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Abstract

This research investigated how the dimensions of values can be categorized and how they are endorsed in three Chinese societies (Hong Kong, Guangzhou and Shanghai). In the first part of the study, the Schwartz's Value Survey was administered to school teachers of the three societies in order to compare the value preferences among these societies based on factors and motivational domains. The overall results showed that Power was rated higher by the respondents from the P.R.C societies than did those from Hong Kong, and Spirituality was rated higher by the respondents from Hong Kong than did those from the P.R.C. Contrary to expectations, people from Hong Kong and Shanghai had higher scores on the factor of Self-cultivation than did those from Guangzhou. The research took a step further to include a Chinese-Western values comparison. The means for the value dimensions and domains of the Chinese were juxtaposed with those of the New Zealand school teachers. No broad Chinese-Western distinction was suggested by the comparison. In the second part of the study, using data collected from university students of the three societies, the correlations of value dimensions and value domains with dominance, need for achievement, collectivism/individualism, and locus of control were calculated. The differences in value preferences were interpreted as related to the degree of the practical
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use of power, the effect of external forces on values, the degree of prevalence of alienation and sex-role emphasis.
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The Value Dimensions and Their Relative Endorsement in Three Chinese Societies

The Origins of the Concept of Values

Value is a basic concept in theories that have emerged from a variety of disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, political science, education, social psychology, and history (Feather, 1975, p.1). Each field pursues value research from a particular point of view. According to Spates’ (1983) review, the history of the concept of value could be traced back to the last century. Nevertheless, work on value did not come to preeminence until Talcott Parsons and his associates’ endeavors during 1950-1965. Based on a careful analysis of the previous works on value, and integrated with their theoretical analyses on the functions of value in society, Parsons and Shils (1951) contended that values were moral beliefs to which people appealed as the ultimate rationales of action.

By 1951, values had been reified by the Functionalists as the “sine qua non” of society, were systematically organized (the value-orientations), had limited variability (because of the restrictions imposed by pattern variable choices), and in the ideal case, could produce totally harmonious social action” (Spates, 1983, p.31). This Functionalist value theory was criticized for three fundamental problems: It lacked sophisticated
empirical support; imposed preordained categories on reality; and was formulated at an unresearchable level of abstraction.

Alternatively, some theorists attempted to classify American values (Coleman, 1944; Gillin, 1955), describe the value changes in America (Riesman, 1950; Chase, 1965), or create their own definitions of values and look for new techniques of value analysis (Allport et al, 1961; Becker, 1950). Morris (1956) argued that values were pointed out by the preferential behavior expressed by an organism toward an object or situation. While values could be stimulated by social, psychological, or biological causes, they were not infinitely variable. Rather, they united around 13 main orientations, which were called by Morris "Ways to live." Because of the above criticisms that were raised against the Functionalist value theory, the alternative approaches fared only somewhat better. With the exception of Morris', few of them produced sophisticated empirical support for their claims.

Cross-Cultural Studies on Values

The continuing tradition of empirical studies and the appearance of alternative measurement instruments in the mid-1970s revitalized the value survey. The classification of American values was enriched with the findings from a variety of investigations, such as content analysis, achievement studies, religious studies, and studies on youth, students, educational differences, and
the generation gap. Meanwhile, findings of value studies based on Americans had been extensively examined by comparing cultural similarities and differences.

Zavalloni (1980) summarized that cross-cultural research on values branched off in four ways: 1) cultural and personality school; 2) comparisons of value-emphases in different cultures; 3) interdisciplinary approaches; 4) values as the analytical basis of functional analysis in sociology. The culture and personality school was based on the assumption that values as behaviour are an expression both of cultural institutions and of individual personality, and that the impact of culture is always mediated by individuals. The comparisons of value emphases in different cultures represented an effort to develop etic concepts, in contrast to the main approach of many anthropologists who rely on emic concepts. The goal of interdisciplinary approaches was to test the assumption that existential and evaluative beliefs are interrelated and may meaningfully differentiate various cultures. In sociology with Parsons, a theoretical framework was developed in which values are used as analytical tools for a multiplicity of purposes that range from the description of a general cultural orientation to role differentiations within a culture, as well as to basic elements of personality.

One of the contributions to the revitalization of the value survey in mid-1970s was the establishing of
alternative measurement instruments. The most significant advance has come from the work of Milton Rokeach. Values were assessed mostly through open-ended questions or essays before the appearance of the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS). The Rokeach Value Survey combines the practical requirements of developing short, easy to administer instruments with the logic of survey research. It consists of two separate check lists in which a respondent is asked to rank order thirty-six statements. The first list measures "terminal values" (preferred "end-states of existence"), and the second list measures "instrumental values" (preferred "modes of conduct"). The 18 "terminal values" are represented by concepts such as equality, world at peace, salvation, exciting life, comfortable life, and social recognition. The 18 "instrumental values" are described through adjectives such as responsible, honest, polite, clean and courageous. The results (Rokeach, 1973) have been the most complete portrait yet of American values, and affiliation. As a measure, the RVS has received its validation despite criticisms on the ranking procedure (Rankin and Grube, 1980). The instrument has been widely used in cross-cultural studies on value (e.g., Bond, 1988; Feather, 1975, 1986; Hofstede and Bond, 1984; Ng et al., 1982; Penner and Anh, 1977).

However, one of the questions which remains in utilizing the RVS for cross-cultural study is whether the western origins of the instrument make it appropri-
ate for use in other cultures. Indeed, the comprehensiveness of the instrument has been qualified even in Western cultures (Braithwaite and Law, 1985). Elsewhere, other instruments, such as the Chinese Value Survey (CVS), have been adopted for discovering culture-free dimensions of cultures (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987). One of its two dimensions at the individual level appears to have no Rokeach counterpart (Bond, 1988).

**Universal Domains of Values**

Instead of comparing the rank orders of values between different cultures, Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) tried to search for the universal psychological structure of value domains by using the RVS. They constructed a theory of the universal types of values by viewing values as cognitive representations of biological needs, interactional requirements for interpersonal coordination, and societal demands for group welfare and survival. According to these requirements, seven motivational domains of values were derived. They were, enjoyment, security, achievement, self-direction, prosocial morality, restrictive conformity and maturity. The enjoyment domain refers to an individual’s physiological gratifications that are transformed into socially recognized values such as pleasure, a comfortable life, happiness, and cheerfulness. The security domain includes values that reflect individual and group safety. Inner harmony, family
security, national security, and a world at peace are suggested to be the representative values of the security domain. Achievement values are those deriving from all three universal requirements, and expressed as capacities, ambition, and social recognition. Values in the self-direction domain reflect the gratification from one's independent capacities for decision-making, creativity, and action. Altruism, benevolence, kindness and love are the contents of the prosocial domain of values that reflect the social requirement of building a supportive social system. The restrictive-conformity domain consists of values that emphasize an individual's conformity to social expectations for the smooth functioning of social interaction, such as obedience, politeness, and cleanliness. The basic contents in the maturity domain are those values expressing the individual's understanding and appreciation of the social and physical reality, such as mature love, and a world of beauty.

The values were further divided along the individualistic vs. collectivist dimension as well as the terminal vs. instrumental dimension in accordance with the interests they serve and the respective types of goal to which they refer. Self-direction, achievement, and enjoyment were hypothesized to serve individual interests; prosocial morality and restrictive conformity served collective interests. Maturity and security served both. These assumptions of values with
goal types, interests served, and motivational domains were tested and confirmed in German and Israeli samples (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987). In a more recent study, a social power domain was found in a Hong Kong sample, and the seven motivational patterns were questioned as not complete (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990). The results of their study also indicated that all three of the predicted compatibilities (restrictive conformity with prosocial and security, maturity with self-direction, achievement with enjoyment) were shown in the seven samples, whereas only one of the predicted principles of motivational conflict (prosocial vs. achievement) held across all samples.

Cultural and Other Factors Relating to Values

Although the hypothesized structure of value domains was confirmed, the effect of cultural and individual factors on the strength of value endorsement on the domains was not assessed in Schwartz and Bilsky’s (1987) investigation. As mentioned above, although the emphasis of defining human values and focus on value research differ from field to field, it is commonly agreed that values refer to the orientation toward what it is considered desirable by social actors (Zavalloni, 1980). In other words, values express the relationship between environmental pressures and human desires. It can be seen from the definition of value that values should be affected by societal and personal factors.
which differ across cultures and individuals since values represent a meeting point between the individual and society. Osgood (1970, cited in Jones, Sensenig and Ashmore, 1978) has argued that overt expression of values should vary as much across situations within cultures as modes of dress or items on a menu. During the process of socialization, the value orientation patterns are internalized, and become basic features of the actor's personality (Parsons and Shils, 1951, p.154). Actually, the results of Bond's and other researchers' studies (Bond, 1988; Bond & Hofstede, 1980; Chinese Culture Connection, 1987; Feather, 1986; Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede and Bond, 1984) established that some special values were heavily correlated with cultural traditions and other factors, such as economic growth and indices of physical and social health. In addition, a great deal of evidence suggested that society socializes men and women to play their sex-roles very differently (Block, 1973; Rokeach, 1973). For instance, American men were conditioned to place a higher value on achievement and intellectual pursuits; women were socialized to place a higher value on love, affiliation and the family (Rokeach, 1973). In a study using the Rokeach Value Survey, the Chinese male students in Hong Kong were found to be more concerned with personal accomplishment, competency-related values; whereas female students were found to prefer family, moral and more intrinsic kinds of values (Lau, 1988). Sex differ-
ences in value ratings were also confirmed in a cross-cultural investigation by Bond (1988). Females' scoring of the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) was higher than that of males on personal morality vs. success, and males' scoring was higher than that of females on competence vs. security.

**Purposes of the Present Study**

The present research will investigate how the dimensions of value can be categorized and how they are endorsed by the people in three Chinese societies. In the past decade, studies on values concerning Chinese people focused on comparisons between Chinese and other cultures, and the results were deduced by comparing the rankings of the value items by different sample subjects (Feather, 1986; Brown and Lee, 1988). The differences found were mostly attributed to differences in cultural traditions or ways of socialization. For instance, Hsu (1972, 1981) claimed that situation-centeredness and the tendency of underplaying all matters of their heart were the two characteristics of the Chinese. It has also been suggested that the Chinese are more collectivistic (Ho, 1979; Li and Yang, 1974). In Mainland China, most of the theoretical discussions concerning human values focuses on the relationship between the Chinese traditional values and modernization (Du, 1986; Li, 1988; Wang, 1986; Zheng and Hu, 1986). It is believed that the tradition of ignoring personal values such as self-
striving and achievement has been the obstacle to the fulfillment of modernization goals. Unfortunately, discussions concerning values in Mainland China have been confused with philosophical disputation and lack empirical support. The investigation in this study will be carried out empirically so that the subsequent discussions can be based on an empirical footing.

As in Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987) value domain survey, the present study will compare the value preferences in different societies based on value groupings instead of individual values. It is believed that importance scores for domains are more reliable, more parsimonious, and clearer in meaning than single value scores (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990).

Two of the Chinese samples are selected from Mainland China. One is from Guangzhou which is located in south China close to Hong Kong. The other is from Shanghai, a city which used to be a famous industrial and business centre in the Far East. The third sample is from Hong Kong. These samples are selected because it is believed that some crucial differences distinguishing these three Chinese societies may influence the way the people there endorse values. Though values reflect to some extent the distillation of the past, they are also a response to societal transformations and to current conditions.

Although Hong Kong is a Chinese society, and a part of China geographically, it has been under British
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colonial rule for about 150 years. The place has developed into a Westernized society especially with regard to its legal and educational system. Economically, the pace of development accelerated from the 1960's through the 1980's. Now, Hong Kong has become one of the most important financial centres in the world, and the people there enjoy a much higher living standard than do those in China. Guangzhou is the capital city of the Guangdong province. Residents there share the same dialect with the people in Hong Kong and have been culturally influenced by the colony. For instance, due to geographical proximity, Guangzhou is able to receive radio and television programmes from the colony. Moreover, many of the people in Guangzhou have relatives in Hong Kong. Economically, the "open policy" was only recently implemented. (The policy was introduced in the early 1980s). People there are just beginning to experience the fruits of such a policy. Shanghai is the biggest industrial city in China which generates 10% of the state's financial income. However, it is least open to western influences. Culturally, Shanghai is the most traditional Chinese society. All these differences may have significant influences on the value preferences of the people in the three societies.

Hypothesis I: Social power

One of the explanations of how economic and social differences may affect value preferences is the theory
It states that in the less developed countries, there are fewer educated people. Therefore, anyone who is educated is much more likely to occupy the few high level positions that are available. As a result, values such as social power may be endorsed more strongly by the people in a poor country than those in a developed country. As mentioned above, the economic growth and level of modernization in the three societies are different. For example, the gross national product per capita of Hong Kong is much higher than that of the P.R.C. (US$ 9,700 vs. US$ 340, approximately in 1988). Thus, according to the above theory, it would be expected that power would be rated more highly by the people in China than by the people in Hong Kong. In addition, social power can be a very profitable instrument in China because of the inefficiency of the legal system. In their study which measures the students' value orientations in Beijing, Peng and Chen (1989) found that political value which included items such as "outstanding others", received the highest ranking among the six value orientations. Accordingly, it is hypothesized that respondents in Shanghai and Guangzhou will rate social power higher than will those in Hong Kong. It is also worth mentioning that people in Guangzhou are believed to be more interested in economic affairs than political affairs when compared to people in other parts of the country (Qing, 1989). It is therefore expected
that the respondents in Shanghai will rate social power higher than will the people in Guangzhou.

**Hypothesis II: Spirituality**

According to Seeman (1972, 1975), the price one has to pay for enjoying a high living standard, where life is usually competitive, is an accelerating sense of alienation: the feeling of being isolated from others, a sense of impersonality and anonymity, the deprivation of the sense of belonging to a community. The people in Hong Kong, with the highest living standards among the three cities, are therefore expected to suffer more from this sense of alienation than people in Shanghai and Guangzhou. They may, therefore, seek after those values which can compensate their spiritual emptiness. It is therefore reasonable to expect that people in Hong Kong will rate values in the spiritual domain higher than their counterparts in Guangzhou and Shanghai.

**Hypothesis III: Self-striving**

Until recently, people in Mainland China are taught and even forced to abandon their self-interests in pursuit of the country's collective interests (Du, 1986). Self-striving and individual achievements are still not encouraged. In addition, the Chinese culture traditionally emphasized filial piety and responsibility to the family. Expression of individual needs and desires were consciously and unconsciously suppressed
(Chen and Yang, 1986). Since suppression could become a positive stimulation, the self-striving domain will probably be rated as more important by the people in Guangzhou and Shanghai than by the people in Hong Kong where the external political forces against personal desire does not exist. In a study to uncover the relations between value preference and personal control, Lau (1989) found that individualistic orientation was especially prominent among Chinese in Mainland China when compared with the Chinese in Hong Kong. Furthermore, although both Guangzhou and Shanghai are in Mainland China, Guangzhou is a more recently developed industrial city. However, the "open" policies by which economic reforms were implemented were adopted earlier in Guangzhou. People in Guangzhou now enjoy the fruits of the flexible economic policies which included many elements of a marketing economy. Opportunities are now open to those who are willing to strive for the better. As a result, people in Guangzhou may rate self-striving as more important than those in Shanghai.

**Hypothesis IV: Sex differences in values**

The process of socialization often trains males and females to take up different sex-roles. In the Chinese society, men are expected to be responsible for "external affairs" of the family, while women are responsible for "inner matters". In addition, men are expected to be "gang" (strong or capable), while women are expected to
be "rou" (soft, polite and obedient). According to the above, male respondents are expected to rate the factor of self-striving, which contains values such as creativity, courage, success, and ambition, higher than will female respondents. By the same token, females will rate factors related to self-cultivation and spiritual life higher than males because they are socialized to develop these qualities.

Through testing the above hypotheses, the present research will also investigate the relationships between values and beliefs, and the relationships between values and behavioural intentions. As stated above, values could be categorized in light of the interests they serve and the types of goals to which they refer. It seems reasonable to assume that people who give high ratings for certain kinds of values may also give high ratings for beliefs and behavioural intentions which have similar orientations with the value domains. In short, the correlations between the importance of values and collectivism/individualism, and those between the need for achievement, locus of control, and dominance will be examined.

Collectivism was defined as a set of feelings, beliefs, ideology, and actions related to solidarity and concern for others (Hui & Triandis, 1986). It is expected that value dimensions such as social power and self-striving, which serve individualistic interests, should be positively related to individualism. Locus of
control refers to the perception of personal control over one's environment. It is speculated that values such as self-striving, self-direction, and achievement would be positively related to the beliefs of self-control over the environment. Dominance refers to the intention of controlling others. Values of social power would positively relate to this scale. Finally, the value domains achievement and self-striving should be positively related to the need for achievement.

**Method**

**Subjects**

In the first part of the study, 200 (115 males, 72 females, 13 who did not specify gender) teachers in Guangzhou, 205 (83 males, 117 females, 5 who did not specify gender) teachers in Hong Kong, 188 (113 males, 82 females, 4 who did not specify gender) teachers in Shanghai were invited to participate in the study. The mean ages of the Guangzhou, Hong Kong and Shanghai sample were 26.25 (SD = 4.32), 29.08 (SD = 4.33), 35.04 (SD = 10.67) years, respectively. They were teaching primary six through secondary three school children. Most of the teachers involved in the study were taking their advanced programme at an educational institute in their respective societies. One reason for selecting teachers as respondents was that teachers are literate, and more receptive to research than other groups. In addition, since teachers play an important role in
value socialization, their values may be more indicative of the preferred cultural hierarchy, and may be transferred to the next generation through the process of education (Schwartz, 1987).

In the second part of the research, 120 (55 males, 65 females) undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at the Chinese University of Hong Kong completed the questionnaires to fulfill a course requirement. The other 126 (72 males, 54 females) were undergraduates of Zhongshan University and Shanghai Normal University, China. They were invited to answer the questionnaires in class. The mean ages in the Hong Kong and China sample were 20.35 (SD = .79), 19.64 (SD = .62) years, respectively. These students were majoring in subjects of social science and natural science.

The Value Measure and Its Construction

In the first part of the investigation, the values survey prepared by Schwartz (1987) for his programme of research was translated, back-translated into Chinese, and refined after consultation, and then used in the study. The value survey consists of 56 items (four extra values were added to the Schwartz's value list in the Shanghai sample, but the extra values were not analyzed in the present study) from 10 (Schwartz revised his domains theory and the domains were increased from 7 to 10) motivational domains of values. These ten motivational domains were Power (social power, wealth, authority, social recognition, preserving public image),
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Achievement (successful, capable, ambitious, intelligent, influential), Hedonism (pleasure, enjoying life), Stimulation (daring, a varied life, an exciting life), Self-direction (creativity, freedom, curious, independent, choosing own goals), Universalism (social justice, broad-minded, world at peace, wisdom, a world of beauty, unity with nature, protecting the environment, equality), Benevolence (helpful, forgiving, honest, mature love, spiritual life, loyal), Tradition Maintenance (accepting my portion in life, devout, respect for tradition, humble, moderate), Restrictive Conformity (obedient, self-discipline, politeness, honoring parents and elders), and Security (family security, national security, social order, clean, reciprocation of favors, sense of belonging). The ten value domains were grouped into four broader, more abstract categories based on theoretical assignment and recurrent empirical organization of the values. They are: Self-promotion (Power plus Achievement plus Hedonism); Self-transcendence (Universalism plus Benevolence); Openness/Change (Self-direction plus Stimulation); Conservation (Security plus Restrictive Conformity, Tradition Maintenance).

The values were selected from Eastern and Western cultures and are believed to tap all motivational domains relevant to any cultural tradition. Related values in the questionnaire were classified into domains according to the assumption that they reflected a simi-
lar major motivational goal and their empirical location in over 2/3 cultures of Schwartz's samples.

The assumption of domains was based on the theory that values were derived from three universal human requirements: needs of individuals as biological organisms, requisites of coordinated social interaction, and survival and welfare needs of groups (Schwartz, 1987). In addition, the value domains were mapped according to the interests they serve (individualistic vs. collectivist) and the type of goal to which they refer (terminal vs. instrumental). The domains which were considered as serving individualistic interests include: 1) Hedonism, 2) Achievement, 3) Power, 4) Self-direction and 5) Stimulation. The domains serving collectivist interests include 1) Tradition Maintenance, 2) Restrictive Conformity and 3) Benevolence. Domains of Universalism and Security were assumed to serve both interests. Each of the ten domains had its corresponding terminal and instrumental values.

The values in the questionnaire were ordered according to the rule of maximizing variation in expected importance between adjacent items, and separating values from the same motivational domains. This arrangement was made to prevent or reduce artifactual correlations among values. The values were rated on a nine-point (from -1 to 7) scale. 7 is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in the respondents' life, and -1 is for rating
any values opposed to the principles that guide the respondents. Zero indicates that the value is not at all important.

In the second part of the study, the Schwartz Value Survey and the following scales were administered:

**Dominance scale.** A twelve item scale formulated by Zhang (1990) was used to measure a person's intent to dominate others. The responses were made on a 6-point scales. The scale consists of questions, such as "Do you tend to control others?", "Would you prefer being a leader than being a worker?" and etc.

**Individualism-collectivism (INDCOL) scale.** The original INDCOL Scale (Hui, 1988) consists of 63 items dealing with concern for six collectivities (own spouse, parents/children, kin, neighbors, friends, and co-workers/classmates). For the purpose of the present study, only the parents/children and friends collectivities were tested. There were 16 items concerning the parents/children collectivity, and 10 dealing with friends. Some sample items are as follows:

P6. It is reasonable for a son to continue his father's business.

P15. I would never tell my parents about how many children I wish to have.

F4. My good friends and I agree on the best places to shop.

**Locus of control.** Subjects were also administered
Levenson's (1973) locus of control scales that include one measure on internality (the Internal scale) and two measures on externality (the Powerful Others and Luck scales). The items attempt to measure the degree to which a subject perceives events in his/her life as being the consequence of his/her own acts, under the control of powerful others, or determined by chance. The scales were translated into Chinese, and the translations were improved by consulting two bilingual persons. The test has 24 items, and each of the three subscales comprised of eight items in a Likert format.

**Need for achievement.** The Chinese version of Myers' (1965) Achievement Motivation Scale (AMS) translated by Lau and Wu (consulted two bilinguals), was administered. The scale consists of nine statements to be rated on a five-point scale. Some examples of the items are as follows:

2. You regard yourself as a more consistent and harder worker in your classroom assignment than the model student in your classes.

7. You have a very strong desire to excel academically.

**Procedure**

In the first part of the investigation, the Schwartz Value Survey was administered in classes to those teachers who were taking their advanced study in a college of education, or personally to those who were currently teaching in schools. The respondents were
asked to rate the values in the scale independently. The survey required about fifteen minutes to complete.

In the second part of the study, the students were invited to complete the questionnaires independently in class. It needed about thirty minutes to complete the Schwartz Value Survey plus the questionnaires.

Results—Part I

By societies, the means for the total score on the Schwartz Value Survey for the teachers' samples were tested. There was no significant difference among the three societies, $F(2, 530) = 3.76, p > .01$. Therefore, it was believed that there was no response bias for the respondents from different areas.

Factor analysis was adopted for data analysis because the technique was able to examine the structure of a given domain as represented by sample of variables, and identify their basic conceptual dimensions (Gorsuch, 1983). Although some universal value domains had been established by Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990) based on theoretical derivation and the data from a number of different cultures, value dimensions derived from the present factor analyses still had their unique worthiness. Firstly, as the importance of values would be compared among Chinese societies, it might be more appropriate to use these indexes, which were, value dimensions based on the Chinese samples only. Secondly,
Schwartz's value domains were established mainly from theoretical derivation and were still being revised based on recent empirical findings. Actually, the number of domains, as well as value labels in the domains, are now being amended (Schwartz, 1990, personal communication).

First, the combined data of the three samples was analyzed by a unweighted least square solution. The unweighted least square solution is one of the factor extraction methods in the factor analysis family which produces, for a fixed number of factors, a factor pattern matrix minimizing the sum of the squared differences between the observed and reproduced correlation matrices. By doing such a joint factor analysis (Leung and Bond, 1989), the value groupings common to these three Chinese groups, as well as the factor scores for further analysis, could be found.

Second, the factor scores based on the loadings greater or equal to .35 was tested by using a two-way analysis of variance with three levels of the culture variable and two levels of the sex variable. For the purpose of comparison, Schwartz's ten value domains, and the four categories (Schwartz, 1990, personal communication) were also tested using the above analyses of variance. The means of the factor scores and the domains as well as the categories and dimensions from the New Zealand teacher's sample would be used for drawing broad comparisons with Western societies.
**Factor Analysis**

By this analysis, we aimed to find out the relative cultural strength on the value structure for these three Chinese groups. The data from the three regions were put together to do a unweighted least square factor analysis. 250 females and 271 males were submitted to the analysis (for each sample, some subjects were dropped for the purpose of getting equal numbers from each sex in each society). The number of subjects from each sample was approximately equal.

A scree test indicated four reliable factors accounting for 26.1% of the matrix variance. An oblique rotation was applied to the four factors.

As could be seen, the first factor involves values pertaining to that of how a person interacts with others or, how a person wishes the world to be. This factor included the values placed in Schwartz’s domains of "Benevolence", "Restrictive Conformity", and "Tradition Maintenance". This factor was named "Self-cultivation".

Values involved in the second factor concerned the ability or potential of a person to approach his/her goals. These values were found in Schwartz’s domains of "Achievement", "Power", and "Stimulation". This was a "Self-striving" factor.
The third factor was named "Social Power". This factor involved those values pertaining to the ability to control others. The factor included the values placed in Schwartz's domains of "Hedonism", "Power", and "Security".

The fourth factor included values pertaining to transcendence of the material world. The values were placed in Schwartz's domains of "Self-direction", "Tradition Maintenance", and "Security". This factor was labeled "Spirituality".

The Cronbach alphas for the four factors were .84, .77, .73, and .64 respectively. The first three coefficients were relatively high, and the fourth was acceptable.

**Analysis of Variance for the Four Factors**

The factor scores of the four identified factors were calculated by adding together those values with factor loadings greater or equal to .35. These scores were then tested by using a 2x3 analysis of variance across the three levels of the sample variable, and two levels of the sex variable. All 521 subjects' data were analyzed. The means of the four factor scores from the three Chinese regions and New Zealand are summarized in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

**Self-cultivation.** There was a main effect for the
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society variable, $E(2, 515)=10.85, p<.001$. The means are summarized in Table 3.

Duncan's post hoc test indicates that the means of Hong Kong and Shanghai are greater than that of Guangzhou. The mean of the New Zealand data on this factor is 4.03. This mean is notably higher than that of the Guangzhou sample ($M=3.64$).

**Self-striving.** There was a main effect for the culture variable, $E(2, 515)=17.63, p<.001$. The mean of the Guangzhou sample was greater than those of the Hong Kong and Shanghai samples according to a Duncan post hoc test for the $M's$ (means=4.07 vs. 3.57 and 3.60 respectively, $p<.01$). There was also a main effect for sex, $E(1, 515)=5.06, p<.05$, with males scoring higher than females ($mean's=3.83$ vs. 3.63 respectively). The mean of the New Zealand data on this factor is 3.88, which is lower than that of Guangzhou but higher than those of Shanghai and Hong Kong.

**Social Power.** There was a main effect for the culture variable, $E(2, 515)=23.05, p<.001$. The mean of the Guangzhou sample is greater than that of Shanghai, and the mean of Shanghai is greater than that of Hong Kong by Duncan's $M's$ test ($M's=4.09$ vs. 3.65, and 3.65 vs. 3.47, respectively, $p<.01$). The mean of the New
Zealand data is 3.38, which is markedly lower than those from the Guangzhou and Shanghai samples.

There was also an interaction between the culture and the sex of the subjects, $F(2, 515)=11.74$, $p<.001$. Male respondents of Guangzhou sample rated this factor higher than did their female counterparts ($mean's=4.34$ vs. $3.77$, $p<.01$). While the means from females showed no difference among the societies.

**Spirituality.** There was a main effect for sex, $F(1, 515)=4.99$, $p<.05$, females scoring higher than males ($mean's=3.64$ vs. $3.39$ respectively). There was also a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=75.91$, $p<.001$. Subjects in the Hong Kong sample scored higher than those from the Guangzhou and Shanghai samples ($mean's=4.18$ vs. $3.32$ and $3.01$ respectively, $p<.01$). The mean of the New Zealand data on this factor is 3.90, which is slightly lower than that of Hong Kong but higher than those of Guangzhou and Shanghai.

**Analysis of Variance for Schwartz's 10 Domains**

Schwartz's 10 "universal value domains" based on 26 samples from 17 countries were tested using analysis of variance with three levels of the culture variable and two levels of the sex variable. The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 4.

---

**Power.** There was a main effect for the culture
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variable, $F(2, 515)=27.90, p<.001$. The Duncan post hoc means test indicates that the mean of Guangzhou sample is greater than those of the Shanghai and the Hong Kong samples, and the mean of the Shanghai sample is greater than that of the Hong Kong sample (mean's=3.63 vs. 3.08, and 3.08 vs. 2.64 respectively, $p<.01$). The mean of the New Zealand data on this domain is 2.24 which is lower than that of any one of the three Chinese samples.

There was also an interaction between the culture variable and sex of the subjects, $F(2, 515)=8.64, p<.001$. The mean of the Guangzhou male is greater than that of its female counterparts (mean's=3.91 vs. 3.18, $p<.01$).

Achievement. There was a main effect for culture variable, $F(2, 515)=17.31, p<.001$. The mean of Guangzhou was greater than those of Shanghai and Hong Kong (mean's=4.66 vs. 4.25, 4.03 respectively, $p<.01$, Duncan's test). The mean of the New Zealand data on this domain is 4.02, clearly lower than those of the Guangzhou and Shanghai samples.

Hedonism. There was a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=13.09, p<.001$. The Duncan means test indicated that the mean of Guangzhou was greater than those of Hong Kong and Shanghai, and the mean of Hong Kong was greater than that of Shanghai (mean's=3.71 vs. 3.34, and 2.99 respectively, $p<.01$). The mean of the New Zealand data on this domain is 3.87, markedly higher.
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than those of the Hong Kong and Shanghai samples.

There was also an interaction between the culture variable and the sex of the subjects, $F(2, 515)=8.69$, $p<.001$. The mean of the Guangzhou males was higher than that of its female counterparts ($mean's=3.15$ vs. 2.57, $p<.01$).

**Stimulation.** There was a main effect for the sex variable, $F(1, 515)=11.00$, $p<.01$, with males scoring higher than females. There was also a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=8.39$, $p<.001$. The means test indicates that the mean of Guangzhou was greater than those of Hong Kong and Shanghai ($mean's=2.86$ vs. 2.37, and 2.34 respectively, $p<.01$, Duncan's test). The mean of the New Zealand sample on this domain is 3.29, noticeably higher than those of all three Chinese samples.

**Self-direction.** There was a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=10.39$, $p<.001$. Subjects in the Guangzhou sample scored higher than those in the Hong Kong and Shanghai samples ($mean's=4.59$ vs. 4.36 and 4.14 respectively, $p<.01$) by the Duncan's test. The mean of the New Zealand sample on this domain is 4.45, higher than that of the Shanghai sample.

**Universalism.** There was no difference for the culture variable and sex variable. The mean of New Zealand sample is 4.47, noticeably higher than those of the three Chinese samples.

**Benevolence.** There was a main effect for the
culture variable, $F(2, 515)=13.41, p<.01$. The mean of the Hong Kong sample was greater than those of the Guangzhou and Shanghai samples ($\text{mean}'s=4.55 \text{ vs. } 4.06 \text{ and } 4.14, p<.01$, Duncan's test). The mean of the New Zealand data on this domain is 4.56, higher than those of Shanghai and Guangzhou samples.

**Tradition Maintenance.** There was a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=25.00, p<.001$. The mean of Hong Kong was greater than that of Shanghai, and that of Shanghai was greater than that of Guangzhou ($M's=2.98 \text{ vs. } 2.45, \text{ and } 2.45 \text{ vs. } 2.17$ respectively, $p<.01$, Duncan's test). The mean of the New Zealand data on this domain is 2.73, markedly higher than the Guangzhou sample.

**Restrictive Conformity.** There was a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=7.34, p<.01$. The subjects in Shanghai scored higher than those in Guangzhou ($\text{mean}'s=4.05 \text{ vs. } 3.84, p<.01$, Duncan's test). The mean of the New Zealand data on this domain is 3.88.

**Security.** There was a main effect for the sex variable, $F(1, 515)=16.35, p<.01$, with females scoring higher than males. There was also a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=5.20, p<.01$. The mean of Hong Kong was higher than that of Guangzhou ($\text{mean}'s=4.36 \text{ vs. } 4.05, p<.01$). The mean of the New Zealand data on this domain is 3.97, lower than those of the Hong Kong and Shanghai samples.
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Self-promotion. There was a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=26.26$, $p<.001$. The respondents from Guangzhou scored higher than did the respondents from Shanghai and Hong Kong (mean's=3.99 vs. 3.43 and 3.34, $p<.01$). There was also an interaction between the culture and sex variables, $F(2, 515)=8.57$, $p<.01$. The mean of the Guangzhou males was higher than that of the Guangzhou females (mean's=4.24 vs. 3.66, $p<.01$).

Self-transcendence. There was a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=5.96$, $p<.01$. The respondents from Hong Kong scored higher than did the respondents from Guangzhou and Shanghai (mean's=4.28 vs. 4.08 and 4.01, $p<.05$).

Openness/Change. There was a main effect for the sex variable, $F(1, 515)=8.67$, $p<.01$, with males scoring higher than females. There was also a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=12.09$, $p<.01$. The mean of Guangzhou respondents was higher than those of Hong Kong and Shanghai (mean's=3.75 vs. 3.37 and 3.25, $p<.01$).

Conservation. There was a main effect for the culture variable, $F(2, 515)=11.32$, $p<.01$. The mean of Guangzhou was lower than those of Hong Kong and Shanghai (mean's=3.29 vs. 3.67 and 3.62, $p<.01$).

Results-Part II
All the statistical analyses in the second part were done with the pooled student subjects from China and Hong Kong. When the overall results were compared with those of each group, no significant differences were found. Therefore, only the overall results will be reported here.

**Internal Structure of the Varied Scales**

As the scales used were formulated in the West and applied to Chinese societies for the very first time, their internal structures and validities were tested before their application.

**Locus of control.** The twenty-four items were subjected to a factor analysis with the method of unweighted least squares. A scree plot test showed that the instrument actually included three factors. The three-factor solution was rotated using the varimax method. There were 9 items in the first factor (Luck), 6 items in the second factor (Powerful Others), and 5 items in the third factor (Self). The loadings for all these items were equal to or greater than .30. Four items were dropped during further analyses. The twenty items included in the analyses were as following:

A. Luck:

1) To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings.

2) When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.

3) Often there is no chance of protecting my per-
sonal interests from bad luck happenings.

4) When I get what I want, it's usually because I'm lucky.

5) Whether or not I have a traffic accident mainly depends on my luck.

6) It's not always wise for me to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune.

7) Getting what I want means I have to please those people above me.

8) Whether or not I get to be a leader depends on whether I'm lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time.

9) It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many friends.

B. Powerful Others:

1) Even if I were a good leader, I would not be made a leader unless I play up to those in positions of power.

2) My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.

3) People like myself have very little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of powerful other people.

4) If important people were to decide they didn't like me, I probably wouldn't make many friends.

5) I am usually able to protect my personal inter-
6) In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.

C. Self:
1) How many friends I have depends on how nice a person I am.
2) I have often found that what is going to happen will begin.
3) I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.
4) When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it.
5) My life is determined by my own actions.

The items included in the three factors were slightly different from those in the three sub-scales described by Levenson (1973). For instance, the item "Getting what I want means I have to please people above me" was included in the factor of Luck, not in the factor of Powerful Others. Internal reliabilities of the three empirical factors were computed. Cronbach alphas for Luck, Powerful Others, and Self were .82, .89, and .80, respectively. The internal consistencies of the sub-scales were relatively high.

Need for achievement. The 9-item need for achievement scale was subjected to a factor analysis using the method of unweighted least squares. There were 8 items which had loadings equal or greater than .30 in the
one-factor solution for the N-ach scale. The Cronbach alpha was .77 for these 8 items. This is relatively high.

Collectivism/individualism. The 16-item C/I (parent) and 10-item C/I (friend) scales were subjected to factor analyses. Only one factor could be extracted from each. If the .30 loading was used as the cutting point for salient items, 11 items were included in the scale of C/I (P), and 6 in the C/I (F). The Cronbach alphas for C/I (P) and C/I (F) were .88 and .65 respectively. The former coefficient was rather high, and the second one was acceptable.

Dominance. The 12 items were also subjected to a factor analysis. A one-factor solution showed that 11 items were salient. The Cronbach alpha for these 11 items was .76. This reliability coefficient was relatively high.

Correlations Between Value Dimensions, Value Domains and the Scales.

Correlations between the four value factors (Self-cultivation, Self-striving, Social power and Spirituality), Schwartz's 10 value domains, 4 value categories and the varied scales were computed and presented in Table 5.

Locus of control with values. Self was positively
correlated with Self-striving ($r(1,243)=.33, p<.01$), Social Power ($r(1,242)=.16, p<.01$), Achievement ($r(1,243)=.35, p<.01$), Power ($r(1,244)=.21, p<.01$), Self-direction ($r(1,244)=.31, p<.01$), Restrictive Conformity ($r(1,242)=.15, p<.01$), Self-promotion ($r(1,244)=.21, p<.01$) and Openness ($r(1,241)=.24, p<.01$). Luck was correlated with Hedonism ($r(1,241)=.19, p<.01$), Social Power ($r(1,242)=.16, p<.01$), Power ($r(1,243)=.16, p<.01$), and Self-promotion ($r(1,242)=.18, p<.01$). Others was positively correlated with Hedonism ($r(1,241)=.16, p<.01$), and negatively correlated with Self-cultivation ($r(1,242)=-.17, p<.01$), and Restrictive Conformity ($r(1,244)=-.16, p<.01$).

**Need for achievement with values.** Need for achievement was positively correlated significantly with Self-cultivation ($r(1,241)=.19, p<.01$), Achievement ($r(1,242)=.26, p<.01$), Restrictive Conformity ($r(1,240)=.23, p<.01$), Conservation, ($r(1,244)=.22, p<.01$), Security ($r(1,242)=.18, p<.01$), and negatively correlated with Hedonism ($r(1,240)=-.15, p<.01$).

**Individualism with values.** Individualism (parent) was found negatively significantly correlated with Self-cultivation ($r(1,242)=-.16, p<.01$), Spirituality ($r(1,243)=-.18, p<.01$), Benevolence ($r(1,241)=-.16, p<.01$), Tradition Maintenance ($r(1,243)=-.17, p<.01$), Restrictive Conformity ($r(1,241)=-.15, p<.01$), and with Conservation ($r(1,244)=-.21, p<.01$). Individualism
friend) correlated negatively with Self-cultivation ($r(1,244)=-.19$, $p<.01$), Benevolence ($r(1,243)=-.18$, $p<.01$), Tradition Maintenance ($r(1,244)=-.18$, $p<.01$), Self-transcendence ($r(1,244)=-.17$, $p<.01$), and positive with Social Power ($r(1,244)=.19$, $p<.01$), Power ($r(1,243)=.23$, $p<.01$), Hedonism ($r(1,244)=.17$, $p<.01$), Security ($r(1,244)=.18$, $p<.01$), and Self-promotion ($r(1,244)=.21$, $p<.01$).

**Dominance with values.** The highest correlation was that between dominance and Power ($r(1,242)=.45$, $p<.01$). Dominance was also positively correlated with Self-striving ($r(1,242)=.35$, $p<.01$), Social Power ($r(1,244)=.27$, $p<.01$), Achievement ($r(1,242)=.41$, $p<.01$), Stimulation ($r(1,242)=.26$, $p<.01$), Self-direction ($r(1,243)=.18$, $p<.01$), Self-promotion ($r(1,042)=.35$, $p<.01$), Openness ($r(1,242)=.26$, $p<.01$), and negatively with Self-cultivation ($r(1,243)=-.21$, $p<.01$), Spirituality ($r(1,242)=-.17$, $p<.01$), Benevolence ($r(1,244)=-.16$, $p<.01$), Tradition Maintenance ($r(1,244)=-.25$, $p<.01$), Security ($r(1,242)=-.17$, $p<.01$), and Self-transcendence ($r(1,044)=-.18$, $p<.01$).

**Discussion**

The results of the present study indicate that the people of the three Chinese societies differ in their value preferences. As to how they are different, the comparisons made using the value factors and those made using the value domains resulted in similar findings.
When using the four value factors, Social Power and Self-striving were rated higher by the people in Guangzhou. The people in Shanghai and in Hong Kong have similar higher ratings for the value factor of Self-cultivation. Whereas values of Spirituality were more highly valued by the people of Hong Kong.

The comparison showed that the people in Guangzhou and Shanghai are more concerned with the values from the Power domain. This coincided with the result of the comparison using the Social Power factor. This difference in the value preference of the three groups of people may be due to the difference in the degree of usefulness of power in the different societies. In China, power is often used to attain higher social positions. It is often perceived as a symbol of capability and a means of controlling others. This can be seen from the fact that there is a strong correlation between the power value (for both the value factor and the value domain) and the personality trait of dominance. Furthermore, in China where autocracy is in practice, power is something which stays with the person once secured. Personal power rather than any legal system runs the show there. Due to this practical value of power, the Chinese people will make the pursuit of power as one of their major personal goals. On the other hand, in a society which is governed by a well established legal system, such as in Hong Kong, the
power that accompanies high social status is of relatively less practical value. Nor does the social status acquired have any guarantee of permanence. This may be the reason why the people in China (both in Guangzhou as well as in Shanghai) rated the domain of Power as more important.

Peng and Chen (1989) found that among the six value orientations, political value, which is similar to the value of power in the present study, was the most preferred one for students in Beijing. It is due to the prevalence of "authority centering" (meaning the worship of authority) that the students in Beijing ranked their preferences in such an order. Both the present study and the Peng and Chen's study, therefore, arrived at similar conclusions about the value of power for the Mainland Chinese. The overall findings on power in the present study are also consistent with the results of some previous empirical studies. For instance, Chinese subjects gave higher rankings to values such as social recognition and ambition than did their Western counterparts or the Chinese who live in a westernized society (Feather, 1986; Lau, 1989).

With regard to the comparison using the Self-striving factor and the domains of Achievement and Stimulation, findings were that both were rated much higher by the people in Guangzhou. This is not surprising because the values contained in the factor of Self-striving come from the domains of Achievement and
Stimulation which serve individualistic interests (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987). Many would assume that this factor should be valued more by the people in Hong Kong as they are living in a westernized society where individualism has a greater predominance than in a traditional Chinese society. The findings, however, showed the contrary. Such a departure from expectation may be based on two reasons. Firstly, as already stated in hypothesis III, external forces which suppress the wish for self-striving may in effect stimulate such a wish. This may be the case in China. Moreover, since Guangzhou was able to adopt the "open policy" earlier than the other cities in the country, self-striving efforts have borne fruits for the people there. As such, the people in Guangzhou have been further encouraged to value Self-striving. Secondly, values which serve individualistic interests may not necessarily be associated with culture-level individualism. Actually, none of these factors or domains showed significant correlations with individualism in the present study. The findings of other researchers have also indicated that people from collectivist societies might have a high desire for individualistic values contained in the Self-striving factor (Furnham, 1984; Lau, 1989; Furnham and Alibhai, 1985).

The fact that the people in Hong Kong value Spirituality higher than their counterparts in China may be
because Hong Kong is a highly competitive society. It has been mentioned before that one of the prices people must pay for modernization is a feeling of alienation (Seeman, 1972, 1975). Since Hong Kong is much more modernized than Guangzhou and Shanghai, the people in Hong Kong may suffer more from such a feeling of alienation. They may experience more pain from impersonality, isolation, and a sense of powerlessness. The other possible explanation is that the feeling of powerlessness of the people in Hong Kong may be enhanced as the date of the colony's return to China approaches. As a result of this sense of helplessness, I speculate that spirituality is highly valued by the residents in Hong Kong.

The Self-cultivation factor included values from Schwartz's domains of Restrictive Conformity, Tradition Maintenance and Benevolence. This value factor emphasizes obedience, loyalty, humility, and magnanimity in one's social and interpersonal relations. Self-cultivation is similar to the moral values discussed by intellectuals in China (Wen, 1989; Zheng and Hu, 1986). These central moral values are loyalty, humility, and moderation, the cultivation of which was believed to be a typically Chinese tradition. They are probably also barricades to modernization because the espousal of these values impedes creativity (Du, 1986; Wang, 1986; Wen, 1989; Zheng and Hu, 1986). Despite this conflict, the educational policies in China encourage the espousal
of such values probably because it will make the people easier to rule. It might therefore be speculated that this Self-cultivation factor would be highly rated by respondents in China. However, the findings of the present study indicated otherwise. It is interesting to note that the means of the Hong Kong sample and that of the Shanghai sample were higher than that of the Guangzhou sample. The correlation in the present study showed a negative association between the value factor of Self-cultivation and individualism. the greater the degree of individualism, the lower the desires for Self-cultivation. Among the three societies, Shanghai is the one with more traditional Chinese characteristics, and is the least westernized. Therefore, it is not surprising that the people in Shanghai rated this value factor higher than those in Guangzhou. The unexpected finding is that the people in Hong Kong also rated this value factor higher than did the people in Guangzhou.

When the results of the different Chinese societies were compared with those of New Zealand, using Schwartz's value domains, no indication of a broad Chinese-Western distinction could be found. The means of the New Zealand sample for the domains of Power, Achievement, Self-direction, Benevolence, Tradition Maintenance, and Restrictive Conformity are close to those of the Hong Kong sample. This finding implies
that not only cultural tradition, but some other factors, such as the social system, may influence value preferences. Although Hong Kong is basically a Chinese society, it is a capitalist society open to western influences in thinking and in culture. This explains why the resulting means of the two places were so close. It is only on Security and Hedonism that the means of the two places showed some sizable differences. The mean of the Hong Kong sample for Security is much higher than that of the New Zealand sample. The higher rating for Security by the people of Hong Kong may be due to the colony's high degree of collectivism and its weakness in military defence. Security and the well-being of the family is relatively more important in any collectivist culture, especially ones like China which are so politically volatile. For Hedonism, the New Zealand sample had a higher score than the Chinese samples. This finding probably reflects Chinese norms of self-effacement and of avoiding any impression of narrow self-seeking.

Some sex differences were found in the comparisons. Male respondents scored higher for the Self-striving factor and the Stimulation domain, while female respondents scored higher on the Spirituality factor. Such differences may be an indication that males have stronger desires for competence and are more willing to take risks. This finding is consistent with the results of other studies (Bond, 1988; Feather, 1986; Lau, 1988).
These sex differences may be the results of socialization which arise from different social expectations surrounding sex roles.

The unexpected finding of the present study on value comparisons is the Guangzhou-Shanghai-Hong Kong pattern of means. The means of Hong Kong are closer to those of Shanghai than to those of Guangzhou. As mentioned in the introduction, people in Guangzhou and Hong Kong share the same dialect and similar patterns of living. A Guangzhou-Hong Kong (or Hong Kong-Guangzhou)-Shanghai pattern of means would be a more reasonable expectation. However, for the value factors of Self-cultivation, Self-striving, and Social Power, the means of the Hong Kong sample were similar to those of the Shanghai samples. As in the case of the value domains, the means of both samples for Achievement, Stimulation, Self-direction, and Restrictive Conformity were also similar. Among the three Chinese cities, Shanghai is slowest to receive western influences. Therefore, much of the traditional Chinese values are preserved. Following the implementation of the "open policy" in Guangzhou, the city received a sudden bombardment of western ideas. The result is a fast disintegration of traditional values. In Hong Kong, however, where western influences had been inherent for over a century, the people there have already overcome the "cultural void" created by the sudden impact of the west and which the
people in Guangzhou are still experiencing. Many of the western ideas adopted by the people in Hong Kong have been moderated to fit into the basically Chinese society. Much of the traditional Chinese values and philosophies of life have, in fact, been revived and are much talked about in Hong Kong like "The way of Zhong Rong" (meaning moderation). This may perhaps be the explanation why the means of the Hong Kong sample were similar to the Shanghai sample.

From this study, we can draw a few inferences. First, Power is a value greatly endorsed by the people in China. Second, some individualistic values were rated highly by people in more traditional Chinese societies contrary to the belief that these values should be upheld more strongly by people in societies where individualism is predominant. Last but not least, contemporary social factors have great influences on people's value system in addition to their cultural backgrounds.
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Table 1.

Loadings over or equal to .35 on the four factors found in joint Hong Kong, Guangzhou, and Shanghai samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-cultivation</td>
<td>Self-striving</td>
<td>Social power</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedient (.57)</td>
<td>Creativity (.64)</td>
<td>Wealth (.61)</td>
<td>Devout (.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social order (.57)</td>
<td>Varied life (.54)</td>
<td>Enjoying life (.50)</td>
<td>Detachment (.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest (.55)</td>
<td>Daring (.53)</td>
<td>Preserve image (.50)</td>
<td>Spiritual life (.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful (.53)</td>
<td>Curious (.51)</td>
<td>Honoring parents</td>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World at peace (.52)</td>
<td>Influential (.49)</td>
<td>Family security</td>
<td>Freedom (.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-discipline (.51)</td>
<td>Capable (.46)</td>
<td>Social recognition</td>
<td>Mature love (.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal (.51)</td>
<td>Successful (.45)</td>
<td>Authority (.40)</td>
<td>Inner harmony (.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National security (.49)</td>
<td>Wisdom (.44)</td>
<td>Pleasure (.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice (.46)</td>
<td>Broad-minded (.41)</td>
<td>Social power (.38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness (.45)</td>
<td>Exiting life (.38)</td>
<td>Health (.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible (.43)</td>
<td>Ambitious (.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble (.43)</td>
<td>World of beauty (.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving (.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (.41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoring parents (.41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect tradition (.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting environment (.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocation (.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

Means of scores by culture and sex on the four factors found in the joint (Guangzhou, Shanghai, and Hong Kong) factor analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-cultivation</td>
<td>Self-striving</td>
<td>Social power</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female 3.71</td>
<td>female 3.96</td>
<td>female 3.77</td>
<td>female 3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male 3.58</td>
<td>male 4.16</td>
<td>male 4.34</td>
<td>male 3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female 4.04</td>
<td>female 3.52</td>
<td>female 3.79</td>
<td>female 3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male 3.95</td>
<td>male 3.66</td>
<td>male 3.53</td>
<td>male 2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female 3.99</td>
<td>female 3.49</td>
<td>female 3.55</td>
<td>female 4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male 3.96</td>
<td>male 3.65</td>
<td>male 3.38</td>
<td>male 4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female 3.99</td>
<td>female 3.49</td>
<td>female 3.55</td>
<td>female 4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male 3.96</td>
<td>male 3.65</td>
<td>male 3.38</td>
<td>male 4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The means of New Zealand are from Schwartz's mailing (1999)
Table 3.

Multiple mean's comparison of the four factor scores on samples

A. Factor I: Self-cultivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=4.00)</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=3.97)</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=3.64)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.01, Duncan's test

B. Factor II: Self-striving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=4.07)</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=3.60)</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=3.57)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.01, Duncan's test
Table 3. (cont’d)

C. Factor III: Social power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=4.09)</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=3.65)</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=3.47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.01, Duncan’s test

D. Factor IV: Spirituality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=4.18)</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=3.32)</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=3.01)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td>.96**</td>
<td>1.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.01, Duncan’s test
## Table 4.

**Multiple mean's comparison of Schwartz's 10 domains on samples**

### Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=3.63)</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=3.08)</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=2.64)</th>
<th>New Zealand (M=2.24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.99**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.01, Duncan's test

### Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=4.66)</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=4.25)</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=4.03)</th>
<th>New Zealand (M=4.02)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.01, Duncan's test
### Table 4. (cont’d)

#### Hedonism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>New Zealand (M=3.87)</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=3.71)</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=3.34)</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=2.99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guangzhou</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hong Kong</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shanghai</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, Duncan’s test**

#### Stimulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>New Zealand (M=3.29)</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=2.86)</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=2.37)</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=2.34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guangzhou</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hong Kong</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shanghai</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, Duncan’s test**
## Self-direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Guangzhou</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Shanghai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou (M=4.59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand (M=4.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong (M=4.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai (M=4.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01, Duncan's test**

## Universalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Guangzhou</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Shanghai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand (M=4.47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou (M=4.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong (M=4.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai (M=3.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. (cont'd)

**Chinese Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>New Zealand (M=4.56)</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=4.55)</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=4.14)</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=4.06)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q<.01, Duncan's test**

---

**Tradition Maintenance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=2.98)</th>
<th>New Zealand (M=2.73)</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=2.45)</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=2.17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q<.01, Duncan's test**
### Restrictive conformity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=4.05)</th>
<th>New Zealand (M=3.38)</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=3.88)</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=3.64)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, Duncan's test

### Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Hong Kong (M=4.36)</th>
<th>Shanghai (M=4.21)</th>
<th>Guangzhou (M=4.05)</th>
<th>New Zealand (M=3.97)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, Duncan's test
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Luck</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>N-ach</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>Dom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-cultivation</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-striving</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social power</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-direction</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition-main.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-conformity</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-promotion</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-transcendence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness/Change</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01.
Chinese Values

Appendix A

Schwartz Value Survey (Chinese version used in Hong Kong)

價值觀問卷

作答指示

這份問卷要問下問問你自已：「對我自己來說，什麼價值觀是我個人的最重要，什麼價值觀是較不重要的？」

下面是用個價值觀列表。這些價值觀是取材自不同的文化，每個價值觀旁都有一個解釋該詞的句子，希望你會理解該詞的意義。

你的任務是按每個價值觀對你的個人重要程度給予分數。請用以下的評分制度：

0 - 表示這個價值觀毫無重要，與你的個人準則毫無關係。

1 - 表示這個價值觀相當重要。

3 - 表示這個價值觀是重要的。

6 - 表示這個價值觀是最重要的。

分數（0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6）越高，表示這個價值觀對你的個人準則越是重要。

-1 - 表示任何與你的做決準則相反的價值觀。

-7 - 表示這個價值觀對你的個人準則是至為重要的；一般來說，最多只有兩個這樣的價值觀。

請把數字（-1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7）填寫在每個價值觀前的空位內，以反映這個價值觀對你個人的最重要程度。

過去請盡量利用所有的數字以區別各價值觀之差異。有些數字會有時會用到一次的。

作為你的個人準則，這個價值觀是：

與我的價值觀相反重要非常至為重要
不重要重要重要
-1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

在你開始回答前，請先細閱 1 - 38 號的價值觀，然後揀出一個對你來說是至為重要的價值觀，並把它圈起來及給予分數。接著，揀出與你相反的價值觀，若無，則揀出對你來說是較不重要的價值觀。把它的圈起來並按其重要程度給予 -1, 0, 或 1 分。最後，請把其中的價值觀評分（至第三十題）。

價值觀第

1. 平等（各人機會均等）
2. 心境安慰（內心平靜）

香港中文大學圖書館藏書
### Chinese Values

**Appendix A (cont’d)**

作為我們的個人造則，這些價值觀是:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>價值觀</th>
<th>不重要</th>
<th>重要</th>
<th>非常重要</th>
<th>至為重要</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. 社會權力（控制及支配他人的力量）
4. 快感（滿足願望）
5. 自由（行動及思想自由）
6. 精神生活（生活中強調精神而非物質性的事物）
7. 緊密感（感受到對自己的關懷）
8. 社會的紀律（社會的穩定）
9. 一個刺激的人生（一些挑戰性的經驗）
10. 人生意義（生命的目標）
11. 福報（有福，良好的態度）
12. 富有（擁有物質及金錢）
13. 家庭安全（保護國土，免受敵人侵襲）
14. 自尊（肯定自己的自我價值）
15. 感恩/回報別人的恩惠（避免欠下別人的人情）
16. 創造力（獨特性，富想像力）
17. 世界和平（世界沒有戰爭及衝突）
18. 尊重傳統（保留年代久遠的習俗）
19. 成熟的愛（感情上及精神上十分親密）
20. 自律（自我約束，抗拒誘惑）
21. 超脫（超越物質世界）
22. 家庭安寧（所愛的人得到安全）
23. 社會認可（他人的尊敬，認可）
### Appendix A (cont'd)

作为我的做人准则，这价值观是：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>不重要</th>
<th>重要</th>
<th>非常重要</th>
<th>至为重要</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. 与自然合为一体（适应大自然）

25. 充满变化的人生（生活中充满挑战，变化万千及新奇的事物）

26. 智慧（博学地理解生命）

27. 威力（领导或命令之权利）

28. 真正友谊（亲密的友谊，一些支持你的朋友）

29. 美好的世界（大自然及艺术的美）

30. 社会公义（纠正不公平的情况，照顾弱小）

### 价值量表二

现在请按照该价值观对您最深的准则的重要程度而给予分数。这些价值观是用不同形式的行为来表达。对你来说，它们有著不同的重要性。用前面的做法一样，请你参考利用所有数目的五行以区别不同的价值观。

在你开始作答前，请先预览 31 - 56 题的价值观，然后选出一个对你来说是最重要的，把它圈起来并按其重要程度给予分数。若无，循序递减对於你来说是最不重要的价值观。请把它圈起来并给予 -1，0 或 1 分。最后，请把其馀的价值观评分。

作为我的做人准则，这价值观是：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>不重要</th>
<th>重要</th>
<th>非常重要</th>
<th>至为重要</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. 独立（依靠自己，自给自足）

32. 贤和（避免极端的感情及行为）

33. 忠诚（对朋友及配偶忠诚）

34. 有野心（有抱负，有雄心）

35. 宽容（能容忍不同的意见及信念）
## Chinese Values

### Appendix A (cont'd)

作為我的做人準則，我之價值觀是：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>與我的價值觀相反</th>
<th>不重要</th>
<th>相反</th>
<th>重要</th>
<th>非常重要</th>
<th>至為重要</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. 謙虛 (謙遜, 不露鋒芒)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. 勇於冒險 (追求冒險, 風險)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. 保護環境 (維護大自然)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. 有影響力 (能影響人和事)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. 尊重/尊敬父母及長者 (表達敬意)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. 選擇自己的目標 (依照個人的意向)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. 健康 (生理及心理上沒有毛病)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. 能幹 (有才能, 勤奮有餘, 有效率)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. 接受命運的安排 (順從人生的際遇)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. 誠實 (真實, 誠意)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. 保持形象 (顧全自己的顏面, 要面子)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. 順從命令 (有責任心, 當忠於職守)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. 智慧 (明理分明, 富思考力)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. 幫助別人 (為別人的幸福而去幹)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. 享受生活 (享受食物, 性, 閒暇等等)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. 虔誠 (忠於宗教信仰及信念)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. 有責任心 (可依賴, 可信任的)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. 好奇 (對各樣事物皆感興趣, 喜歡探究)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. 責任大過 (願意犧牲他人)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. 成功 (達到目標)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. 乾淨 (整齊清潔)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
性别（请圈）： 男  女

出生年份：

接受正统教育的年数：

婚姻状况（请圈）： 单身  已婚或同居  婚居  已离婚

子女数目（请圈）：  0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  或以上

请你描述一下现在的职业，或上一份受雇的职业。请尽量明确。（例如：车房的漆匠，服装店的营业经理，小学六年级的自然科老师）


若有宗教信仰，你对其虔诚的程度是？（请圈）

非常虔诚

非常虔诚

不

2  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
这份问卷要你问自己，"对我来说，什么价值观是我做人的重要准则？"

下面有两份价值观项目表。这些价值观选自不同的文化。每个价值观后的括号内都有一个解释该词的句子，希望能帮助你了解该词的意义。

你的任务是按每个价值观对于你做人准则的重要程度给予分数。请用以下的评分制度：
0 — 表示这个价值观毫不重要，与你的做人准则毫无关系。
3 — 表示这个价值观是重要的。
6 — 表示这个价值观是非常重要的。
分数（0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6）越高，表示这个价值观对你做人准则越是重要。
-1 — 表示与你做人准则相反的价值观。
7 — 表示这个价值观对你做人准则是极端重要的。

一般来说，最多的只有两个这样的价值观。
请把分数（-1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7）填写在每个价值观前的空格内，以表明这个价值观对你个人的重要程度。请尽量利用所有的分数以区别各价值观的差异。有些分数你可重复使用。
作为我的做人准则，这价值观是

与我的价值观相反 不重要 重要 非常重要 极端重要

-1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

在你开始回答前，请仔细阅读1—30号的价值观，然后拣出一个对你来说是极端重要的价值观，把它圈起来并给予分数。接着，请拣出与你相反的价值观，并给它-1。如果没有，则请拣出对你来说不重要的价值观，给它0或1。然后评价其余的价值观（直到30）。

价值观表（一）

1. ——平等（各人机会均等）
2. ——心情安详（内心平静）
3. ——社会权力（控制及支配他人的力量）
4. ——快意（满足欲望）
5. ——自由（行动及思想自由）
6. ——精神生活（生活中强调精神而非物质性的事物）
7. ——归属感（感受到别人对自己的关怀）
8. ——社会的纪律（社会的稳定）
9. ——刺激性的人生（一些令人激动的经验）
10. ——人生意义（人生的目的）
11. ——礼貌（有礼，良好的态度）
12. ——富有（拥有物质及金钱）
13. ——国家安全（保护国土，免受敌人侵袭）
14. ——自尊（肯定自己的自我价值）
15. ——报恩／报答别人的情谊（避免欠别人的人情）
16. ——创造力（独特性，富有想象力）
17. ——世界和平（世界没有战争及冲突）
18. ——尊重传统（保留年代久远的习俗）
19. ——成熟的爱（感情上及精神上十分亲密）
20. ——自律（自我约束，抗拒诱惑）
21. ——超脱（脱离物质世界）
22. ——家庭安康（所爱的人得到安全）
23. ——社会认可（别人的尊敬，认可）
24. ——跟自然合为一体（适应大自然）
25. ——充满变化的人生（生活中充满挑战，变化万千及新奇的事物）
26. ——智慧（成熟地理解人生）
27. ——权威（领导权或命令权）
28. ——真正的友谊（亲密的友谊，一些支持你的朋友）
29. ——美好的世界（大自然及艺术美）
30. ——社会公正（纠正不公正的情况，照顾弱小）
价值观表（二）

现在请按价值观对做人准则的重要程度给予分数。这些价值观是用不同形式的行为来表达的。对你来说，它们有着不同的重要性。与前面的做法一样，请尽量利用所有的分数以区别不同的价值观。

在你开始作答前，请先细阅31—60号的价值观，然后选出一个对你来说是极端重要的，把它圈起来并按其重要程度给予分数。接着，请选出与你相反的价值观，给予-1。如果没有，则请选出对你来说是最不重要的价值观，请把它圈起来并给予0或1分。最后，给其余的价值观评分。

作为我的做人准则，这价值观是

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>与我的价值观相反</th>
<th>不重要</th>
<th>重要</th>
<th>非常重要</th>
<th>极端重要</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. ——独立（依靠自己，自给自足）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. ——温和（避免极端的感情行为）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. ——忠诚（对朋友及团体忠诚）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. ——有志气（勤奋，有抱负）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. ——胸怀宽广（能容忍不同的意见及信念）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. ——谦虚（谦逊，不露锋芒）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. ——勇于冒险（追求冒险，风险）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. ——保护环境（维护大自然）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. ——有影响力（能影响人和事）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. ——尊敬／尊重父母及长者（表达敬意）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. ——选择自己的目标（选择个人的意向）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. ——健康（生理及心理上没有毛病）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. ——能干（有才能，胜任有余，有效率）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. ——接受命运的安排（顺从人生的际遇）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. ——诚实（真实、诚恳）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. ——保持形象（顾全自己的面子）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. ——服从命令（有责任心，尽忠职守）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. ——聪明（条理分明，富有思考力）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. ——帮助别人（为别人的幸福而奋斗）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. ——享受生活（享受食物、性、闲暇等）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. ——虔诚（忠于宗教信仰及信念）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. ——有责任心（可信赖，可信任的）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. ——好奇（对各种事物都感兴趣，喜欢探索）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. ——宽容大量（愿意饶恕别人）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. ——成功（达到目标）</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
作为我的做人准则，这价值观是

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>价值观</th>
<th>不重要</th>
<th>重要</th>
<th>非常重要</th>
<th>极端重要</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56——干净（整齐清洁）</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57——学历（接受正规教育的程度）</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58——爱国心（热爱祖国）</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59——竞争性（强烈的竞争意识）</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60——关心政治（对政治问题感兴趣）</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

非常感谢你的合作！下面请你继续回答下列问题；

1. 当前改革的步伐，你认为：
   ①太快  ②较快  ③适中  ④较慢  ⑤太慢

2. 对当前物价调整的状况，你感到：
   ①很满意  ②较满意  ③无所谓  ④不满意  ⑤很不满意

3. 当前各类人员纷纷出国，你认为这一现象会给我国今后的发展带来：
   ①很不利的影响  ②弊多利少  ③无关大局  ④弊少利多  ⑤很有利的影响

4. 当前的政治思想工作，你认为：
   ①不需要  ②该削弱  ③无所谓的  ④该有所加强  ⑤大力加强

性别（请圈）：男  女

出生年月_________________________

接受正统教育的年数_________________________

婚姻状况（请圈）：单身  已婚  寡居  已离婚

子女数目（请填）：_________________________

年收入（元）  1千以下  1~2千  3~5千  5千以上
（包括工资、奖金）

请你描述一下现在的职业，或一份刚受聘的职业。请你尽量明确。

工种（专业）_________________________ 职称_________________________ 现任职务_________________________

对现在工作满意程度  不满意  1  2  3  4  5  很满意
以前的教育对现在工作  根本无用  1  2  3  4  5  非常有用
继续接受正规教育  不希望  1  2  3  4  5  很希望

专业培训  不希望  1  2  3  4  5  很希望

若有宗教信仰，你对它虔诚的程度？请圈

毫不  0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  非常虔诚
Appendix A (cont’d)

Schwartz Value Survey (English Version)

VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS

In this questionnaire you are to ask yourself: “What values are important to ME as guiding principles in MY life, and what values are less important to me?” There are two lists of values on the following pages. These values come from different cultures. In the parentheses following each value is an explanation that may help you to understand its meaning.

Your task is to rate how important each value is for you as a guiding principle in your life. Use the rating scale below:

0—means the value is not at all important, it is not relevant as a guiding principle for you.
3—means the value is important.
6—means the value is very important.

The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), the more important the value is as a guiding principle in YOUR life.

-1 is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you.
7 is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your life; ordinarily there are no more than two such values.

In the space before each value, write the number (-1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) that indicates the importance of that value for you, personally. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed to my values</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>of supreme importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you begin, read values 1 to 30 and choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values, or—if there is no such value—choose the value least important to you, and rate it -1, 0, or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values (to 30).

VALUES LIST I

1 ___EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)
2 ___INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)
3 ___SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)
4 ___PLEASURE (gratification of desires)
5 ___FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Importance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. A Spiritual Life (emphasis on spiritual not material matters)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sense of Belonging (feeling that others care about me)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social Order (stability of society)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. An Exciting Life (stimulating experiences)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Meaning in Life (a purpose in life)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Politeness (courtesy, good manners)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Wealth (material possessions, money)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. National Security (protection of my nation from enemies)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Self Respect (belief in one's own worth)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Reciprocation of Favors (avoidance of indebtedness)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Creativity (uniqueness, imagination)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. A World at Peace (free of war and conflict)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Respect for Tradition (preservation of time-honored customs)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Mature Love (deep emotional &amp; spiritual intimacy)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Self-Discipline (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Detachment (from worldly concerns)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Family Security (safety for loved ones)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Social Recognition (respect, approval by others)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Unity with Nature (fitting into nature)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. A Varied Life (filled with challenge, novelty and change)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Authority (the right to lead or command)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. True Friendship (close, supportive friends)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. A World of Beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Social Justice (correcting injustice, care for the weak)</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a guiding principle in my life, this value is:
VALUES LIST II

Now rate how important each of the following values is for you as a guiding principle in your life. These values are phrased as ways of acting that may be more or less important for you. Once again, try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers.

Before you begin, read values 31 to 56 and choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values, or—if there is no such value—choose the value least important to you, and rate it −1, 0, or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values.

**AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed to my values:</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important of supreme importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling &amp; action)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. BROADMINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. DARING (seeking adventure, risk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. HONORING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purposes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life's circumstances)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. HONEST (genuine, sincere)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my &quot;face&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. OBEDIENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A (cont’d)

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed to my values</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>supreme importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. **INTELLIGENT** (logical, thinking)

49. **HELPFUL** (working for the welfare of others)

50. **ENJOYING LIFE** (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.)

51. **DEVOUT** (holding to religious faith & belief)

52. **RESPONSIBLE** (dependable, reliable)

53. **CURIOUS** (interested in everything, exploring)

54. **FORGIVING** (willing to pardon others)

55. **SUCCESSFUL** (achieving goals)

56. **CLEAN** (neat, tidy)
Appendix A (cont’d)

Sex (circle): Male Female
Year of birth:_______
Number of years of formal schooling:_______
Marital status (circle): Single Married or Widowed Divorced cohabiting
Number of children (circle): 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more

Please describe your current occupation or your occupation when last employed. Be as explicit as you can. (For example: painter in an auto garage, sales manager in a clothing store, 6th grade science teacher)

How religious are you, if at all? (circle)
Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 Very religious 6 7

Which of the following political parties comes closest to representing your views? (circle) [Provide a list of the parties and "other"]
Appendix B

Dominance scale (Chinese version)

請根據下面的6點量表回答下列各問題，並將所選擇的答案數值填寫在各題右側的括號中。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>完全不真實</th>
<th>很少真實</th>
<th>不很真實</th>
<th>有些真實</th>
<th>很真實</th>
<th>絕對真實</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 你傾向於主導與他人的談話嗎？    ( )
2. 你寧願做工人而不做經理嗎？    ( )
3. 別人常常徵求你對一些事情的意見嗎？ ( )
4. 有時你讓別人臨時你而不去爭辯嗎？ ( )
5. 你傾向於支配你周圍的人嗎？    ( )
6. 你不喜歡在一群人中出頭露面嗎？ ( )
7. 成為一個領導者的想法十分吸引你嗎？ ( )
8. 你寧願聽從命令而不是發出命令嗎？ ( )
9. 在辯辯或討論時，即使處於少數，你也會為自己的觀點辯護嗎？ ( )
10. 你厭惡在公眾場合（如婚禮上）講話或發言嗎？ ( )
11. 如果你被要求負責控制某種場合，這會使你感到不安嗎？ ( )
12. 你容易被他人的觀點所動搖嗎？ ( )
Appendix B (cont'd)

Dominance scale (English version)


Dominance Scale

1. Do you tend to dominate the conversation?
2. Would you prefer to be a worker rather than a manager?
3. Do other people tend to seek your opinion on things?
4. Rather than argue, do you sometimes let other people push you around a bit?
5. Are you easily swayed by other people's opinions?
6. Do you tend to boss people around?
7. Would you dislike standing out from the crowd?
8. Does the idea of being a leader rather attract you?
9. Would you rather take orders than give them?
10. In an argument or discussion, will you argue for your own point of view even though you are in the minority?
11. Do you hate giving speeches or talks in public (For example: Being asked to say a few words at a wedding)?
12. If you are told to take charge of some situation, does this make you feel uncomfortable?
Read the following questions carefully, and then circle your chosen answers.

Answering Guide: 
1 - Indicates your actual situation is not similar.
2 - Indicates your actual situation is somewhat similar.
3 - Indicates your actual situation is very similar.
4 - Indicates your actual situation is highly similar.
5 - Indicates your actual situation is extremely similar.

1. When you know the exam questions will have two taken from outside reading, you will read all the materials: 1 2 3 4 5
2. You think you are more hardworking than other students in class: 1 2 3 4 5
3. Others (not including your best friends) think you are a lazy person because you are too serious: 1 2 3 4 5
4. You think your classmates think you are a hardworking person: 1 2 3 4 5
5. Although most teachers may not think you are the most intelligent student, they will regard you as one of the most hardworking students: 1 2 3 4 5
6. Other interests (sport, extracurricular activities, hobbies) make it difficult for you to achieve academic success: 1 2 3 4 5
7. Your academic achievement is superior to others' strong wishes: 1 2 3 4 5
8. You are more eager to become an honor student than other students in class: 1 2 3 4 5
9. In most work, you will try to do better than you think you should: 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix C (cont’d)

Need for achievement (English version)

The statements are to be rated on a five-point scale:
5-very true of self; 4-fairly true; 3-a little true;
2-hardly true; 1-not at all true. Please circle the
appropriate numbers.

1. When you know there are going to be one
   or two questions on an exam from outside
   reading assignments, you always read all
   the materials. 1 2 3 4 5

2. You regard yourself as a more consistent
   and harder worker in your classroom
   assignment than the typical student in
   your class. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Others (not your good friends) have
   thought of you as one who “missed
   some of the fun” because you were
   so serious. 1 2 3 4 5

4. You think your fellow students in
   school think of you as a hard worker. 1 2 3 4 5

5. Most of your teachers probably think
   of you as one of their hardest workers
   even though not necessarily one of the
   smartest. 1 2 3 4 5

6. Other interests (sports, extracurricular
   activities, or hobbies) prevent you from
   obtaining an excellent rating or mark
Appendix C (cont'd)

for effort in school work.

7. You have a very strong desire to excel academically.

8. You try harder to get on the school honor roll or merit list than the average students in your class.

9. You try to do most jobs at least a little better than what you think is expected.
Appendix D
Collectivism/individualism measurement (Used in Hong Kong, Chinese version)

多謝你參加這個研究。我們打算藉此問卷了解一般人對別人之態度與

若你極為不同意，請填0；若你極為同意，請填5。如此類推。

1. 若有一些個人問題，我寧可自己破腫，也不和朋友商量。
2. 若情況許可，我願意跟好朋友合力買一部汽車，那末各人不用獨自買自己的車。（在本問卷中，「朋友」均指同性朋友）
3. 我喜歡住在我的好朋友附近。
4. 我的好友與我都認為某幾間店子很值得光顧。
5. 我考慮做那一類工作時，絕不考慮老友的看法。
6. 和朋友一起旅行，便不能活動自由，以致與途大衆。
7. 儘管一羣人財迷心貪，這是他們（他）自己的事，對朋友不必勸阻。
8. 儘管朋友鎧手細緣，經常闊贈，交友之道，仍應該是有福同享，有難同當。
9. 我有________個朋友，知道我家每月的總收入是多少。
     P. 0-1; Q. 2-3; R. 4-5; S. 6-7; T. 8-9; U. 超過9
10. 平均來說，我的朋友認為理想的兒女數目與我自己認為的數目相差________人。
     P. 無差別; Q. 一人; R. 二人; S. 三人; T. 四或以上; U. 我一点也不知道朋友的意見。
11. 我的音樂興趣跟我父母的完全不同。
12. 這一代的父母對孩子管教過份嚴厲，扼殺了孩子的自發性。
13. 過去我決定甚麼大事情，都沒有想到那些決定會帶來給父母甚麼利與害。
14. 跟異性來往，兒女應徵珣父母的意見。
15. 即成孩子榮獲世名的諾貝爾獎，作父母的不必自豪。
16. 子承父業，理所當然。
17. 我不會把我的意見和新增的知識告訴父母。
18. 我信奉我父母的宗教。
19. 就是母親要黃金，我也不會讓她把我的儲金答用的積積拿去。
20. 如果我有一部汽車，不管父母的駕駛技術如何，我也不會讓他們使用。
21. 父親獲得當地長官表揚及頒贈獎狀，嘉許其在社會之服務貢獻，作為兒女的不感引以為榮。

22. 我學業、事業上的成就，跟她父母的培育極有關係。

23. 年青人計劃升學或就業時，宜考慮父母的建議。

24. 家庭越大，問題越多。

25. 我從沒有向父母表示希望有多少個孩子。

26. 父母期望我有多少孩子，與我自己期望的數目相差____個。
   A. 沒有不同    B. 一個    C. 兩個    D. 三個    E. 四個    F. 五個以上
   G. 我不知道父母的期望
Appendix D (cont’d)

Collectivism/individualism  (Used in the P.R.C., Chinese version)

多謝你參加這個研究。我們打算借此問卷了解一般人對個別之態度與舉動。請你對下列每一題，在題目左邊的空格上表示你的意見。

一．代表極不同意
二．代表不同意
三．代表傾向不同意
四．代表傾向同意
五．代表同意
六．代表極同意

若你極不同意，請填“一”；若你極同意該項，請填“六”，如此類推。

問卷研究絕不同於考試。問卷沒有對與錯。因此請你按照你自己的感受回答。

1. 我的音樂興趣跟我父母完全不同。
2. 這一代的父母對孩子管教過分嚴格，扼殺了孩子的自主性。
3. 過去我決定什麼大事情，並沒有想到那些決定會得罪父母什麼利益？
4. 跟異姓朋友來往，雙親總是在父母意見。
5. 即使孩子要買學貴名的玩貝爾樂器，作父母的不必自責。
6. 子承父業，理所當然。
7. 我不會把我的意見和知識告訴父母。
8. 我與父母對各樣事情的想法相同。
9. 若其母親需要用藥，我也會讓她去買便宜的藥來拿去。
10. 如果我有一部自行車，不管父母的騎車技術如何，我也不會讓他們使用。
11. 父母獲得衣著及飲食，盡享其在社會的尊嚴；作為子女的不應該引以為恥。
12. 自己在學業、事業上的成就，跟父母的培育沒有關係。
13. 年青人計劃升學或就業時，宜考慮父母的建議。
14. 家庭越大，問題越多。
15. 我從沒有向父母表示希望生男或生女。
16. 父母希望我几歲結婚，我跟自己期望的年齡相差
    （一．沒有不同， 二．一歲， 三．兩歲， 四．三歲， 五．四歲以上，
    六．不知父母期望）
17. 對於一些個人問題，我希望自己做決定，也不想求父母商量。
18. 討論不許可的議，我願意跟好朋友合力買一部自行車，街坊各人不用花錢買自己的車。
19. 我喜歡住在好朋友的家附近的地方。
20. 我的好朋友與我都認為有幾間商店很值得光顧。
21. 我考慮做那一類的工作時，絕不考慮老友的看法。
22. 和朋友一起旅行，便不能活动自由，以致浪费大钱。
23. 尽管一个人犯了错误，这是他（她）自己的事，做朋友不必责备。
24. 遇到朋友笨手笨脚，经常闹别扭，但交友之道，应该是有福同享，有难同当。
25. 我共有 ___个朋友，知道我家每月的总收入是多少？（一. 8-1，二. 2-3，
三. 4-5，四. 6-7，五. 8-9，六. 超过9）
26. 平均来说，我的朋友认为理想的结婚年龄与我自己的年龄相差 ___岁？（一. 无差别，二. 一岁，三. 二岁，四. 三岁，五. 四岁以上，六. 不知朋友意见）
Appendix D (cont’d)
Collectivism/individualism (used in Hong Kong, English version)

The statements are to be rated on 6-point scale.
0—extremely disagree; 6—extremely agree.

PARENT

P1. My musical interests are extremely different from my parents.

P2. In these days parents are too stringent with their kids, stunting the development of initiative.

P3. When making important decisions, I seldom consider the positive and negative effects my decisions have on my parents.

P4. Teenagers should listen to their parents’ advice on dating.

P5. Even if the child won the Nobel prize, the parents should not feel honored in any way.

P6. It is reasonable for a son to continue his father’s business.

P7. I would not share my ideas and newly acquired knowledge with my parents.

P8. I practice the religion of my parents.

P9. I would not let my needy mother use the money that I have saved by living a less than luxurious life.

P10. I would not let my parents use my car (if I have), whether they are good drivers or not.
Appendix D (cont’d)

P11. Children should not feel honored even if the father were highly praised and given an award by a government official for his contribution and service to the community.

P12. Success and failure in my academic work and career are closely tied to the nurture provided by my parents.

P13. Young people should take into consideration their parents’ advice when making education/career plans.

P14. The bigger a family, the more family problems they are.

P15. I have never told my parents the number of sons I want to have.

P16. The number of sons my parents would like me to have differs by (0 / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / or more / I don’t know) from the number I personally would like have.

FRIEND

F1. I would rather struggle through a personal problem by myself than discuss it with my friends.

F2. If possible, I would like co-owning a car with my close friends, so that it wouldn’t be necessary for them to spend much money to buy their own cars (in this questionnaire, all the "friends" mean the ones with same sex).

F3. I like to live close to my good friends.

F4. My good friends and I agree on the best places to shop.
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F5. I would pay absolutely no attention to my close friends' views when deciding what kind of work to do.

F6. To go on a trip with friends makes one less free and mobile. As a result, there is less fun.

F7. It is a personal matter whether I worship money or not. Therefore it is not necessary for my friends to give any counsel.

F8. The motto "sharing in both blessing and calamity" is still applicable even if one's friend is clumsy, dumb, and causes a lot of trouble.

F9. There are approximately (0 / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / more than 4) of my friends who know how much my family as a whole earns each month.

F10. On the average, my friends' ideal number of children differs from my own ideal by (0 / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / or more / I don't know my friends' ideal).
Appendix D (cont'd)

Collectivism/individualism (used in the P.R.C., English version)

P1. My musical interests are extremely different from my parents.
P2. In these days parents are too stringent with their kids, stunting the development of initiative.
P3. When making important decisions, I seldom consider the positive and negative effects my decisions have on my parents.
P4. Teenagers should listen to their parents' advice on dating.
P5. Even if the child won the Nobel prize, the parents should not feel honored in any way.
P6. It is reasonable for a son to continue his father's business.
P7. I would not share my ideas and newly acquired knowledge with my parents.
P8. I would not let my needy mother use the money that I have saved by living a less than luxurious life.
P9. I would not let my parents use my bicycle (if I have), whether they are good drivers or not.
P10. Children should not feel honored even if the father were highly praised and given an award by a government official for his contribution and service to the community.
P11. Success and failure in my academic work and career are closely tied to the nurture provided by my parents.
P12. Young people should take into consideration their parents' advice when making education/career plans.
P13. The bigger a family, the more family problems they are.
P14. I have never told my parents the number of sons I want to have.
P15. The number of sons my parents would like me to have differs by (0 / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4 / or more / I don’t know) from the number I personally would like have.

FRIEND

F1. I would rather struggle through a personal problem by myself than discuss it with my friends.
F2. If possible, I would like co-owning a bicycle with my close friends, so that it wouldn’t be necessary for them to spend much money to buy their own bicycles (In this questionnaire, all the “friends” means the ones with the same sex).
F3. I like to live close to my good friends.
F4. My good friends and I agree on the best places to shop.
F5. I would pay absolutely no attention to my close friends’ views when deciding what kind of work to do.
F6. To go on a trip with friends makes one less free and mobile. As a result, there is less fun.
F7. It is a personal matter whether I worship money or not. Therefore it is not necessary for my friends to give any counsel.
F8. The motto “sharing in both blessing and calamity” is still applicable even if one’s friend is clumsy, dumb, and causes a lot of trouble.
F9. There are approximately (0 / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4/more than 4) of my friends who know how much my family as a whole earns each month.
F10. On the average, my friends’ ideal number of children differs from my own ideal by (0 / 1 / 2 / 3 / 4/or more / I don’t know my friends’ ideal).
Appendix E
Measurement of locus of control (Chinese version)

請細讀下列問題，然後在右邊的量表上圈上適合於你的數字：

1. 我能否當個領導者，主要取決於我的能力：
   非常不同意 不同意 同意 相當同意 非常同意
   1 2 3 4 5 6
2. 我生活上很多事情的結果都會受偶發事件所牽制：
   1 2 3 4 5 6
3. 我覺得大部分事情發生在我生活中的事情，都是那些掌握的人所致：
   1 2 3 4 5 6
4. 我會否遇上交通意外，主要決定於我本身是否小心：
   1 2 3 4 5 6
5. 我對自己所做的計劃的可行牲很有把握：
   1 2 3 4 5 6
6. 如果我能得到我想要的東西，那一定是我好運：
   1 2 3 4 5 6
7. 我對自己本身是否走運
   1 2 3 4 5 6
8. 即使我有好的能力，如果那些掌握的人不賞識，那麼我仍不能成為領導者：
   1 2 3 4 5 6
9. 我能有多少朋友，主要決定於我本身是怎樣的一個人：
   1 2 3 4 5 6
10. 我能否當個領導者，主要取決於我的能力：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
11. 我生活上很多事情的結果都會受偶發事件所牽制：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
12. 我覺得大部分事情發生在我生活中的事情，都是那些掌握的人所致：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
13. 我會否遇上交通意外，主要決定於我本身是否小心：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
14. 我對自己所做的計劃的可行牲很有把握：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
15. 如果我能得到我想要的東西，那一定是我好運：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
16. 我對自己本身是否走運
    1 2 3 4 5 6
17. 即使我有好的能力，如果那些掌握的人不賞識，那麼我仍不能成為領導者：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
18. 我能有多少朋友，主要決定於我本身是怎樣的一個人：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
19. 我能否當個領導者，主要取決於我的能力：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
20. 我生活上很多事情的結果都會受偶發事件所牽制：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
21. 我會否遇上交通意外，主要決定於我本身是否小心：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
22. 我覺得大部分事情發生在我生活中的事情，都是那些掌握的人所致：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
23. 我會否遇上交通意外，主要決定於我本身是否小心：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
24. 我能有多少朋友，主要決定於我本身是怎樣的一個人：
    1 2 3 4 5 6
Measurement of locus of control (English version)

The statements are to be rated on 6-point scale.
1-extremely disagree; 6-extremely agree.

1. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability.
2. To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings.
3. I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people.
4. Whether or not I have a traffic accident depends on how careful I am.
5. When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.
6. Often there is no chance of protecting my personal interests from bad luck happenings.
7. When I get what I want, it's usually because I'm lucky.
8. Even if I were a good leader, I would not be made a leader unless I play up to those in positions of power.
9. How many friends I have depends on how nice a person I am.
10. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
11. My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.
12. Whether or not I have a traffic accident mainly depends on my luck.
13. People like myself have very little chance of
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protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of powerful other people.

14. It's not always wise for me to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune.

15. Getting what I want means I have to please those people above me.

16. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends on whether I'm lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time.

17. If important people were to decide they didn't like me, I probably wouldn't make many friends.

18. I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.

19. I am usually able to protect my personal interests.

20. Whether or not I would have a traffic accident depends on how careful the drivers on the roads are.

21. When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it.

22. In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.

23. My life is determined by my own actions.

24. It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many friends.