaviours are more or less conducive to the economic success of societies and the development of democracy.

Mirosława Czerniawska, Joanna Szydło

References:

[1] Czerniawska, M. & Szydło, J. The worldview and values – analysing relations, *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, Vol. 17, 2020, Art. #58, pp. 594-607.

[2] Bar-Tal, D. *Group beliefs. A conception for analyzing group structure, processes, and behavior*, Springer-Verlag Inc., New York 1990.

[3] Cieciuch, J. Czym jest światopogląd? Filozoficzny kontekst psychologicznego pojęcia, *Psychologia Rozwojowa*, 10(2), 2005, pp. 147-159.

[4] Rokeach, M, *The nature of human values*, Free Press, New York 1973.

[5] Rokeach, M. *Beliefs, attitudes and values*, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco 1968.

[6] Czerniawska, M. *Inteligencja a system wartości*, Trans Humana, Białystok 1995.

[7] Czerniawska, M. *Zmiany wartości i postaw młodzieży w okresie przeobrażeń ustrojowych. Kolektywizm versus indywidualizm. Studium interdyscyplinarne*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Białostockiej, Białystok 2010.

[8] Czerniawska, M. Teorie wartości Miltona Rokeacha i Shaloma H. Schwartza, *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny*, 4 (218), 2010, pp. 5-18.

[9] Borowiak, A. O czym mówimy, kiedy dyskutujemy o dyskursie postmodernistycznym?, In: *Psychologiczne studia nad językiem i dyskursem*, I. Kurcz, J. Bobryk (ed.), Wydawnictwo Instytutu Psychologii PAN i Wydawnictwo SWPS Academica, Warszawa 2001, pp. 141–175.

[10] Borowiak, A. Światopogląd postmodernistyczny a postulat tolerancji, In: *Tolerancja i wielokulturowość. Wyzwania XXI wieku*, A. Borowiak, P. Szarota (ed.), Wydawnictwo SWPS Academica, Warszawa 2004.

[11] Borowiak, A. & Golec, A. Poznawcze i światopoglądowe wyznaczniki preferencji politycznych, *Studia Psychologiczne*, 42 (2), 2004, pp. 5-16.

[12] Borowiak, A. & Szarota P. Światopogląd partnerów jako modulator miłości, *Studia Psychologiczne*, 42(3), 2004, pp. 15-26.

[13] Boski, P. *Kulturowe ramy zachowań społecznych. Podręcznik psychologii międzykulturowej*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Wydawnictwo SWPS Academica, Warszawa 2009.

[14] Karimov, A. & Kazakova, V. Perceptual Image in Worldview, *Rethinking Social Action. Core Values*, 2015, pp. 1123-1127.

[15] Lvov, A.A. Anthropological turn in worldview studies: Theoretical and practical aspects, *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta-Filosofiya i Konfliktologiya*, 36(2), 2020, pp. 279-290.

[16] Havrylenko, V.V. Human as a carrier of the worldview: individual and collective dimensions, *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 18, 2020, pp. 62-75.

[17] Schlitz, M.M., Vieten, C. & Miller, E.M. Worldview Transformation and the Development of Social Consciousness, *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 17(7-8), 2010, pp. 18-36.

[18] Manukyan, A. & Manukyan, M. Philosophical wisdom as a method of formation of worldview of an individual, *Wisdom*, 7(2), 2016, pp. 59-62.

[19] Varpio, L. & Ellaway, R.H. Shaping our worldviews: a conversation about and of theory, *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 26(1), 2021, pp. 339-345.

[20] Oesterdiekhoff, G.W. & Vonderach, G. World history and societal evolution: Historical periods and psychological stages, *Mankind Quarterly*, 61(4), 2021, pp. 820-853.

[21] Stenmark, M. Worldview studies, *Religious Studies*, 2021, pp.1-19.

[22] Ram, I.G. Management philosophy toward an ethical worldview, *Paradigm Shift in Management Philosophy: Future Challenges in Global Organizations*, 2019, pp. 155-175.

[23] Landrum, N.E. & Ohsowski, B. Identifying Worldviews on Corporate Sustainability: A Content Analysis of Corporate Sustainability Reports, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 27(1), 2018, pp. 128-151.

[24] Walker, R.L., Alabi, D., Roberts, J. & Obasi, E. M. Ethnic Group Differences in Reasons for Living and the Moderating Role of Cultural Worldview, *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(3), 2010, pp. 372-378.

[25] Kozlova, N.V., Malkova, I.Y. & Shcheglova, M.S. Characteristics of Professional Worldview of Higher Education Students (Based on the Siberian Region), *Sibirskiy Psikhologicheskiy Zhurnal-Siberian Journal of Psychology*, 45, 2012, pp. 20-27.

[26] Doktor, T. The "New Age" worldview of Polish students, *Social Compass*, 46(2), 1999, pp. 215-224.

[27] Van Egmond, N.D. & De Vries, H.J.M. Sustainability: The search for the integral worldview, *Futures*, 43(8), 2011, pp. 853-867.

[28] Trevino, J.G. Worldview and change in cross-cultural counseling, *Counseling Psychologist*, 24(2), 1996, pp. 198-215.

[29] Madden, B.J. Management's worldview: four critical points about reality, language, and knowledge building to improve organization performance, *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce,* 22(4), 2012, pp. 334-346.

[30] Johnson, K.A., Hill, E.D. & Cohen, A.B. Integrating the Study of Culture and Religion: Toward a Psychology of Worldview, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(3), 2011, pp. 137-152.

[31] Taylor, J.R. Communication is not neutral: "Worldview" and the science of organizational communication, *Handbook of communication in organisations and professions*, 2, 2011, pp. 103-118.

[32] Kriazh, I. Role of personal attitude in worldview formation, *Science and Education*, 1, 2015, pp. 108-114.

[33] De Kadt, M. Worldview Matters, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 49(3), 2017, pp. 489-494.

[34] Moreno-Fernandez, F. Worldview, Discourse and Society, *Framework for Cognitive Sociolinguistics*, 2017, pp. 59-73.

[35] Kalman, C.S. What is the Students' Worldview?, *Successful science and engineering teaching: theoretical and learning perspectives, 2nd Edition*, 16, 2018, pp. 69-87.

[36] Sullivan, J. Worldview: The history of a concept, *Heythrop Journal-A Quarterly Review of Philosophy and Theology*, 46(1), 2005, pp. 96-98.

[37] Stacewicz, P. The Informational Worldview and Conceptual Apparatus, *Interdisciplinary Investigations into the Lvov-Warsaw School*, 2019, pp. 251-272.

[38] Tieku, T.K. Collectivist Worldview: Its Challenge to International Relations, *Africa and International Relations in the 21st Century*, 2012, pp. 36-50.

[39] Magee, R.G. Worldview beliefs, morality beliefs and decision-making referents: Implications for the psychology of morality and ethics instruction, *Advances in Psychology Research*, 100, 2014, pp. 1-24.

[40] Nilsson, A. Humanistic and normativistic worldviews: Distinct and hierarchically structured, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 64, 2014, pp. 135-140.

[41] Zanocco, C.M. & Jones, M.D. Cultural Worldviews and Political Process Preferences, *Social Science Quarterly*, 99(4), 2018, pp. 1377-1389.

[42] Williams, B. The worldview dimensions of individualism and collectivism: Implications for counselling, *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 81(3), 2003, pp. 370-374.

[43] Toews, J.E. Monism: Science, Philosophy, Religion, and the History of a Worldview, *Central European History*, 46(3), 2013, pp. 653-657.

[44] Savchenko, A. Sociocultural space: looking into the future, *National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*, 4, 2016, pp. 34-37.

[45] Rice, A.J., Colbow, A.J., Gibbons, S., Cederberg, C., Sahker, E., Liu, W.M. & Wurster, K. The social class worldviews of first-generation college students, *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 30(4), 2017, pp. 415-440.

[46] Vengoa, H.F. The global world. A history In conclusion: global history and contemporary worldview, *Mundo Global: Una Historia*, 2013, pp. 109-123.

[47] Czerniawska, M. & Szydło J. Conditions for Attitudes towards Native Culture, Religion and Church and Religiously Motivated Ethics, *European Research Studies Journal,* 23(4), 2020, pp.123-134.

[48] Czerniawska, M. & Szydło J. More or Less Pro-Liberal? Comparative Analysis of the Attitudes of Young People Entering the Labour Market, *European Research Studies Journal,* 23(3), 2020, pp. 564-580.

[49] Alontseva, N.V, Ermoshin, Y.A., Dugalich, N.M., Kupriyanova, M.E. & Dmitrieva, E.G. Worldview orientations of religious literature as an agent of socialization in the modern society, *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 15(3), 2019, pp. 157-166.

[50] Bawden, R. & Allenby, B. Sustainability science and the epistemic challenge: some matters philosophical and why we ought to

come to know them better, *Sustainability Science*, 12(6), 2017, pp. 901-905.

[51] Brandt, M.J. & Crawford, J.T. Worldview conflict and prejudice. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 61, 2020, pp.1-66.

[52] Fedotova, V.A. Individual values as predictors of positive or negative attitudes towards innovation among representatives of various generations of Russian people, *Psychology, Journal of the Higher School of Economics*, 14(4), 2017, pp. 717-734.

[53] Khlyscheva, E.V., Dryagalov, V.S., Topchiev, M.S., Romanova, A.P. & Bicharova, M.M. Postmodern rhizome and models of religious identity, *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 16(1), 2020, pp. 119-130.

[54] Kushkimbayeva, A., Dyussembina, G., Tutinova, N. & Khalimullina, N. The concept of people's cognitive model as a national and cultural worldview, *Opcion*, 35(22), 2019, pp. 440-453.

[55] Tang, N., Wang, Y. & Zhang, K. Values of Chinese generation cohorts: Do they matter in the workplace? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*,143, 2017, pp. 8-22.

[56] Bauman, Z. *Socjologia*, Zysk i S-ka, Poznań 1996.

[57] Bauman, Z. *Etyka ponowoczesna*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1996.

[58] Bauman, Z. Śmierć i nieśmiertelność w ponowoczesnym świecie, In: *Humanistyka przełomu wieków*, J. Kozielecki (ed.), Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak, Warszawa 1999, pp. 55-78.

[59] Gellner, E. *Postmodernizm, rozum i religia*, Wydawnictwo PIW, Warszawa 1997.

[60] Lyotard, J.F. *Kondycja ponowoczesna. Raport o stanie wiedzy*, Fundacja Aletheia, Warszawa 1997.

[61] Faleev A.N., Filatova M.N. & Mayer V.V. Postmodernism: Theoretical and methodological problems, *Astra Salvensis*, 2020, pp. 307-319.

[62] Kiereś, H. Kultura klasyczna wobec postmodernizmu, *Człowiek w Kulturze*, 1998.

[63] Hejnicka-Bezwińska, T. *Pedagogika ogólna*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2008.

[64] Rohan, M.J. A rose by any name? The values construct, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(3), 2000, pp. 255-277.

[65] Brzozowski, P. *Skala Wartości (SW). Polska adaptacja Value Survey M. Rokeacha*, Polskie Towarzystwo Psychologiczne, Wydział Psychologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 1989.

[66] Golec de Zavala, A. & Van Bergh, A. Need for cognitive closure and conservative political beliefs: Differential mediation by personal worldviews, *Political Psychology*, 28(5), 2007, pp. 587-608.

[67] Czerniawska, M. Horyzontalna i wertykalna postać "indywidualizmu – kolektywizmu" a wartości, *Kultura – Społeczeństwo – Edukacja*, 2(18), 2020, pp. 275-291.

[68] Omar, S., Idrus, S. & Noordin, F. Individualism-Collectivism and Its Influence on Positive Organizational Behavior: An Exploratory Study, *Advanced Science Letters*, 21(5), 2015, pp. 1193-1196.

[69] Rhee, M., Alexandra, V. & Powell, K.S. Individualism-collectivism cultural differences in performance feedback theory, *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, 27(3), 2020, pp. 343-364.

[70] Topalova, V. Individualism/collectivism and social identity, *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 7(1), 1997, pp. 53-64.

[71] Zhang, C., Zhou, C.X & Liang, Z.M. The Relationship Among Individualism/Collectivism, Autonomous Motivation and Employee Creativity of Newcomers in Careers, *Proceedings of The Second Summit Forum of China's Cultural Psychology*, 2016, pp. 145-151.

[72] Hamamura, T. Are Cultures Becoming Individualistic? A Cross-Temporal Comparison of Individualism-Collectivism in the United States and Japan, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(1), 2012, p. 3-24.

[73] Brewer, P. & Venaik, S. Individualism-Collectivism in Hofstede and GLOBE, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42(3), 2011, pp. 436-445.

[74] Vargas, J.H. & Kemmelmeier, M. Ethnicity and Contemporary American Culture: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of Horizontal-Vertical Individualism-Collectivism, *Journal of Cross-*

Cultural Psychology, 44(2), 2013, pp. 195-222.

[75] Beilmann, M., Koots-Ausmees, L. & Realo, A. The Relationship Between Social Capital and Individualism-Collectivism in Europe, Social Indicators Research, 137(2), 2018, pp. 641-664.

[76] Gardner, W.L., Reithel, B.J., Foley, R.T., Cogliser, C.C. & Walumbwa, F.O., Attraction to Organizational Culture Profiles Effects of Realistic Recruitment and Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism, *Management Communication Quarterly*, 22(3), 2009, pp. 437-472.

[77] Binder, C.C., Redistribution and the Individualism-Collectivism Dimension of Culture, *Social Indicators Research*, 142(3), 2019, pp. 1175-1192.

[78] Schwartz S.H., Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In: C. Seligman, J.M. Olson, M.P. Zanna (eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario Symposium*, Vol. 8, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. 1996.

[79] Schwartz, S.H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M., Refining the Theory of Basic Individual Values, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(4), 2012, pp. 663-688.

[80] Cieciuch, J. Pomiar wartości w zmodyfikowanym modelu Shaloma Schwartza, *Psychologia Społeczna*, T. 8 1(24), 2013, pp. 22-41.

[81] Galarowicz J., *W drodze do etyki wartości. Fenomenologiczna etyka wartości*, Wydawnictwo PAT, Kraków 1997.

[82] Brzozowski P., *Skala Wartości Schelerowskich – SWS. Podręcznik*, Warszawa 1995.

[83] Brzozowski P., Uniwersalna hierarchia wartości – fakt czy fikcja?, *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, 3 (48), 2005, pp. 261-276.