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Abstract

Values are widely labelled as “principles” as well as “motivators” that influence our lives. Given their importance in everything we do, including our work, we advocate recognizing and understanding values as part of deepening one’s self-awareness – a key element in leadership development – especially where this emphasizes authenticity or emotional intelligence. While there is a substantial consensus about the link between understanding one’s values and self-awareness, research explicitly relating this to leadership development is more limited. By reviewing an extensive range of classic and contemporary academic literature on: values, values hierarchy, work values, organizational values; as well as values sources, change, conflict, congruence and communication; we provide a holistic view of the concept of values. Next, we use this review to derive an integrated definition and a framework for understanding values (personal, work and organizational). These act as a constructive contribution for deeper self-awareness in leadership – a part of leadership development that is ‘insightfully aware’. Finally, we identify a number of suggestions to guide future research seeking to explore and apply the role and understanding of values in leadership and organizational dynamics.

Keywords: Values; Work Values; Values Hierarchy; Values Sources; Values Compatibility or Congruence; Values Conflict; Leadership Development.; Personal Motivators; Insightful Awareness.
Understanding Values for Insightfully Aware Leadership

“It's not hard to make decisions when you know what your values are.”
Roy Disney

“Leadership is a potent combination of strategy and character. But if you must be without one, be without the strategy.”
General Norman Schwarzkopf

“Do not let your special character and values, the secret that you know and no one else does, the truth – do not let that get swallowed up by the great chewing complacency.”
Aesop

“At the end of the day, when it comes time to make that decision, as president, all you have to guide you are your values, and your vision, and the life experiences that make you who you are.”
Michelle Obama

“Our organization’s values are not really the nice text we find in the company’s website, posters and brochures, they are what we live and breathe through actions and deeds as individuals and as a team in the business.”
CEO on an Executive Education Course

Introduction

Increasing awareness of self, others and situations is at the heart of most leadership development – be it in leadership training, executive education courses or coaching, feedback and reflection activities. These leadership development initiatives use many processes where individuals discover more about themselves, the perceptions of their behaviours and performance, and then attempt to create a working agenda of priorities to address in order to maximize their leadership performance for the future. These processes are designed to provide leadership and personal insights. Where these are deep, effective and fully integrated, we use the term ‘insightful awareness’, to encompass a profound understanding by the leader – about their “strengths, weaknesses, drivers and blockers”.

---

1 Comment during an executive education leadership discussion, November 2013 – witnessed by one of the authors.

2 INSEAD Professors Ian C. Woodward and Vincent Dominé use the expression ‘Insightful Awareness’ to describe an integrated process of deep discovery of self-awareness together with awareness of others and context as part of senior executive leadership development programs at the school, including the “Advanced Management Program” (AMP).
This paper examines one critical aspect of ‘insightful awareness’ of self in relation to others and context – the concept of values.

Values are widely labelled as “principles” as well as “motivators” that influence our lives. Our values are reflected through our behaviours and actions, even if we are not fully cognizant of them. We might hold a notion of what we value, but the reasons behind it may not be as clear. Really knowing and being able to articulate our values can give us rich insights into our behaviours, our interaction with others, and our frames through which we make decisions. Equally today, many organizations and teams frequently discuss, articulate and focus on their vision, values and culture in building engagement and performance. There is wide media and public commentary on values and ethical issues – in politics, business and the broader community.

Given the importance of values, it is crucial to understand what values really are, how they operate in our lives as well as the workplace, and what influences them? In essence, we will argue that people should become ‘insightfully aware’ of values as a part of their leadership development.

At the outset we note that values are "among the very few social psychological concepts that are successfully employed across all social science disciplines" (Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989, p. 351). However, even with the enormous appeal of the concept of “values” along with the large body of academic literature on it, there remains no clear agreement on its definition and nature.

Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to examine many of the core theoretical assumptions in the academic literature that are relevant to understanding of values, relate these to their potential impact on a leader’s development and highlight areas for further research.

Our paper by its nature cannot offer an exhaustive commentary on all aspects of values, but instead looks into the critical and widely acknowledged aspects of this concept. In doing so, we review classic and contemporary literature on values definitions; work values; values sources; values change; values conflict and compatibility (congruence). By reviewing these key themes, we seek to draw out key theoretical issues and debates as well as suggest implications of values understanding for leadership development that increases ‘insightful awareness’ for a person.

The first section (and related appendices) of the paper traverse various definitions and descriptions of values proposed in the literature over time and also brings attention to the more recent comprehensive work in this area.

Following this review of “personal values”, the second extended section then looks specifically at values in relation to work, organization and leadership. In the third section we explore different factors that relate to the sources and development of values in people, as well as a brief examination of value change.
In the fourth section we turn to the literature on value conflict and compatibility or congruence.

Then in section five we present a derived values definition and overarching framework of connecting different value-related concepts (based on the materials covered in our review and leadership teaching experience) that may be useful for those designing sessions on this concept in leadership development – in particular for values understanding, exploration and articulation or communication. This section then connects to our conclusions, as well as to implications for further research, leadership development practice and pedagogical deployment.

1. What are Values?

“Values: principles or standards of behaviour; one’s judgement of what is important in life.”

_Oxford Dictionary_

Numerous scholars have added to our understanding of values in general and at work, producing an enormous body of literature on values, each being predicated on diverse sets of assumptions. So, in this first section we turn to review the historical development of our understanding of values, and investigate the debates about their nature, before moving on to Shalom Schwartz’s (1992) conceptualization of values, which is the most widely acknowledged representation of values structure in the academic literature (Rosario, Carmen, & Biagio, 2014; Siltanen, 2006).

1.1 The Development of Values Definitions

References to values cross more than two millennia of thinking. Direct references appear in the work of ancient philosophers such as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle (Kluckhohn, 1951a) who viewed values in the light of virtues (Aristotle, trans. 1986; Plato, trans. 1999). Much later, inquiry on values also appears in the works of Henrick Rickert (1899), Wilhem Windelband (1919) and Eduard Spranger (see Hamman, 2011).

These philosophical paradigms informed modern theories and discussion on values. Broader social science research into the values concept began in earnest with the work of Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey (1931). With the belief that one can comprehend people’s motives by looking into their value arrangements, Allport et al. (1931) came up with a value measure using Spranger’s (1928) work. In the nineteen thirties, this work made Allport a leader in values field research (Hamman, 2011; Rohan, 2000).

Post World War II, a leading theory of values was introduced by the anthropologist Clyde Kluckhohn (1958). Kluckhohn (1962) perceived the variations in value orientations as a lens to varied societies and cultures. He developed a systematic way to look at the value orientations, referred to as Value Orientation Method (Kluckhohn, 1958).
The social psychologist Milton Rokeach (1973), one of the most often cited authors in the modern values literature, raised some concerns about Kluckhohn’s broad and extensive philosophical construct of values. Rokeach, in contrast, considered values to be specific. For Rokeach (1973, p. 3) a value is, “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end state of existence is personally and socially preferable to alternative modes of conduct or end states of existence”. He differentiated values into two types: *instrumental*, relating to desired conduct or behaviour (such as ‘ambitious’ or ‘honest’); and *terminal* (further divided into personal and social) relating to a desired end state of existence (such as ‘an exciting life’ or ‘social recognition’). These values, *instrumental* and *terminal*, comprise the Rokeach Value Survey. (For reference, a representative list of some major values surveys or instruments is found in Appendix 1).

According to Rokeach (1973), it is in the nature of values to be implicit and they surface only when an individual considers a specific choice preferable to other choices. While Rokeach’s view of what counts as a value is very influential, as will be seen, the academic literature since the 1950s is overwhelmed with many different definitions and descriptions of the value construct.

Adding to further ambiguity in understanding the nature of values, is the usage of the word, “value” itself (Hamman, 2011). Although we agree with Hamman (2011), that an individual, “does not ‘have a value’; they instead have an orientation or endorsement towards a value” (p.1); as the vast majority of the literature uses the term “value” instead of “value orientation”, our paper will be no different.

For our research, we reviewed literature on a range of value definitions and descriptors published between 1950 and 2014 from more than twenty thought leaders, highlighting the key insights put forth by scholars e.g. Kluckhohn (1951a), Rokeach (1973), M. Brown (1976), Schwartz (1992, 1994), Feather, (1995), Parks & Guay (2009), Longest, Hitlin, & Vaisey (2013). We present a synthesis of this in Table 1 (Appendix 2).

By so doing we also present the variations that exist between these definitions and descriptions. This evidences that the delineation of the value concept is neither simple nor consistent. Rohan (2000) notes that the different definitions proposed by different theorists have added to the confusion over the construct. Therefore, in seeking to define what values are, we further compare the construct of values with other value related concepts in Table 2 (Appendix 2). From the values literature presented in the two tables, we highlight some common, yet significant elements:

- Values as standards and guiding principles;
- Values as abstract concepts related to beliefs, attitudes, needs, motivations and desirable goals;
- Values applying across multiple situations in our lives as well as remaining relatively stable over time;
- Values existing in a hierarchy; and
- Values as a fundamental influence on people’s choices – thinking, emotions, behaviours and actions.
Given the multiplicity of views on values, to assist in focussing our discussion, we draw particular attention to Schwartz’s (1992, 1996) conceptualisation of values – which is both comprehensive and extensive – and draws some similar conclusions from the literature to those we noted above (See Schwartz & Bilsky 1987, 1990 and Schwartz, 2003, p. 262 for details). Together with the other research we review, the Schwartz conceptualisation and model will contribute to the ‘insightfully aware’ framework for understanding values which we present in section five – (this framework connects relationships between values, their sources, work values, values development, value hierarchy, conflict and congruence).

1.2 Schwartz’s Values Conceptualisation and Model

The Schwartz (1992, 1996) model of values types (see Figure 1) specifies values as voluntarily enduring standards or benchmarks that provide stability between one’s needs, fluidity and effectiveness of social interaction, and group survival. There are ten value types namely: Achievement; Power; Hedonism; Self-Direction; Stimulation; Universalism; Benevolence; Tradition; Security; and Conformity (Schwartz, 2009). These value types clusters include Schwartz’s 56 nominated core values (See Appendix 1 for details).

![Figure 1. Theoretical model of relations among motivational types of values, higher order value types, and bipolar value dimensions (Schwartz, 1992) (as seen in Schwartz, 1994, p. 24)](image)

A critical aspect of the Schwartz model is how the interrelationships between these values types are structured. The structure is a circle of conflicts and compatibilities where adjacent values share a motivation in the circle and have an incompatible motivation with values on the other side of the circle (Schwartz, 1994). The circle may further be divided into four broader types of
values, arranged in two pairs of incompatible higher order value orientations (Openness to Change vs. Conservation; and Self-Enhancement vs. Self-Transcendence) (Schwartz, 1992, 1996).

Therefore, in this model, the values on the opposite side of the circle can be inconsistent with each other because of the conflicting motivation that might result in contradictory behaviours and decisions. These motivations are considered compatible if they result in similar behaviours or decisions (Schwartz, 1992, 1996). Bardi et al. (2009) illustrate this with an example of an individual who is asked by his/her superordinate to do something and can respond by obeying or not obeying. Obeying will help an individual to realize his/her ‘Conformity’ and ‘Security’ values that are adjacent to each other, while violating ‘Self-Direction’ values, which lie on the opposite side. Not obeying will help an individual to realize his/her ‘Self-Direction’ values, violating his/her ‘Conformity’ and ‘Security’ values.

Therefore, realizing different values simultaneously leads to different outcomes – social, practical and psychological, which might be conflicting with each other or be compatible. As a result, attaching greater importance to conflicting values can lead to internal conflict which can negatively affect an individual’s well-being and lead to other social and practical issues viewed negatively by others (Bardi et al., 2009). Schwartz (1992) argues that this is a reason for people tending to value one side of the circle over the other. Sagiv & Schwartz (1995) point to the role of external social forces in influencing the usual arrangement of conflict/compatibility between values.

We also note that Feather (1995) focused on the situational aspects and its motivational outcomes. However, he also emphasized the need to recognize the relations between value types and the valences (‘attractiveness’ or ‘aversiveness’) of the values, and the choices between alternative courses of action as a result.

The circular structure proposed by Schwartz (1992) was researched in over 70 nations and with more than 200 samples (Maio, Pakizeh, Cheung, & Rees, 2009).

1.3 Values Hierarchies and Core Values

Beyond the definition and categorisation of values, is the question of a hierarchy of values – which is important for a person in understanding the role of values as drivers of specific behaviours and potential value congruence or conflict.

Values “are hierarchically organized in terms of their importance for self (Feather, 1995, p. 1135). Bardi et al., (2009) note that people vary in the importance they place on values as well as their personal value hierarchies. A value significant to one individual may not be as significant to another. Rokeach (1973) and Schwartz (1992) both highlight the critical role of personal value hierarchies in shaping perceptions, attitudes and behaviours, as most preferences reflect differences between at least two values.
As an example, consider a team leader and their potential decision as to whether to take the major credit for the team performance in a discussion with a superior. This action might be determined not only by their absolute personal importance on the ‘Achievement’ value of ‘success’, but also by their relative personal importance of ‘Achievement’ values when compared to the relative importance they place on the conflicting values of ‘Benevolence’ and ‘Conformity’ such as ‘sense of loyalty’.

Another example might be of two friends who share similar values as they articulate them (say ‘relationships’ and ‘trust’), yet for each the absolute level of importance is not the same. For example, which person is more likely to lie to their friend to protect the relationship (if relationship is a higher order value), or which one is more likely to believe they are deeply betrayed when this is found out (because for them trust is a higher order value).

Related to a values hierarchy, is the notion of “core” values. According to Pant & Lachman (1998) values are “core” when their impact on people’s behaviours and actions prevails over that of other values in the value system. Core values are fewer in number, and though not apparent at first, “are accessible if we ask the right questions” (Meyer & Topolnytsky, 2000, p. 9.4). According to Schwartz & Inbar Saban (1988) whenever two values are core in influencing an action, the one that is present at the higher level in an individual’s hierarchy will be more influential in determining the behaviour.

2. Values in Practice

We take our values and our personal value hierarchies with us across life, so a critical area of understanding values in leadership development is the relationship of values to work and organizational settings, to which we now turn.

2.1 Work Values and Organizational Values

According to some authors (e.g. Frieze, Olson, Murrell, & Selvan, 2006; Thorpe & Loo, 2003), our work values shape from our personal values, just like other different facets of life. Acting as attributes, they mediate between an individual’s motivating external factors and emotional tendencies. They help in setting one’s principles, motivations, interests, expectations, standards in judging and dealing with work related problems and choosing careers (Busacca, Beebe, & Tornan, 2002).

However, there is a lack of consensus in the literature on what counts as work values and whether they can be measured using the same methods as other values (Furnham, Petrides, Tsaoisusis, Pappas, & Garrod, 2005). Every so often these are viewed in relation to culture (Parsons, Cable, & Wilkerson, 1999) and sometimes considered as individual (George & Jones, 1997).

---

3 Witnessed by one of the authors in a classroom discussion on this subject
Boldero & Francis (2002) differentiate work values into two sets, “standard” and “goal-oriented”. The differentiation, according to them, reflects the difference between a desired self-state for present and future. Work values are also classified into intrinsic work values defined by the content of work (e.g. autonomy, creativity) and extrinsic work values which are not based on the work content but rather, external factors (e.g. salary, job security) (George & Jones, 1997). Furthermore, some authors consider work values as “instrumental” (Porfeli, 2008) while others see them as an innate quality which rests on individual beliefs about their profession (Ravari, 2012).

Despite the different views and definitions on work-values, there is general agreement that they act as crucial behaviour motivators (Hitlin & Piliavin, 2004). However, they are not the only motivators influencing behaviour (Hamman, 2011). Work values can operate simultaneously in context with different motives such as social constraints (e.g. society which seeks consensus) and attitudes (e.g. occupational or organizational commitment).

Work values impact: employees’ job satisfaction (Berings, De Fruyt, & Bouwen, 2004; Boldero & Francis, 2002; Ravari, Vanaki, Houmann, & Kazemnejad, 2009); commitment (Posner & Schmidt, 1993); organizational performance (Hambrick & Brandon, 1988); and strategy (Humble, Jackson, & Thomson, 1994). They also echo employees’ attitudes in dealing with obstacles for attaining and maintaining satisfaction with their work (Altun, 2003; Perry, 2005). Tietjen & Myers, (1998) argue that respecting and acknowledging employees’ values is a way to improve employee satisfaction.

Studies were conducted to investigate work values in terms of their relationship with work behaviour and outcomes. For example, a study by Frieze et al. (2006) of eight hundred MBA students found that some work values were linked to higher salary levels and number of working hours. Similarly, earlier research by England & Lee (1974) on managerial values and success suggested that managerial pay (indicator of personal success) for American managers was correlated with an increased significance put by managers on profit maximization, influencing others and risk-taking. The less successful managers in this research scored lower on ‘dynamism’ and ‘achievement orientation’. Ryan Jr, Watson, & Williams (1981) conducted a comparable research on male and female managers, and found that ‘power’ and ‘aggressiveness’ was related to high levels of pay for male managers but not for female managers.

Work values tend to have a noticeable significance as they decide, control, and alter the associations between institutions, organizations, and individuals (Agle & Caldwell, 1999). They are effective ethical decision-making standards at an intrapersonal level and in influencing ethical behaviour (Akaah & Lund, 1994), specifically decisions related to integrity (Mumford, Helton, Decker, Shane Connelly, & VanDoorn, 2003; S. L. Williams, 2011).

Organizational values, on the other hand, form the basis of documented codes of ethics and are often seen as, “lists of generic beliefs regarding people, competitiveness, customers, quality, and productivity that a variety of individuals can agree with and which do not offend” (Williams, 2011, p. 316). Values such as ‘improving service quality’, ‘being sensitive to diversity’,
‘maximizing profits’ and ‘integrity’ have become service/performance benchmarks for global organizations. However, some authors argue that these are not true values, but instead are “lists” that do not shape ethical conduct in employees or managers (S. L. Williams, 2011).

Core values in relation to an organization are its “central and enduring tenet” (Collins & Porras, 2000, p. 73). These values tend to have an internal meaning and significance to organizational members (Van Rekom, Van Riel, & Wierenga, 2006) especially under situations marked by uncertainty, where relying on these values discussions rather than processes characterized by bureaucracy and control is more emphasized (Ouchi, 1979).

McDonald & Gandz (1992) developed a list of 24 organizational values based on 45 interviews with senior managers, consultants and employees as well as the review of earlier typologies in the literature (See Appendix 1 for additional information). They further clustered these values into four groups: ‘task-oriented’ values, ‘change-related’ values, ‘status quo’ values and ‘relationship-oriented’ values. According to their work, all organizations hold these values, although the relative significance of these values groups would vary across different organizations.

Individual values and organizational values are linked through the idea of ‘work-value congruence’ which impacts behaviour and other organizational functioning (Ren, 2013). Work-value congruence refers to the ‘consistency’ or ‘match’ between personal and organizational values (Chatman, 1989). The importance of congruence and match between organizational values and personal values is shown in the literature (e.g. (Berkhout & Rowlands, 2007). Previous studies suggest the influence of perceived values congruence on employee outcomes, commitment and satisfaction (Cable & Judge, 1996; Lee & Mowday, 1987), interviewers’ interviewee perceptions and recommendations as well as organization recruitment decisions (Cable & Judge, 1997) and job choice decisions (Cable & Judge, 1996). Value congruence is positively correlated to leaders’ satisfaction (Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1991), organizational citizenship behaviour and performance (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999)) and success (Bretz & Judge, 1994) and negatively correlated to intentions to leave (Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991), and exit (Chatman, 1991).

With an increased contemporary interest in corporate social responsibility, governance, ethics, sustainability (Kaptein, 2004), major organizations see the importance of paying more attention to the workplace rules, values and philosophies as a way to gain sustainability and be acknowledged for their social responsibility (S. L. Williams, 2011).

For example, a “code of ethics or conduct” for a corporation – as a policy document – could articulate the values as well as employees’ and managerial behavioural expectations. It might explain the values and rules that an organization endorses (Kaptein, 2004) and its expectations of its employees in terms of behaviour (Kaptein & Wempe, 2002). Additionally, even though the set of rules and anticipated ethical conduct may be documented by organizations in their codes of conduct or ethics, a crucial aspect in its execution, is a setting where employees are supported and nurtured to abide by them (Benson, 1989; Kaptein, 2004).
In a multicultural and diverse global business environment, the corporate culture has become a mix of organizations’ vision (Humble et al., 1994), pre-existing work values (Holden, 2001) and the values of different organizational members (Choy & Lee, 2009).

Although leaders understand the urgency of defining and executing work values and their impact on ethicality in operating global organizations (Humble et al., 1994), the reality is that more focus is put on ethics education and training (Sekerka, Bagozzi, & Chamigo, 2009) that emphasises regulations, law, standards, the issuance and enforcing of compliance, rather than engaging and sharing values (S. L. Williams, 2011).

Research, for example, by Seevers (2000) emphasizes the criticality of communication in defining values, as organizational values impact the way tasks are carried out by people. Therefore not defining values clearly can lead to a drop in individual and organizational performance, with an obvious need to achieve general agreement and consensus on organizational values (Musek Lešnik, 2006; Simmerly, 1987).

2.2 Leadership, Values and Self-Awareness

For a leader, understanding personal, work and organizational values is vital. The role of values as predictors of followers’ perceptions and attributions about their leaders is examined in the literature. For example, the significance of values in preferable modes of conduct is suggested in work on charismatic leadership, where scholars often highlight their role in affecting behaviours and attitudes of leaders as well as in demonstrating higher levels of effort and engagement (Bass, 1985; Egri & Herman, 2000; Gardner & Avolio, 1998; House, 1977). Charisma originates from leaders’ values, traits and behaviours, followers’ perceptions and attributions, the context or a blend of all of these (House, 1977).

According to Gardner & Avolio (1998), the values charismatic leaders hold, affect the content of their vision as well as the methods selected to realize that vision. Studies, e.g. by Lord & Brown (2001), indicate that values impact followers’ emotions, cognition and behaviour by engaging their self-concepts. Likewise, research by J. L. Thomas, Dickson, & Bliese (2001) examined the role of values and motives in leadership success in an assessment centre setting. Their research highlighted the role of personality in mediating the relationship between values and leadership success. A study of 218 leaders enrolled in an EMBA program (full-time employees working in five organizations), found that leaders who held values such as ‘traditional’, ‘collectivistic work’, ‘self-transcendent’, and ‘self-enhancement’ were rated higher on charisma by their subordinates (Sosik, 2005).

An extension of charismatic leadership theory that places values as a fundamental element, are so-called “Values-Based Leadership” models (VBL). The centrality of values potentially offers an approach with leadership behaviours that influence a “strong ethical core and robust corporate governance” (Lestrange & Tolstikov-Mast, 2013). A VBL approach is likely to be effective when the “the environment involves a high degree of stress and
uncertainty, the organizational task is closely related to dominant values of
the society, the situation offers at least some opportunity for ‘moral’
involvement, goals cannot be easily specified and measured, and when the
leader cannot link extrinsic rewards to individual performance.” (House &
Aditya, 1997)

Values are also a central dimension of authentic leadership. For example,
authentic leaders are defined as, “those who are deeply aware of how they
think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own
and others’ values/moral perspectives, knowledge, and strengths; aware of
the context in which they operate; and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic,
4). The level of self-awareness stressed in this definition is a key element
linking values understanding in ‘insightfully aware’ leadership development
for authenticity.

Gardner, Avolio, Luthans, May, & Walumbwa (2005) relate self-awareness to
self-reflection. According to them, “by reflecting through introspection,
authentic leaders gain clarity and concordance with respect to their core
values, identity, emotions, motives and goals” (p.347). Increasing self-
awareness entails attempting to understand one-self and one’s surrounding
predicated on self-reflection. Self-awareness denotes a state of deliberation
where an individual channels his or her attention to certain dimens
ions of the
self (Duval & Wicklund, 1972; Hannah, 2005) with no hinting whether one’s
view of oneself is precise or not. Despite this, knowing and understanding
who one is, and what one values, helps authentic leaders to create a sense of
self that gives a strong support for their behaviours, actions and decisions
(Gardner et al., 2005).

The role of clear and conscious values in directing authentic leaders thereby
enabling them to function at increased levels of moral integrity is also
highlighted in research (e.g. Luthans & Avolio, 2003). Howell & Avolio, (1992)
suggest that authentic leaders hold values which stress the welfare of their
groups. Inauthentic leaders, on the contrary, are “insensitive and
unresponsive” and emphasise self-oriented values sacrificing their
constituencies. In a similar vein, Michie & Gooty (2005) who examined the
role of values and emotions on authenticity in leaders, propose that authentic
leaders will give more importance to self-transcendent values and will have
positive other-directed emotions. They further suggest that other-directed
emotions will drive authentic leaders to demonstrate behaviours which align
with their self-transcendent values. Moreover, leaders’ authenticity and
transparency in their communication of values (authentic leadership), allows
followers to see their “true-self” thereby enabling them to assess congruence
of actions (E. A. Williams, Pillai, Deptula, & Lowe, 2012, p. 328).

Emotional intelligence (EI) is a very important and related leadership concept
that emphasizes self-awareness and social awareness. Self-Awareness is an
essential component of EI, along with self-regulation, motivation, empathy
and social skill (Goleman, 2004). Self-awareness as discussed earlier involves
an in-depth understanding of one’s values, emotions, goals, strengths,
weaknesses, needs and drives (Goleman, 2004). Emotional intelligence
motivates us to work towards our goals, stimulates our deepest values and
aspirations, changing them from “things we think about to what we live” (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997, p. xiii). EI is also considered to be an important factor in leadership success (Smollan, 2009). This is because EI enables leaders to engage with followers by gaining insights into the emotional foundations of their behaviour at work. EI involves instilling emotional understanding as a way of building commitments, comprehending people’s reactions on an emotional scale and responding accordingly (Smollan, 2009).

EI is strongly linked to transformational (Bass, 2002; J. M. George, 2000), charismatic leadership (Walter & Bruch, 2007) and authentic leadership (Gardner et al., 2005). Prati, Douglas, Ferris, Ammeter, & Buckley’s (2003) work suggests that EI of leaders in association with that of followers produces an environment of trust and cohesion resulting in effective team performance. Other studies e.g. by Jordan & Troth (2002) and F. W. Brown & Moshavi (2005) also highlight the role EI plays in promoting positive relations with colleagues. Therefore the relationship of values to emotionally intelligent leadership orientations is significant.

Considering the relationship of values understanding to self-awareness discussed above, there is a clear case for this to be integrated into leaders’ reflection and development. Leadership development often entails increasing awareness of one self (Hall, 2004). Therefore, an ‘insightfully aware’ leader would hold a profound and clear understanding of his or her purpose and the reasons behind it and build this understanding into his or her development agenda.

Understanding values is one of the most important aspects of this profound level of self-awareness. Leadership development can enhance the match between leaders’ roles, the values they espouse and the work context. Bringing values (personal, work and organizational) can enable leaders to know and accomplish what they believe is important. With an idea of who you are and what you want to be, a blueprint for effective personal leadership development can be created.

Furthermore, this kind of self-awareness approach will be consistent with the development of contemporary leadership competencies in emotional intelligence, social intelligence and the ability to learn from experience and adaptive change – competencies emphasized by such leadership authors as Gary Yukl (2012).

3. Values: Sources, Development and Change

Our work values, just like our personal values, are shaped, developed and changed by various factors, which we review in this section.

There is extensive literature and research positing a wide range of individual and external sources for values including: Socio-Economic Factors; Personality; Gender; National Culture; Religion; and Age, Cohort and Adult Life Stages.
3.1 Socio-Economic Factors

Personal needs is one of the factors that shapes values within people (Kasser, 1992; Rokeach, 1973). The values people hold may be linked to the degree to which their primary social group environment backs their intrinsic needs. For example, according to Kohn (1990) being brought up in a supportive and nurturing family environment promotes sociability and pro-social dimensions because in this case most of the needs of children are fulfilled liberating them from self-focused tendencies. This link between secure attachment and sociability is reinforced by other research (e.g. Sroufe, Egeland, Carlson, & Collins, 2005; Waters, Wippman, & Sroufe, 1979). Controlling, unfriendly and aggressive family environments, on the other hand, are linked with a propensity to be antisocial, hostile, self-serving and manipulative (Kazdin, 1987; Loeber, 1990; Lyons-Ruth, 1996; McCord & McCord, 1964).

Similar values can be transferred from parents to children through their parenting and the way they shape their children’s surroundings (Kasser, Koestner, & Lekes, 2002) enabling children to get into positions that match their inclination for self-direction; and with regard to children in lower socio-economic class families, conformity reinforces stratification (M. L. Kohn & Schooler, 1982; Lareau, 2003; Mortimer & Lorence, 1979).

Other studies also emphasize the role of neighbourhood in affecting value development in individuals (Kasser, Richard, Zax, & Sameroff, 1995). A study by Burns, Homel, & Goodnow (1984) indicates that parents in dangerous neighbourhoods care less for sociability and curiosity in comparison to those from safer and lower risk neighbourhoods. The reason for this may be that in neighbourhoods marked by misconduct and impoverishment, espousing sociability and curiosity is rather dysfunctional (Kasser et al., 1995).

Values studies in the field of sociology, demonstrate values being related to an individual’s social class, delineated as a mix of social status, power and wealth (Longest et al., 2013). Scholars in this field therefore argue that people’s decisions are informed by their values which make them feel within their “comfort zone”, and in turn create and reflect their class (Bourdieu, 1984; M. L. Kohn, 1959; Lareau, 2003).

Social structure and personality tradition research suggests the impact of social class on values through: closeness of supervision; job routinization; and job complexity (Kohn, 1959; Kohn & Schooler, 1982). People in privileged jobs are more self-directed than ones in less advantaged jobs. This condition is embedded so that ones with greater job freedom place greater importance on self-direction and flexibility than on control and conformity (M. L. Kohn, Naoi, Schoenbach, Schooler, & Slomczynski, 1990; M. L. Kohn & Schoenbach, 1993; Pearlin & Kohn, 1966; Slomczynski, Miller, & Kohn, 1981).

Similar to studies mentioned above, Longest et al. (2013) also indicate that economic and employment factors play a stronger role for values that are associated with workplace issues such as ‘Self-Direction and ‘Achievement’. These, however, do not appear to play a prominent role when it comes to other social relation values like those clustered in Schwartz’s typology of ‘Benevolence and Universalism’.
Although Socio-Economic factors, as life experience based influences, appear as very significant sources for values, we argue that it is necessary to look holistically into the role of other factors as value sources as well.

3.2 Personality

Individuals hold values; individuals have personality characteristics; and the relationship between personality and values is highlighted in the literature.

Staw, Bell, & Clausen (1986) argue that personality and affective disposition have a continuous effect on how individuals see their social reality. They further argue that individuals with different personality traits may prefer different factors in their work settings. Hamman (2011) explains this through an example of an individual who places high importance on ‘Openness’ as a personal value, and may therefore, like to work in a work setting that encourages variety, enthusiasm and opportunity to present views that are likely to stimulate well-matched work values like ‘autonomy’ and ‘stimulation’.

Olver & Mooradian (2003) believe that even though an individual’s values are affected by his/her experiences, personality has a crucial role to play. They further suggest that, in certain situations, personality may even dominate other external factors. Roccas et al. (2002) explain how values and traits are related and further underscore the compatible and incompatible relationships between them. In their contention, a relationship will exist between values and traits, when the behaviour that typifies a trait promotes the accomplishment of motivational goals signified by values. A negative relationship between values and traits will come into play when the behaviour that characterizes a trait is in conflict with the motivation goal represented by values.

Likewise, Bilsky & Schwartz (1994) relate traits and values in terms of covariant (when two variables change together) and compensatory (when one variable compensates for another) associations. They maintain that values and traits are covariant when the behaviour linked with the trait serves values predicated on growth needs. For example, an individual with a trait of creativity will probably put more importance on change (independence) than strict routine. And, values and traits are compensatory when the behaviour linked with trait serves values predicated on deficiency needs. For example, an individual with a trait of anxiety (nervousness) will probably put more importance on routine than on change.

Further research reinforcing the link between values and personality includes: a study by Duffy, Borges, & Hartung(2009) investigating the relationship between personality, vocational interests, and work values of medical students; a Furnham et al., (2005) study examining the association between the ‘Big Five’ personality characteristics and work values of 500 individuals from Great Britain and Greece; and Parks’s (2007) meta-analysis involving 11 studies, which reviews the association between values and personality. Overall, these studies demonstrate a significant role of personality characteristics as a source of values in people.
3.3 Gender

There is also research that focuses on the differences in gender with regards to values, although we note these are in relation to gender cohorts. Studies suggest that women are more “communal” with the propensity to possess emotional, expressive and people-oriented values. Men, however, tend to be more “agentic” (obeying authority) with the propensity to possess individualistic values (Schwartz & Rubel-Lifschitz, 2005, 2009). These variations are described as self-transcendence values (e.g. ‘Benevolence’ and ‘Universalism’) vs. self-enhancement values (e.g. ‘Power’ and ‘Achievement’) by Schwartz & Rubel (2005).

Gender is a frequent theme in the work values literature (Beutel & Marini, 1995; Weisgram, Bigler, & Liben, 2010). For example, the values that individuals internalize are affected by their life experiences, culture and social interactions (Rokeach, 1973). Other research found that women are mostly restricted to opt for positions that have different expectations in comparison to men, which then results in differences in behaviours, motivations and goals (Eagly, 1987). Furthermore, women’s work values were found to impact their labour market decisions (Stam, Verbakel, & de Graaf, 2014).

The majority of the studies (Bond, 1988; Feather, 1987; Marini, Fan, Finley, & Beutel, 1996; Xiao, 2000) support these predictions for gender as a source of values, although some found only a few differences with regards to the significance of values by gender (Prince-Gibson & Schwartz, 1998; Struch, Schwartz, & van der Kloot, 2002) and a very few that point at the change in the gender value association (e.g. Xiao, 1999) indicating that women favour self-oriented values such as autonomy more than men. In considering the range of research results relating gender to values, it must be noted that gender differences in work values may replicate gender differences in an individual’s life experiences, culture and social interactions (Hamman, 2011).

3.4 National Culture

National culture influences values to a great extent (Longest et al., 2013). Work values are often rooted in culture of a nation or society (D. Brown, 2002; Jaw, Ling, Wang, & Chang, 2007). This is predicated on the notion that a person’s values are influenced by primary social group, norms – both social and cultural, values and beliefs (Gahan & Abeysekera, 2009) which form “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another” (Hofstede, 2001, p. 9).

A number of cross-cultural studies highlight the role of national cultures in influencing people’s values and therefore a repertoire of work values, goals, and conduct (Akthar, 2000; Bigoness & Blakely, 1996). For example, Keles & Aycan (2011) suggests that managerial sociocultural values influence the performance management system practices, which they implement, in a manner more aligned with their values. Research (e.g. Hegney, Plank, & Parker, 2006) conducted in Western Countries suggests that the non-fulfilment of intrinsic work values leads to a decline in job satisfaction. Similarly studies conducted in eastern context (e.g. Ravari, 2012) also indicate
the role of work values in mitigating employees’ dissatisfaction with their jobs.

Bigoness & Blakely’s (1996) study examining differences in managerial values across 12 nations, however, produced mixed results suggesting variations as well as homogenization of values across nations. Similarly, a cross-cultural study by Ralston, Gustafson, Cheung, & Terpstra (1993) on divergence/convergence of managerial values across the US, China and Hong Kong also gave mixed results, supporting both convergence and divergence views. However, this study elicited the cross-vergence perspective which, “advocates that the combination of sociocultural influences and business ideology influences is the driving force that precipitates the development of new and unique values systems among individuals in a society owing to the dynamic interaction of these influences” (Ralston, 2008, p. 29).

In summary, these studies point towards the notion of global corporate culture emerging (Ralston, Holt, Terpstra, & Yu, 1997) which exists in the current business context. Nevertheless, there is strong evidence that suggests the influence of national culture as a source of individual and societal values.

3.5 Religion

Religion is another factor associated with values (Longest et al., 2013). This notion is long held. For example, Weber (1930/1998) contended that Protestants were brought up to give high importance to ‘restraint’, ‘conformity’ and ‘tradition’. Studies show that these values align with the majority of religions (Alwin, 1986; Starks & Robinson, 2007). According to Schwartz & Huismans (1995) strongly religious individuals place less importance on openness to change in comparison to less religious ones. In their study, Longest et al. (2013) contend that people who are regular members of religious congregations tend to place less importance on ‘Power’ and ‘Achievement’ values and more importance on ‘Benevolence’. One research study conducted by Sagie (1993) on Israeli youth found religiosity as a significant factor influencing individuals’ sense of work obligation. To the contrary, a study by Chusmir & Koberg (1988) found that religious affiliation had no role in increasing role achievement and career progress. Nevertheless, we believe that religious philosophies and beliefs (or non-beliefs) can act as a significant factor in developing and shaping values and beliefs of individuals and societies – and are an important potential source of the values some people may hold quite strongly.

3.6 Age, Cohort and Adult Life Stages

In addition to religion, Longest et al. (2013), argue that values can be influenced by cohort and age. A number of studies suggest that birth cohorts are increasingly placing more importance on ‘Hedonism’ and ‘Achievement-orientation’ (Baker, 2005; Inglehart & Welzel, 2005; Inglehart, 1997). For example a US based research by Lyons, Duxbury, & Higgins (2005) suggests that “Generation X” individuals give higher importance to ‘Achievement’ and ‘Stimulation’ in comparison to “Baby Boomers”. Similarly, Longest et al.
suggest that older cohorts place more importance on self-transcendence and less on self-enhancement values in comparison to younger age cohorts.

In terms of work values, studies by Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman, & Lance (2010) and Wray-Lake, Syvertsen, Briddell, Osgood, & Flanagan (2010) found that work centrality declines with successive age cohorts, while extrinsic work values and leisure values become more important (see Parry & Urwin, 2011 for a detailed review). Nevertheless, we note that the empirical evidence in this intergenerational area is sparse; and more research is needed to draw definitive conclusions on the depth of relationship between values and birth cohorts (S. Lyons & Kuron, 2013).

Experiencing different life stages and major events also affects values (Longest et al., 2013). Getting married and having children are the most significant adult life stages (L. K. George, 1993) which transfer a person into new roles – ones accompanied by changes in expectations and duties which can influence values. Longest et al. (2013) show that being married and having children are the two life stages, inclined towards ‘traditional’ values.

While it is clear that there are many individual and external factors which provide the source or influence for an individual’s personal and work values, and that in any individual the combination of factors may be different; it is also clear that these values as developed are substantial ingredients in that individual’s make-up and view of the world. Therefore, a related and relevant question is how values might change over time for other reasons.

3.7 Values Change

Values literature in the field of psychology tends to suggest that values are stable, which is critical for the value studies in this field, as it indicates values are variables which can help to predict personal outcomes (Bardi et al., 2009). This view is largely predicated on the repeatability of value survey instruments (see Appendix 1).

Despite the underpinning of stability, there is research (beyond that on adult life-cycle) that demonstrates the potential for value change over time. For example, Schwartz (2005); Bardi & Goodwin (2011) differentiate value change into two types, ‘mean-level and rank-order’, the former referring to “a change in the mean importance of a value” (p. 914) across the sample (group of individuals); and the latter referring to “a change in the rank-order of individuals” (p. 914) on a scale of value significance. Some studies suggest that mean-level changes are a result of societal changes (Inglehart, 1997), organizational influence on workforce (Chatman, 1991), influence of education (Chatard & Selimbegovic, 2007) and personal experience changes (Rokeach, 1973).

If different individuals share the changes in a personal experience at the same time, this might imply a mean-level change in values importance (Bardi et al., 2009) – for example, a major war which affects many lives). On the other hand, if different individuals have very different personal experiences, during that major event, this might also lead to a rank-order change in values for themselves, which is a within-an individual change (Bardi et al., 2009).
According to Rokeach (1968), value change results as a result of variance or inconsistencies between the behaviour and values experienced by an individual because of the intake of information from a significant other or by identifying and acknowledging the contradictions and inconsistencies in their current value arrangement. This process of acknowledging and identifying, results in change in values to reinstate consistency (Rokeach, 1968). Schwartz & Bardi (1997) used a cohort comparison to suggest that in order to conform to the prospects available in their environment, individuals, mostly young people, might modify their values.

In their study Murphy, Gordon, & Mullen (2004) suggested a change in adult value structures in the United States following the September 11, 2001 attacks, with an increase in the salience of ‘survival’, ‘safety’ and ‘security’ values and decrease in salience of ‘self-esteem’ and ‘self-actualization’ values. These findings were replicated in the study on teenagers by Murphy et al. (2006). Likewise, a study by Verkasalo, Goodwin, & Bezmenova (2006) on adolescents and university students in Finland indicated higher security values amongst students after the September 11, 2001 attack, however the security value scores came back to their standard level in the samples collected a few months after the attack.

Schwartz (2005) believes that values may adjust as an individual ages because of a variety of reasons. He provides an example of ‘Hedonism’, which may become less significant as the body ages and physical performance slows down. Additionally, values may adjust to changing life situations; for example, ‘Achievement’ values related to development opportunities or “stretch” project assignments may be relatively significant in young people who are in early stages of their career.

Rokeach (1973) advocates that a value change necessitates an alteration in the entire arrangement of values, as the change in the significance of one value should lead to change in the whole hierarchy of values. Bardi et al. (2009), however, raise concerns here about whether the structure of value change is random or more organized. They argue that the, “structure of value change should mirror the value structure” (p. 915). This was confirmed by their study conducted in Germany and Czech Republic on eight hundred and eleven high school students (Bardí et al., 2009). Their research further suggests that the impact of major life events on value change was more significant than that of age, which suggests that the necessity to adapt to significant circumstances affects value change to a greater extent than age.

A further study by Krishnan (2008) supports this view, where research was undertaken with university business students. Its results indicate a mean-level increase in ‘Self-enhancement’ and concurrent decrease in ‘Benevolence’. Since the unit of analysis was mean-level changes it is not known whether this was also replicated at the individual level (Bardi et al., 2009).

There are many circumstances in life where an individual chooses between incompatible values or pursues conforming values concurrently (Bardi et al., 2009). Therefore, when an individual goes through an increase in his/her two conflicting values, he/she is likely to experience a conflict over and over
again which is likely to influence his/her understanding, judgements and decisions (Bardi et al., 2009). Consequently, in the next section we discuss the interaction of individual and organizational values, particularly through the lens of work-value conflict and compatibility or congruence.

4. Values Conflict and Values Compatibility or Congruence

Conflict of values is faced by people every day, where they are confronted with the dilemma as to “what is the right thing to do?” (van der Wal, de Graaf, & Lawton, 2011, p. 332). An individual’s life, with different aspects—personal and professional, is filled with different expectations, duties, and responsibilities, which in turn are defined by the specific role he or she undertakes at any point in time. One of the attributes of these different roles is that an individual endures or pursues them for his/her interest.

It is essential to understand whether values that bind us in our personal and professional lives are of a similar nature (van der Wal et al., 2011). Values conflict is not just limited to being intra-personal, but can also be interpersonal and organizational (Hultman, 2006).

Interpersonal value conflict in the workplace demonstrates itself as differences amongst people with regard to goals, preferences, ways, and beliefs, thus leading to power and trust issues, politics, perceptions of manipulation and competition (Hultman, 2006). Organizational conflict, on the other hand, reflects a ‘mismatch’ between an individual, team, and organizational values. The notion of ‘match’ which some perceive as using employees to realize organizational ends is debatable (Hultman, 2006).

Others argue that ethical issues might enhance the prominence of value conflict in an organization – intra-individual which emerges from differences in the degree of importance placed on certain values by the person; and inter-individual conflict reflecting a conflict between different individual values and organizational values (Coye, 1986). An individual, when faced with a critical situation with ethical implications, or with the outcomes of a prior similar decision, may become abruptly and distressingly conscious of a value conflict (Wrench, 1969).

The diverse nature of values conflict, discussed above, is noteworthy, as it implies that value conflicts confront people not merely with a moral problem but also different kinds of organizational problems. This can be explained through examples in public administration where it is contended that in governance, seeking a significant value restricts seeking other values (van der Wal et al., 2011). For example, one of the works of Okun (1975) on public policies, demonstrates that equality and efficiency inevitably conflict with one another. Walzer (1973) believes that public actors in governance might select a mode of action, which might not be morally right but still appropriate on utilitarian grounds – consider, as an exemplar, that in a democracy, transparency is an obligation, but there are certain policy areas that necessitate confidentiality for effective implementation, as a result of which, this obligation is breached (Nieuwenburg, 2004).
Transparency as a value received greater notice with the controversial data disclosed by Wikileaks (van der Wal et al., 2011). Transparency is a value some administrators would openly oppose (Piotrowsky, 2010). For example with regards to Wikileaks, governments contend that, “without secrecy, diplomacy is argued to be impossible” (van der Wal et al., 2011, p. 333).

People tend to deal with conflicts through mentally driven processes of comparison amongst values (Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989). As discussed earlier, most scholars in the values field believe in the hierarchical arrangement of values in accordance with the significance an individual attaches to the values he/she holds (Locke, 1991; Rokeach, 1973). Locke (1991, p. 291) puts it this way: “since values motivate action, they must be held, in any given context, in hierarchical form.” Therefore, “since a person can only take, in effect, one action at a time, a person who did not have any hierarchy of values would be paralyzed by conflict and would be unable to act at all or to sustain an action once taken” (Locke, 1991, p. 291).

In situations when there is no conflict between individual and organizational values, individuals tend to be accommodative of organizational values, even if not consciously (Liedtka, 1989). Weick (1969) believes that people often depend on scripted processes, rather than deliberate thinking to shape their conduct and “frame” the issue.

However when a conflict emerges between different values, inter or intra-individual, the usage of scripted processes is disturbed and people tend to use non-scripted processes. This is where the significance of values becomes apparent in decision making with regard to that specific decision (Liedtka, 1989). Image theory (Beach & Mitchell, 1985 as cited in Liedtka, 1989, p. 806) is better able to explain the process where this conflict is evident. According to this theory, decision makers often reach the decisions after evaluating the congruence or match between recommended actions and their self-image – image views that may also be influenced by values.

Self-image “consists of principles that dictate which goals the decision-maker pursues… who one is and what one regards as appropriate and comfortable for oneself” (Liedtka, 1989, p. 5). These images surface from experiences as well as being the outcomes of different values possessed by these individuals in addition to their perceptions of themselves. However, we observe that even organizations have a self-image, identified as culture, explained by Broms & Gahmberg (1983) as follows: “We define the culture of a domain as the collection of central values hidden in the shared myths and symbols of that domain. Behind every culture there is a nucleus of images … This nucleus is a generator inside man, and it produces innumerable variations of the same nuclear images, or sometimes anti-images (in countercultures). Those variations that are brought to the surface we call part of ‘our culture’” (p. 482 as cited in Liedtka, 1989, p. 806). Image, culture and values hold a close relationship.

Since, congruence between different values held by individual and organization becomes a concern only in its absence, an initial step to comprehend the process of decision making entails examining this dyad (or
two way exchange) so as to see whose value-set or self-image will prevail in the decision making process (Liedtka, 1989). Individuals’ ethical decisions will be influenced by their personal values. Organizational values will also influence the ethical decisions in the work context which will also be influenced by how strong the organization culture is which reflects its stated values.

Rival values might be a frequent occurrence at multinationals, confronting people with ethical dilemmas (S. L. Williams, 2011). Understanding and deciding which values are more significant to one’s workplace, perceiving and defining them in a way that is compatible with one’s self and then rating them according to their significance for an organization is critical in managing ethical behaviour at work (S. L. Williams, 2011).

So values, their sources and potential conflict or congruence represent a complex set of interrelationships. To make sense of this for ‘insightfully aware’ leadership development, we move to our findings and suggestions.

5. A Values Definition and Framework for Understanding Values in Insightfully Aware Leadership

In addition to providing a substantial literature review to understand the concept of values, and highlight areas for further research, a prime motivation for undertaking this paper was to synthesize a values definition and values framework for use in leadership development practice.

The detailed discussions in earlier sections on values definitions and descriptions, work values, values sources and change, as well as values conflict and congruence, show that different authors use various terms such as ‘beliefs’, ‘principles’, ‘motives’, ‘forces’, ‘goals’, ‘authorities’ etc. to describe ‘values’ from time to time. The values terminology is inconsistent. There is no absolute concurrence on a values definition in the literature.

If this topic area is to be actively embedded in leadership development activities, then a realistically usable definition of values is needed – readily understandable and meaningful for executives and others – especially if values considerations are to be part of a development process for leaders to gain ‘insightful awareness’ of themselves, others and context.

5.1 Towards a Usable Definition of Values

Therefore, guided by our literature reviews and analysis, we posit a definition for understanding values and their attributes, which could be used for leadership development practice.

- Values Definition and Attributes:
  - Personal values are the fundamental principles or standards, and the essential elements of an individual, which guide his or her thinking, emotions, behaviours, actions and choices over time, and across multiple situations.
Values influence our conscious and unconscious behaviours and actions.

Values are abstract in concept and in their articulation (e.g. ‘trust’, ‘achievement’; ‘security’; ‘respect’; ‘making a difference’ etc.).

Values are clustered in twelve types (each type with closely related characteristics, e.g. the ‘Power’ cluster including ‘influential’, ‘authoritative’, ‘powerful’ etc.). The circle in the centre of Figure 3 in the next sub-section lists the twelve value types.

Values exist in hierarchy – with our most important values at the top of our list. These form our “core” values.

Values tend to be relatively stable over time. Yet, the values themselves, and the hierarchy of importance can change.

Values come from many sources including: socio-economic factors (e.g. social class, family, childhood environment); personality; national culture; gender; religion; age/adult life stages (e.g. marriage or having children); and major life experiences or events (e.g. a war; or catastrophic natural disaster).

Values are linked to beliefs and attitudes, often seen through actions and behaviours, which make them apparent and observable to self and to others.

Beliefs that relate to judgments (e.g. sense of what is ‘good’ or ‘bad’, or the ‘way the world ought to be’) are closely tied to values.

There is the potential for value compatibility (congruence) and value conflict in specific situations – alignment and misalignment of values, behaviours, actions and choices – within a person (such as ‘ambition’ vs. ‘relationships’) or between different people (such as ‘results orientated’ vs. ‘harmony’).

Personal values relate strongly to our work and organizational values – and may also be compatible or in conflict.

We believe that if an individual is able to articulate and understand their values, this will allow them to generate meaningful insights about how they see themselves, the circumstances they face, the behaviours they undertake, and their potential reactions to courses of action at a particular moment in time.

We contend that because a person’s values are so fundamental, an individual fights attempts to alter them, and reacts positively or negatively when these values are either satisfied or breached.

As different people have different values and hierarchies (as well as word choices to express these), the potential for either values compatibilities (potentially “shared values”) or values conflicts in groups or work situations is significant.

For these reasons, a clearer understanding of values would contribute to ‘insightful awareness’ in leadership performance and development, especially if emotionally intelligent, charismatic, authentic or values-based leadership approaches are desired.
5.2 An “Understanding Values Framework”

Guided by our literature review, pedagogical experience and some preliminary research analysis, we also propose a values framework to capture the interrelated concepts in values raised by our definition. This framework should be helpful for those planning or undertaking leadership development activities as it includes many relevant elements that influence an individual’s values, and thereby their behaviours and actions at work.

This framework also relates individual, work and organizational levels and relationships. (There is a detailed beta version of the framework in Appendix 3 as a basis for further research and development including descriptions of our twelve value types and word examples). A simpler version of overall the framework is provided in Figure 2).

![Figure 2. Understanding Values Framework – In Simple Terms](image)

On one side of the framework, we have **Values – Sources and Change**.

This area indicates a range of various factors, which influence value orientation, development and change. The seven factors encompass: Socio-Economic; Personality; Gender; National Culture; Religion; Age, Cohort and Adult Life Stages; and Values Change resulting from major life experiences and events (noting that values are relatively stable over time).

We do not specifically ascribe any factor as the direct source for a particular value type in the values system. Nevertheless, we believe that in a leadership development setting, a checklist of potential sources is a useful reference point to aid reflection and discussion.
The centrepiece of the framework is the *Personal Values System*

As a basis we begin by taking the Schwartz circular model of values (1992, 1994) as previously discussed as the most comprehensive current representation of a value structure proposed in the literature. His model portrays the associations between ten value types (clusters) in terms of compatibility (congruence) and conflict, together with the broad motivation goals they share.

We then make three modifications to the circular structure (discussed below) to reflect our research to date. In addition, we place the ideas of a Values Hierarchy, Values Congruence/Compatibility and Conflict explicitly within the Personal Values System. (This part of the overall framework can be seen in Figure 3).

---

**Figure 3. Understanding Values Framework – the Personal Values System**

The modifications we propose to the Schwartz circle are:

1. **We treat compatibility/congruence and conflict across the values types with a wider range of positions and possibilities compared to the Schwartz model.**
In the Schwartz model the value types opposite to each other (such as ‘Universalism’ and ‘Achievement’) are in conflict whereas values that are adjacent tend to be more compatible. Whilst we see this, like Feather (1995), we believe that values adjacent to each other can, at times, conflict.

Feather (1995) explains this through an example of an individual who concurrently puts importance on success while also seeking a life of pleasure. So ‘Achievement’ and ‘Hedonism’ might be conflicting in the sense that they require acts that can result in contradictory results if one strives for them simultaneously. Striving for achievement may constrict a hedonistic approach to life in many settings and seeking pleasure might be at the cost of achievement.

Similarly values opposite to each other in the Schwartz circle might not necessarily conflict. According to Feather (1995) individuals in cultures that place importance on mutuality and communal endeavors might strive for ‘Conformity’ and ‘Achievement’ together, without the conflict as is suggested by the original Schwartz model.

Represented by rotating arrows around the circle, in our framework, we propose that values types can be compatible or conflict with each other irrespective of where they lie in the circle – and should be considered by people in context and situation.

2. We keep Schwartz’s ten values types and add two additional values types, namely: ‘Ethical Judgment’ and ‘Highly Abstract Values – Idealistic Personal State’. We add Values Communication to the Personal Values System.

We have added ‘Ethical Judgment’ values as a type cluster, placed between the values types of ‘Universalism, Benevolence’ and ‘Security, Conformity, Tradition’ because of the renewed interest in ethical dimensions reflecting the salience of values such as ‘integrity’, ‘honesty’, ‘fairness’, ‘transparency’, ‘accountability’ and ‘dependability’ in contemporary discourse in business and society. These values, we believe, provide justification for people’s choices when faced with ethical dilemmas and the direct expression of the motivational source of “Objective Morality”. These represent one’s conduct more specifically in a work place.

We also note literature (e.g. Mumford et al., 2003; Singhapakdi & Vitell, 1993) that shows the role of values in ethical judgment and integrity related decisions. In our experience, language that reflects ‘Ethical Judgment’ type values appears very often in values articulation exercises and executive discussions – related to self, as well as to teams and organizations.

We do recognize that in the Schwartz descriptions of the values types (see Appendix 1), ‘Ethical Judgment’ values could be variously linked or encompassed as part of the five value types (Universalism, Benevolence, Security, Conformity, Tradition). Nevertheless, we believe leaders and executives will more clearly understand this additional cluster as being directly relevant to their understanding and communication of values.
The other value type we propose, is placed as an inner circle at the center, and linked to all the values types. This we call ‘Highly Abstract Values’ contributing to the higher order value motivator of an ‘Idealistic Personal State’. These include values language and descriptions (seen very often from people) such as: ‘absolute bliss’, ‘total completeness’, ‘ultimate happiness or elation’, ‘nirvana’ and so forth. These notions lie well below the surface of our everyday life and are linked strongly to core values and principles when they are experienced positively.

We believe these idealistic values feature significantly as expressions of a deeply desired personal state to which the person’s other values contribute. Sagiv & Schwartz (2000) observe that, although it is an important value, ‘happiness’ is not included in the Schwartz definitional list, because people achieve it through attaining whatever outcomes they value. Nevertheless, as such personal states are values; we believe these will be more understandable by being explicit in the framework.

In our field research to date, we witness this ‘Highly Abstract’ values language in many values articulation and discussion exercises with executives, especially when someone describes how he or she feels or would see himself or herself, when all their other major values are fully satisfied and are congruent. As these may not be readily definable “values” types per se, we place them in the center of the circle linked to all the other values.

Research work on values language through articulation is ongoing. However, we include Appendix 4 with some recent results from values articulation and discussion exercises for information. The personal communication and articulation that is meaningful of values is an essential part of the ‘insightfully aware’ approach to values understanding we are encouraging. Articulating one’s values in language that is meaningful gives rise to a high level of “ownership” in the “understanding” of these values as major “insights” in a leader’s self-awareness. Furthermore there is a relationship between values expressed and values as witnessed through behaviours as noted earlier. Therefore, we include Values Communication: Articulation, Expression and Behaviours as part of the Personal Values System.

3. We rename one Schwartz higher values motivation and add the idea of a Values Hierarchy within the Personal Values System.

Like Schwartz, we keep the higher order value motivations at the edge of the circle (‘Self-Transcendence’, ‘Openness to Change’, ‘Self-Enhancement’); however, we change the Schwartz title of ‘Conservation’ to ‘Conservatism and Objective Morality’ to improve communication understanding in a leadership development situation, and directly reflect the additional value type of ‘Ethical Judgment’ we have added.

As established by research (e.g. Bardi et al., 2009; Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992), the Personal Values System also recognizes that values are ranked by importance relative to each other, i.e. a personal values hierarchy – the higher priorities are our “core” values or are values that we place more importance on, have most influence in directing our lives, our understanding of ourselves and of others, and our perception of the world. They provide justifications for
the decisions we take. Understanding that values exist in a hierarchy will contribute to an individual exploring the relationship of their values to their leadership behaviours, as well as the conflicts they face or experience – and is an essential part of understanding our personal values system.

In the framework, Work Values and Organizational Values are situated underneath the Personal Values System.

In line with the literature, we propose that work-activity perception is seldom the outcome of one value; but rather it is an outcome of different sets of values that operate simultaneously. As discussed in earlier sections, an individual’s personal values shape his or her work values, which then interact with organizational values.

Work values are significant as they determine, control and alter the association between an individual and organization (Berings et al., 2004; Boldero & Francis, 2002; Hambrick & Brandon, 1988; Posner & Schmidt, 1993). So, we have linked personal values and organizational values through the theme of work values, which can lead to either ‘work-value congruence’ or ‘work-value conflict’, impacting behaviours and other organizational functioning – positively or negatively – productively or counter-productively. Work-value congruence, we believe, can lead to positive work behaviours, whereas value conflict, on the other hand, is likely to lead to negative work behaviours.

Work values also interact with the organization. Whether a person believes that Organizational Values are appropriate or not for them (either in reality or perception) will influence work value congruence and conflict. In this, the person’s view is likely to be affected by many other elements; for example, the person’s working experience with the organization, the presence or absence of leadership role-modelling, destructive leadership behaviours, feelings of reward, appreciation or frustration. This is a complex area not encompassed by our review, although we note there is a large body of literature in areas such as organizational leadership and strategic human resource management that addresses these matters.

**Conclusion and Implications**

Values are not end states but rather ways of conduct, that shape and direct an individual’s actions (Schwartz, 1992). For people, thinking about personal values is an outcome of learning, inspiration, reflection and personal experience. Literature (e.g. Longest et al., 2013) highlights a range of sources that predict the values that an individual holds. For organizations, thinking about values is influenced by real work experiences, ethics-oriented training sessions, and the organizational expectations documented in such things as code of ethics (S. L. Williams, 2011).

Values control the choice of organizational goals thereby serving as standards through which decisions are assessed. They constitute the “givens” and map out the choices before the process of decision-making starts (Liedtka, 1989). Work values impact employees’ performance decisions by providing criteria...
for choosing a particular behaviour or action over an alternative (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987). Values significant to work settings are ways of conduct that nurture productivity as values are criteria of expectation and competence (Schein, 1985). Sharing work values helps to predict performance behaviours of others (Posner, Kouzes, & Schmidt, 1985). Besides contributing to culture (Asgary & Mitschow, 2002) work values can enable organizations to consider different ways of working ethically in different nations. However, they are less specific in influencing people’s behaviours when confronted with actual ethical dilemmas (S. L. Williams, 2011).

Leadership, organizational and team performance is profoundly influenced by values. With respect to leaders’ perspective, values might not essentially affect the choice of a purpose, but they act as means through which purpose can be monitored. They can guide leaders by impacting ideas about potential directions and help them to understand, as well as decide, what they will be comfortable with in relation to organizational strategy, functioning and direction. We, therefore, see significant opportunity for scholars in the fields of strategic management and organizational leadership to extend research in a contemporary global business environment in relation to the intersection between organizational values and personal values (Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Sosik, 2005; Walsh, 1995).

It is important for organizations to clearly define and rate its values which form the basis of organizational practices and strategies (Humble et al., 1994). Once that is done, a comparison needs to be drawn between them and their existing practices and culture (Asgary & Mitschow, 2002). These values should be translated in workplace expectations, in dealing with customers and specifically in employees’ roles and tasks. Comprehending the values and their role in daily behavioural activities should be integrated into training and development programs. It is suggested that managers be given training in “moral awareness” through open conversations with regard to dilemmas they face mixed with feedback from peers about the consequences of decisions and actions (Tepper, 2010, p. 596).

We observe that because of variations in defining, operationalizing, and measuring, values, as a concept is rather a complex one. Therefore, it is essential for future studies in this area to clearly identify which sets of assumptions they base their understanding of values upon. Furthermore a comparison of different factors (e.g. social constraints, situational factors etc.) that influence values as well as how they interact in organizational context is another arena for future in-depth research. As noted earlier, there is also an important need to review values in relation to generational cohorts with multiple generations working together in the modern work place.

Previous research put forth some perspectives on work-value congruence and work-value conflict; however the explanation of the effect of congruence and conflict is an area to extend research. Contemporary empirical and theoretical discussions integrating varied perspectives (such as how people cope with work values issues in cross-cultural and inter-generational settings) are required to deepen our understanding of this area of contemporary management approaches and performance. How both of these themes, congruence and conflict, could help organizations gain competitive advantage
is another area of further research. Whilst studies indicate that value congruence can be employed as a strategic HR tool to coordinate different people management practices in the workplace (Werbel & DeMarie, 2005), additional analysis on work value conflict could assist in improving the design of training programs and management approaches to avoid and manage unproductive conflict in organizations.

Given the commentary on values congruence and conflict together with values hierarchy, a very interesting arena of investigation is the potential relationship of values to the concept of an “immunity to change” in an individual. The immunity to change research by Kegan & Lahey (2009) demonstrates the role of so-called “competing commitments” in working against a genuine change an individual is initially committed to pursue. In our view, values, especially if they conflict with the ones that facilitate the proposed change, can be one of the reasons behind these “competing commitments”. Embedded values and principles can prevail over the outside reality, “creating string effect and conviction of truth without any configuration from the environment - feeling over fact - and then having the neocortex (conscious) rationalize the choice” (Wade, 1996, p. 123). Therefore the interplay between “immunity to change” and “values understanding” is another area of research that would be very rewarding, as it directly links to ‘insightfully aware’ leadership development that understands a person’s hidden “drivers and blockers” for action and change.

Although our discussion of values is based on academic literature, it would be remiss not to mention that there is a large body of popular business writings as well as leadership or management education and training activities and courses that reference “values”. We have not attempted a detailed examination of these materials and approaches for this paper. However, an exploration of the relationship between ideas from the world of leadership development practice and the perspectives gained from the literature is a potential area of further research – or at the very least intensive pedagogical development. (A brief Appendix 5 touches on this matter).

With an increased contemporary interest in leadership grounded on values, this paper gives assurance that an emphasis on recognizing and understanding values is a necessity. Our review offers a comprehensive report of classic and recent literature on values and work values. The objective was to understand different conceptualizations of values and work values; to look into the role of different factors that impact people’s values; and report studies around issues relating to value change, conflict and congruence.

Finally, we believe that deriving the integrated “Understanding Values Framework” as presented in the previous section, together with a usable definition and descriptions of values, their attributes and role in our lives can make a constructive contribution to leadership development that seeks ‘insightful awareness’. We acknowledge that further quantitative and qualitative research should be undertaken. Application experience in leadership development practice will also inform further improvements and enhancements to the proposed definition and framework.
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Appendix 1

Measuring Values

There are various ways of assessing or measuring values reported in the literature. We list a number of the well-known instruments below for reference and information:

- PVS or Personal Value Scale (Scott, 1965) which includes 12 value items: (1) intellectualism, (2) kindness, (3) social skills, (4) loyalty, (5) academic achievement, (6) physical development, (7) status, (8) honesty, (9) religiousness, (10) self-control, (11) creativity, and (12) independence.

- RVS or Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) (Rokeach, 1973) which comprises of 36 (instrumental and terminal) value items.
  - Terminal values include: an exciting life, pleasure, mature love, true friendship, inner harmony, social recognition, a sense of accomplishment, family security, national, security, self-respect, health, a comfortable life, freedom, salvation, equality, wisdom, a world at peace, and a world of beauty.
  - Instrumental values include: ambitious, broad-minded, capable, clean, cheerful, courageous, forgiving, helpful, honest, imaginative, independent, intellectual, logical, loving, obedient, polite, responsible, and self-controlled.

- LOV or List of Values (Kahle, Poulos, & Sukhdial, 1988) which contains 9 values: (1) fun and enjoyment, (2) warm relationships, (3) self-fulfillment, (4) being well respected, (5) sense of accomplishment, (6) security, (7) self-respect, (8) sense of belonging, and (9) excitement.

- CES or Comparative Emphasis Scale (Ravlin & Meglino, 1987) which includes 4 values: (1) achievement, (2) helping (concern for others), (3) honesty, and (4) fairness.

- Shared Values in Organizations put forth by McDonald & Gandz (1992) which lists 24 values: (1) adaptability, (2) aggressiveness, (3) autonomy, (4) broad-mindedness, (5) cautiousness, (6) consideration, (7) cooperation, (8) courtesy, (9) creativity, (10) development, (11) diligence, (12) economy, (13) experimentation, (14) fairness, (15) forgiveness, (16) formality, (17) humor, (18) initiative, (19) logic, (20) moral integrity, (21) obedience, (22) openness, (23) orderliness, and (24) social equality.
• LVI or Life Values Inventory (Crace & Brown, 1995) comprises of 14 values: (1) achievement, (2) belonging, (3) concern for the environment, (4) concern for others, (5) creativity, (6) financial prosperity, (7) health and activity, (8) humility, (9) independence, (10) interdependence, (11) objective analysis, (12) privacy, (13) responsibility, and (14) spirituality.

• SVS or Schwartz Value Survey (Schwartz, 1994) which measures value preferences through rankings (clustered in his 10 value types), containing a total of 56 core values:

  o **Self-Direction**: creativity, curious, freedom, choosing own goals, and independent.
  o **Stimulation**: daring, a varied life, and an exciting life.
  o **Hedonism**: pleasure, and enjoying life.
  o **Achievement**: successful, capable, ambitious, influential, intelligent, and self-respect.
  o **Power**: social power, authority, wealth, preserving my public image, and social recognition.
  o **Security**: clean, national security, social order, family security, reciprocation of favors, healthy, and sense of belonging.
  o **Conformity**: politeness, honoring of parents and elders, obedient, and self-discipline.
  o **Tradition**: devout, accepting portion in life, humble, moderate, respect for tradition, and detachment.
  o **Benevolence**: helpful, honest, forgiving, loyal, responsible, true friendship, a spiritual life, mature love, and meaning in life.
  o **Universalism**: protecting the environment, a world of beauty, unity with nature, broad-minded, social justice, wisdom, equality, a world at peace, and inner harmony.
# Appendix 2

## Table 1
Different Values Definitions/Descriptions in the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Description</th>
<th>Definition/Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An internalized understanding</td>
<td>Values convey an individual’s internalized understanding of socially desirable routes to realize his/her needs.</td>
<td>(Kluckhohn, 1951b; Rokeach, 1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conception of what is desirable</td>
<td>“A value can be viewed as a conception, explicit or implicit, of what an individual or a group regards as desirable, and in terms of which he/she or they select, from among alternative available modes, the means and ends of action.”</td>
<td>(Guth &amp; Tagiuri, 1965, p. 124-125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingredient of motivation</td>
<td>Values are the, “determinants of motivated behaviour.”</td>
<td>(M. Brown, 1976, p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities</td>
<td>“Values serve as the authorities in the name of which choices are made and action taken.”</td>
<td>(Morrill, 1980, p. 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A broad tendency</td>
<td>Values are “a broad tendency to prefer certain states of affairs over others.”</td>
<td>(Hofstede, 1984, p. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Inclination (tendency)</td>
<td>Values are an association between abstract categories which are defined by strong emotional elements and connote an inclination for specific actions</td>
<td>(Karahanna, Evaristo, &amp; Srite, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An objective psychological state, An objective relationship, An objective material condition</td>
<td>A value is “an objective, either a psychological state, a relationship, or material condition, that one seeks to attain.”</td>
<td>(Super, 1980, p. 130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element of organizational culture</td>
<td>Values are a vital element of organizational culture.</td>
<td>(Schein, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposable dispositions</td>
<td>Values are “transposable dispositions” that go beyond the apparent situations and actual objects.</td>
<td>(Bourdieu, 1990, p. 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations, Standards</td>
<td>Values include aspirations as well as deeply rooted standards that decide future course of action as well as rationalize former actions.</td>
<td>(Braithwaite &amp; Scott, 1991; Kluckhohn, 1951b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntarily enduring standards or benchmarks</td>
<td>Values are voluntarily enduring standards or benchmarks that provide stability between one’s needs, fluidity and effectiveness of social interaction, and group survival.</td>
<td>(Schwartz, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs</strong></td>
<td>Values encompass beliefs, which people have and which; in turn guide their behaviours and actions. Furthermore, values as beliefs have a normative or judgment quality (e.g. good or bad). (Feather, 1995)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motives, Needs</strong></td>
<td>Values are not just beliefs but also motives, which operate, as needs that shape individual’s goal-oriented behaviour. (Feather, 1995)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linked to sense of self</strong></td>
<td>Values are also closely linked to individual’s sense of self. Feather (1995) however does not restrict their impact to cognitive preferences in organized ‘self’ concerning circumstances. Values influence the manner an individual understands or delineates a situation in order for certain events, actions and possible results to appear as more appealing in comparison to others which are seen as unfavourable. Feather (1995) explains it by providing an example of an honest person who finds following an honest approach or action as attractive. (Feather, 1995; Rokeach, 1973)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes, Component of self</strong></td>
<td>Values are “attributes” used by people to define themselves and which form an important component of their self-concept. (Verplanken, 2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trans-situational goals, Guiding principles</strong></td>
<td>Values are “desirable trans-situational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in the life of a person or other social entity”. (Schwartz, 1994, p. 21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principles</strong></td>
<td>Values act as principles that lead to effective management in organizations. (Mitchell &amp; O’Neal, 1994)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principles</strong></td>
<td>“Values…are principles for action encompassing abstract goals in life and modes of conduct that an individual or a collective considers preferable across contexts and situations.” (Braithwaite &amp; Blamey, 1998, p. 364)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes, Guiding principles</strong></td>
<td>Values can be differentiated into “values as preferences” and “values as principles” (p. 676). The former ones are basically “attitudes” signalling ones ‘preference’ for different situations. “Values as principles”, frequently called personal or individual values are “guiding principles” on how one should behave. (Parks &amp; Guay, 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-coerced</strong></td>
<td>Values hold a “non-coerced” element, a sense that behaviour, which shapes from values is not attributed by ego as appears on the outside. (Joas, 2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Differences: Values and Related Concepts in the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences between Values and other Concepts</th>
<th>List of Differences</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference between values and beliefs</strong></td>
<td>Values are relatively lesser in number than numerous beliefs that individuals hold, and different people attach different importance to values they possess which are hierarchically arranged. Individuals tend to be emotionally attached to their core values and protect them when their values are questioned, fulfilled, or unfulfilled.</td>
<td>(Feather, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beliefs are an individual’s worldview whereas values are more stable and long-term beliefs regarding what is significant.</td>
<td>(Fu et al., 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference between values and needs</strong></td>
<td>Unlike needs, individuals have greater liberty to select one value over other depending on their propensities or choices and the understandings of desired modes of behaviour.</td>
<td>(Rokeach, 1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values are easily articulated and somewhat salient to individual’s consciousness in comparison to needs.</td>
<td>(McClelland, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A feature of ‘goodness and badness’ is attached with values, which does not exist with needs (p. 1136).</td>
<td>(Feather, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unlike needs, “values reflect the desires of society, culture and institutions”</td>
<td>(Hamman, 2011, p. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference between values and attitudes</strong></td>
<td>Values are more universal in comparison to attitudes.</td>
<td>(Rokeach, 1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both values and attitudes are measured in different ways. With regards to values, individuals rate them according to their significance as guiding principles while attitudes are measured through scales that show different levels of inclinations towards an object.</td>
<td>(Feather, 1995; Maio &amp; Olson, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values are abstract and predicated on principles, while attitudes are specific and applied to more tangible contexts.</td>
<td>(Rohan, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values differ from attitudes with regard to the extent to which they demonstrate stability over time.</td>
<td>(Gahan &amp; Abeysekera, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference between values and goals</strong></td>
<td>“Goals can be seen as application of values to specific situations” (p. 293). They are assumed to manifest an individual’s values as they are viewed, consciously or unconsciously, to relate to the situation. Goals and values have a multifarious association. A value can influence individual’s goal choices whereas a given goal can demonstrate an impact of numerous or varied values.</td>
<td>(Locke, 1991)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Understanding Values Framework
IC Woodward & S Shaffakat 2014
(V1.0 June 2014, adapted from Feather (1995), Longest et al. (2013), Rokeach (1973), Schwartz (1994) and other literature.)
### Twelve Values Types*

**Definitions, Descriptions and Word Examples in each of the Clusters.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Word Description Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>Independent thought and action; choosing, creating, exploring, and drive.</td>
<td>Capacity to Contribute, Creativity, Empowered, Personally-Engaged/Diligent Freedom/Liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>Excitement, novelty, optimism and challenge in life.</td>
<td>Energized, Daring, Opportunity-Seeking, Alive, Excited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself.</td>
<td>Pleasure, Fun, Indulgence, Enjoying Life, Personal Gratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.</td>
<td>Accomplishment/Successful, Esteem/Pride/Confidence, Ambition, Rewarded, Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources.</td>
<td>Powerful, Invincible, Social Recognition, Importance, Authority/Decisive, Affluence/Wealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.</td>
<td>Self-Discipline/Obedience, Professional, Dedicated, Persistent, Responsible, Respectful/Tolerant to Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>Respect for, commitment to, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self.</td>
<td>Respect Religion, Respect Social Norms, Respect Customs, Humility, Devout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Judgment</td>
<td>Personal ethicality or moral compass in terms of integrity, honesty, fairness, transparency, accountability, dependability, mutual respect.</td>
<td>Honesty/Integrity, Accountability/ Reliability, Fairness, Ethical, Authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Preserving and enhancing the welfare of those with whom one is in frequent personal contact (the ‘in-group’).</td>
<td>Trust, Family, Relationships, Teamwork, Empathy, Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature.</td>
<td>Equality/Inclusion, Helping Disadvantaged, Spirituality, Wisdom, Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly-Abstract Values</td>
<td>Representation of an idealistic personal state when other values are satisfied such as absolute bliss, completeness, ultimate happiness or elation, total harmony, nirvana and the like.</td>
<td>Ultimate Happiness, Ecstatic/Elation, Nirvana/Bliss, Complete-Calm/Serenity, Absolute Joy/Fulfillment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Adapted from Schwartz (1994, 2009)*
Appendix 4

Preliminary Data – Values Language from Business Leaders

Table A below summarises the language (word descriptions) and their frequency in two separate leadership development retreats undertaken in January 2014. There were a total of 18 participants — two CEOs and their respective senior leadership teams. The word descriptions of values are from the participants themselves; as they nominated their ten values in their own language. Also, participants were not shown the 12 value clusters. A pedagogical process of posed questions and responses generated an initial list of words, from which each participant chose ten that are reported in the table. The values generated were used in personal reflection as well as a discussion of their team and organizational values. As part of our preliminary research, we have categorised the words into the value type clusters.

Table A: Summary of Core Values as Articulated by Executives in Leadership Development Retreats (January, 2014) (Total Response = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Cluster</th>
<th>Word Descriptions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction (4%)</td>
<td>Change Agent&lt;br&gt;Find an answer, Immediate Solution to the situation&lt;br&gt;Ability to Contribute&lt;br&gt;Self-Help&lt;br&gt;Self-Closure&lt;br&gt;Hard-working, Strong Work Ethics &amp; Drive</td>
<td>1&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation (4%)</td>
<td>Alive, Energized, Drive, Excited, Motivated&lt;br&gt;Open-minded&lt;br&gt;New Challenges &amp; Opportunities</td>
<td>6&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism (2%)</td>
<td>Relaxed&lt;br&gt;Travel&lt;br&gt;Fun</td>
<td>1&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement (16%)</td>
<td>Achievement, Successful, Accomplishment, Sense of Accomplishment&lt;br&gt;Respected&lt;br&gt;Brilliant, Awesome&lt;br&gt;Smart, Confidence&lt;br&gt;Pride, Proud, Honour&lt;br&gt;Positive Change, Positive Influence&lt;br&gt;Recognition, Validated (for Efforts &amp; Risks)</td>
<td>7&lt;br&gt;8&lt;br&gt;3&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;3&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (2%)</td>
<td>Appreciation&lt;br&gt;Inspirational</td>
<td>1&lt;br&gt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security (7%)</td>
<td>Relieved, Relief&lt;br&gt;Security, Secure (Job, Future), Feeling Safe&lt;br&gt;Certainty&lt;br&gt;Financially Independent&lt;br&gt;No Apprehension - No Gap in future retirement plan</td>
<td>3&lt;br&gt;5&lt;br&gt;2&lt;br&gt;1&lt;br&gt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B on the following pages summarise the language (word descriptions) and their frequency in a leadership development program exercise undertaken in April 2014. There were a total of 38 participants — all senior executives from a multinational company. The word descriptions of values are from the participants themselves; as they nominated their ten values in their own language. Also, participants were not shown the 12 value clusters. A pedagogical process of posed questions and responses generated an initial list of words, from which each participant chose ten that are reported in the table. The values generated were used in personal reflection as well as a discussion of their personal leadership development agenda. As part of our preliminary research, we have categorised the words into value type clusters.
Table B: Summary of Core Values as Articulated by Executives in Leadership Development Retreats (April, 2014) (Total Response = 380)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Cluster</th>
<th>Word Descriptions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction (4%)</td>
<td>Contribute to Success, Make a Difference, Contribute Engaged, Engaging Empowered Creative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation (8%)</td>
<td>Excited, Excited about the Future, Challenge, Enthused, Energised, Alive, Pumped, Passionate Moved Motivated, Driven, Motivation Opportunity-seeking</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism (2%)</td>
<td>Stress-free, Less Stress, Carefree, Relaxed Fun Indulgence</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement (28%)</td>
<td>Success, Achievement, Accomplishment Recognition, Acknowledgment, Accepted, Flattered, Complimentary Respected</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence, Smart, Attractive, Grand, Bright Competent, Effective, Productive, Problem Solving, Excellence, Great Outcome</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valued, Being Needed Proud, Pride, Esteem Considered Worthwhile, Worthwhile</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rewarded Accuracy, Rightness, Proven Right</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (5%)</td>
<td>Powerful, Strong, Invincible, Unbeatable Important Decisive Vindicated, Proven, Validated, Justified</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security (3%)</td>
<td>Financial Security Relieved, Relief Healthy Safe, Fear, Non-threatened</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity &amp; Tradition (3%)</td>
<td>Persistent, Diligence, Tenacity Humility, Humble Professional Faith</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Judgment (8%)</td>
<td>Commitment, Reliable, Promise, Do what you say, Dependable, Credibility Honesty, Truth Fairness Integrity Authentic Ethics</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Continued from previous page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Cluster</th>
<th>Word Descriptions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benevolence</strong></td>
<td>Trust, Trustworthy</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family, Friendship, Relationship, Belonging of Family, Marriage</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouragement, Supportive, Actively supported/backed, Endorsement</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teamwork, Team, Collaboration, Close to Team</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring, Care, Nurture, Giving, Helpful</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loved</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respectful, Courtesy</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy, Empathic, Kindness, Understanding</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universalism</strong></td>
<td>Justice, Social Equity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highly-abstract</strong></td>
<td>Meaningful Life, A Meaning in Life</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td>Blessed, Thankful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content, Satisfied, Deeply Contented, At Peace, Complete, Fulfilled, Complete, Calm,</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balanced, Lucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happy, Great, Overwhelming/Extreme Happiness, Joy, Delighted, Exhilarated, Blissful,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top of the World, Euphoria, Ecstatic, Fantastic, Elation, Culmination</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5

A Brief Perspective:
Values and Business Education Practice

A large quantity of business books and publications make reference to the role of values in effective organizational leadership, vision, change, alignment, engagement, and stakeholder or customer relationships. For example: John Kotter’s “Leading Change” (1996); Michael Hackman and Craig Johnson’s “Leadership: A Communication Perspective” (2013 6th edition); Dave Ulrich and Norm Smallwood’s “Leadership Brand” (2007); Ram Charan in various books including that co-authored with Larry Bossidy, “Execution: The Discipline of Getting Things Done” (2002); and Rosabeth Moss Kantor’s “Confidence” (2004) – to name but a very few.

Values and character are an essential part of Stephen R. Covey’s “The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People” (1989). In “The Leadership Challenge” (2007) by James Kouzes and Barry Posner, clarifying values and leading by example are at the heart of their ‘model the way’ approach to leadership. In Joseph L. Badaracco’s classic book “Defining Moments” (1997) on ethical decision-making in business leadership, understanding values is a central part of when we “reveal, shape and test” these decisions. There are numerous Harvard Business Review articles as well, such as Patrick M. Lencioni’s “Make Your Values Mean Something” (Lencioni, 2002), which argues that companies and leaders should weave their values into everything they do.

Well known leadership commentators like Marshall Goldsmith make frequent reference to values in many articles, to moving away from a focus on “values statements” as words in organizations, towards understanding “values” in relation to actions – as these actions speak more forcefully for employees. (Interestingly there is a scholarly review on this word-action relationship in values in “Inspiration and Cynicism in Values Statements” by Joel E. Urbany – Journal of Business Ethics (Urbany, 2005)). Similarly, “Good to Great” (2001) author Jim Collins argues that you cannot “set” organizational values, you can only discover them and that leaders and managers should spend their attention on the doing more rather than just talking about values.

A very brief look at the curricula and subject offerings in many MBA and management degrees together with executive education programs across the major business schools (such as Harvard, INSEAD, Stern and Wharton) reveals many discussions, sessions or courses relating to ethics or values as well. Whilst a comprehensive list of people involved with these is not practical, we would note some executive educators we are familiar with in this field, including Professor Schon Beechler (formerly of Columbia and now INSEAD), as well as consultant Mansfield Elkind who actively engage on values exploration in leadership development programs. INSEAD Professors Ian C. Woodward and Vincent H. Dominé also use a values session and discussion, as well as a session on “hidden drivers and blockers”, as part of an integrated set of leadership development activities (with other personal leadership and emotional intelligence sessions, coaching, diagnostics and
reflection) as part of ‘insightfully aware leadership’ work in the “Advanced Management Program”.

From a pedagogical perspective, teaching and session design in this topic area appears to involve a range of approaches – from theory explication, surveys, cases to experiential learning, discussion and coaching.

For values articulation, exploration and discussion; a number of popular approaches familiar to the authors are:

1. Using a Values measurement instrument (such as the Rokeach or Schwartz values surveys) and basing discussions on these results.
2. Having people review lists of “values” words and make selections or generally articulate a values list and then placing these in hierarchical importance for themself.
3. Having people respond to a series of questions about how they feel or think in particular situations that have occurred in their professional or private lives, and then developing a draft values list from amongst the answers, and then refining and organizing these until the person is comfortable with the list, its language and its hierarchy.
4. A combination of the above approaches including comparing self-generated values lists with the Schwartz cluster types or some other values typology such as our proposed 12 value clusters in this paper’s framework outlined in Section Five.

Following any of these value articulation and exercises or processes, there is usually discussion and personal reflection on the role of the values in different aspects of the person’s life, work, leadership/management style or relationships as well the interplay between personal values and their team or organization setting. There is much potential for further theoretical and applied research on these development approaches and their effectiveness and efficacy.