

T. R. NO. 91

१/८

Technical Report

wp 1975 / 91

WP91
WP
1975
(91)



**INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT
AHMEDABAD**

TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING THE VALUES
OF FUTURE MANAGERS

by
Mirza Saiyadain

T.R.No. 91

Oct., 1975

No. ~~90~~ 91.

To
Chairman (Research)
IIMA

Technical Report

Title of the report TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING THE VALUES OF FUTURE MANAGERS
Name of the Author HIRA S. SAJJAD PAIN
Under which area do you like to be classified? CRB

ABSTRACT (within 250 words)

..... This study attempts to look at the effect of sex, previous academic background and the annual family income on the value patterns of students who have opted for management education. Examining a few exceptions the results suggests that there is no social desirability element influence the value patterns. It is concluded that ~~from~~ perhaps the values are a function of peer culture rather than the conventional 'cross-cultural' differences.

Please indicate restrictions if any that the author wishes to place upon this note None

Date 22/10/75

Signature of the Author

TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING THE VALUES OF FUTURE MANAGERS

By

Mirza S. Saiyadain

Although one of the early descriptions of value refers it as a conception for desirable (Kluckhohn, 1951), it is difficult to find a generally accepted definition of value. One major reason is that value is a technical term in most of the behavioural sciences and humanities and in each one of these discipline there are wide disagreements on its meaning. The only general agreement is that values somehow have to do with the normative as opposed to existential position (Kluckhohn, 1951). Operationally a study of choice behaviour seems to offer the nearest approach to a research method uniquely adopted to the study of values. Some of the early studies on values (see Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1951; Rosenberg, 1957; Goldeen, Rosenberg, Williams, and Suchman, 1960; Sharma, 1971) have got around solving the problem of defining values by operationalizing them in terms of choice. The present study follows the same reasoning.

Most of the early attempts in measuring values have conceived of values as personal goals or interests rather than as moral imperatives. Perhaps all were influenced directly or indirectly by Spranger's (1928) contention that there are various "types of man" who could be identified by their dominant interests. One of the most

prominent attempts in operationalizing Spranger's "types of man" has been Study of Values developed by Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, (1951). Their scale measures the relative preference for six different kinds of ideas and activities; theoretical, economic, social, political, aesthetic and religious. Although a few questions are couched in terms of "should" or "ought" but in general personal preferences are what is measured.

Study of Values has been administered to people in a variety of professions. The attempt has been to establish profiles derived from the indicated preferences. Generally speaking, vocational preferences have been found to be a part of a clustering of attitudes related to basic value systems and not the result of a single attitude toward a given field.

Despite complexity in defining, values have fascinated researchers because they have been found to exhibit substantial directive force in human experiences. Values are important because they sum up the past experience of the individual in terms of directive motivational-perceptual states growing out of learning and fashioning further learning. This process, therefore, has consequences not only in terms of observable behaviour but also with respect to potential for individual's action. In a very interesting study Vaughan and Mangan (1963) found that when the task content represented a "high" value there was significantly less yielding to group pressure than when it represented a "low value."

In the area of managerial behaviour, Guth and Tagiuri (1965) have presented a number of examples and case studies which illustrate the ways in which personal values influence corporate strategy choices. Thus by and large research suggests that values are precursors of behaviour.

This study concerns itself with the influence of sex, previous academic background, and annual family income on value orientations of students who have opted for management education at Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad. Our interest in these three biosocial variables has been because these have shown differential influence on value orientations and have been found to be potent determinants of behaviour. They are major contributory factors in the "types of men" people become and are believed to fashion further learning.

As far as differences in values because of sex differences are concerned the studies point both similarities and differences in the value orientations of males and females. By and large, both Indian and foreign studies have shown that female tend to indicate those values that are oriented to other persons, like social service, relations with others and interest in people. While male value orientations refer to such things as security, material comfort, self esteem, hard work and fame (Powell and Bloom, 1962; Thompson, 1966; Reddy and Parameswaran, 1966; Postonjee, Akhtar & Chowdhury, 1967).

Though there does not seem to be a consensus on the rationale of these differences most of them seem to attribute these to social expectations and roles played by male and female in culture. On the other hand few studies indicate no difference in the value orientations of male and female (Govinderajacherylu, 1968; Postonjee & Akhtar, 1969).

Not too many studies have examined the effect of previous academic background (e.g., Arts, Engineering, Medical etc.) Those that have manipulated this variable have found variations in the value orientations of people with different academic backgrounds. Dhar (1965) found commerce students to rank prestige and independence as the most important values. In another study, Reddy and Parameswaran (1966) found engineering, medical and science students higher on theoretical and arts students on social and aesthetic values. As far as annual family income is concerned, though Reddy and Parameswaran (1966) indicate low income samples valuing money more than other things, Vasanta (1972) found that socio-economic differences do not seem to make difference in work values.

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Three hundred and nineteen students between the ages of 19 to 25 and enrolled in the two year post graduate programme in business administration were administered the value questionnaire on the very first day of their classes. The questionnaire mostly designed

on the pattern of Fortune-Yankelovich Survey (1969) measured their values and attitudes in five broad areas: (a) factors influencing choices of a job, (b) concerns on the job, (c) definition of success, (d) general personal values and (e) the generation profile. Several alternatives were listed under each of these five areas and respondents had the choice to check as many as they like.

Of the 319 respondents 16 were female and 303 males. Academic background wise there were 45 arts, 39 commerce, 145 engineering, and 90 science students; 29 came from families whose annual family income was below Rs:5,000, 68 from Rs:5,001 - Rs:10,000, 64 from Rs:10,001 - Rs:15,000, 51 from Rs:15,001 - Rs:20,000 and 107 whose family income was above Rs:20,000 per year.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Ranks, in terms of the number of people endorsing various factors under each one of the five areas, are given in Tables 1 through 5 along with the values of Kendall tau between various alternatives under each of the three biosocial characteristics. Results are presented below separately for each one of the five areas.

a. Choice of job: The respondents were provided a list of six factors that may influence their choice of careers (see Table 1). These factors have been found to show significant variation in responses. Of the

three biosocial variables, sex and annual family income seem to suggest differential ranking of the factors that will have great influence on their choice of a career. As far as academic background is concerned the rankings of factors indicate statistical similarity in choice. By and large they would be motivated by challenge in job and would not involve their families in deciding for a career.

Sexwise, for males it is the challenging nature of the job which will influence them most in their decisions. In case of females, it is the freedom to decide on the job that plays most significant role. The most interesting thing is that both male and female would not like to involve their families in deciding for a career for themselves. Annual family income does not make any difference in assigning the top rank to the factors in the choice of a career. All five groups rank challenging nature of job as most important. The differences are in second, third and fourth ranks. Those whose annual family income is less than Rs:5,000 care for money is a second most important thing, unlike those whose annual family income is between Rs:10,000 - Rs:15,000 or above Rs:20,000. This seems consistent with the earlier finding by Roddy and Paramashwaran (1966). However between the rest of the sub-groups under annual family income there seems to be a degree of correspondence in their relative importance attached to various factors.

b. Concerns on the job: What are their major concerns on the job evokes replies similar across the sub groups irrespective of sex, academic

background and annual family income. All the values of tau are significant beyond conventional levels of significance (see table 2), suggesting lack of differences atleast statistically. However, respondents with commerce background would rather be more concerned with maintaining good relations on the job rather than having freedom to make their own decision which obviously seems the choice of all other of them. In case of commerce students it is second in importance.

c. Personal values: The most interesting finding of this area is the hundred percent correspondence in the ideas they subscribe to irrespective of the groups (see Table 3). All of them believe that hard work always pays, self sufficiency should be honoured and reactions like others always show off should be brushed aside as the least important area to worry about.

d. Definition of success: What is the definition of success that reflects their personal values? It is unanimously the sense of satisfaction in what ever they do (see Table 4) followed by respect by friends and fellow employees and having love and respect of family. Living a religious life seems to be on its way out. It is the least preferred definition of success given by respondents. This is the general picture that emerges and it is beyond variations as far as sub groupings are concerned. All values of tau are statistically significant suggesting that respondents irrespective of their sex, academic background and annual family income, by and large, agree on their definition of success as reflected in their personal values.

c. Generation profile: How do they perceive their generation is a questions which elicits variations in rankings among the sub groups except those based on sex (see Table 5). Both male and female consider their generation optimistic about future, self centered, fearful of financial insecurity, compromising with things they do not like, trusting and trustworthy, tolerant and respectful to people in authority in that order.

As far as their academic background is concerned, it seems that students with science background paint an altogether different picture of their own generation in comparison to those with arts, commerce and engineering background. Although optimism about future remains the most predominant factor for engineering students, financial insecurity, concern with self respecting authority, compromising with things they do not like, trusting and trustworthiness and tolerance come next and in that order. Arts, commerce and engineering students by and large agree on the overall profile of people of their own age, except arts graduate consider concern with self as most important factor as compared to engineering.

Ranking of the respondents belonging to annual income group of less than Rs:5,000 do not seem to agree with those coming from family income groups above Rs:10,000. For the latter concern for self is most important while for the first optimism about future represents the most dominant factor in the people of their own age. Their generation is least concerned with compromising things they do not like according to

those whose annual family income is less than Rs:5,000 while trusting and trustworthiness falls in the same category for those family annual income is above Rs:20,000.

Barring a few exceptions, by and large there seems to be a high degree of correspondence on the ranking of factor under the five areas by respondents belonging to various sex, academic background and annual family income groups. Statistical matching is striking in such areas as concerns on the job, personal value, and definition of success. However, the correspondence across subgroups in the areas, choice of career and generation profile is not as clear cut as the other three. If one is to give a general picture of the values and attitudes of this sample, one can venture to say, atleast on the basis of results, that the managers of tomorrow value challenges in job, freedom to decide, hard work and sense of satisfaction. They are not willing to involve their families in choosing a job though the respect by family member is a thing that remains of significance to them.

The rather overwhelming similarity of rankings suggest that values, atleast in the five areas under study, are more a function of peer culture rather than such conventional differences as sex, previous academic background and annual family income. Perhaps values are **superordinate** and grow out of interactions with peers rather than handed down by family. It seems that to understand the value orientations of a group the focus may need to be shifted from cultural heritage to contemporaneity of the group life. Perhaps values represent reference

group aspirations and that cultural expectations and stereotypes may not be tenable explanations any more. True values would remain normative, but norms in this case will have no history. The context will be here and now.

How does this process take place is still a question open for research. If one can speculate perhaps physical and psychological proximity may have some explanation to offer. It is possible that the sharing of a belief system current to one's generation leads to a value orientation different from the one held by the previous generation. Hence every generation becomes a matter of considerable interest to its oldest not because it carries the burden of values of its fathers and forefathers but because it steadily forces change upon our society.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G.W., Vernon, P.E. & Lindzey, G. Study of Values, Boston: Houghton - Mifflin, 1951
- Dhar, C. Work values of adolescent boys. Guidance Review, 1965, 3, 12-21
- Fortune - Yankelovich Survey. What they believe, Fortune, January 1969, 79(1), 70-71 and 179-181
- Goldson, R.K., Rosenberg, M., Williams, R.M. & Suchman, E.A. What college students think, New York, D. Van Nostrand, 1960
- Govindarajocharyulu, S.T.V. Occupational values of high school students. Indian Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 5, 79-86
- Guth, W & Tugliuri, R. Personal values and corporate strategies, Harvard Business Review, 1965, 123-132
- Kluckhohn, K. Values and value orientation in theory of action. In Parson & Shils (Eds) Towards a general theory of action, New York: Harper Torch books, 1951, 388-433
- Postanjo, D.M. & Akhtar, S.S. A study of sex differences in relation to occupational values and income aspirations, Manas, 1969, 16, 59-63
- Postanjo, D.M., Akhtar, S.S. & Chowdhary, T. A study of occupational values of male and female students. Indian Psychological Review, 1967, 4, 44-50
- Powell, M. & Bloom, V. Development of reasons for vocational choices of adolescents through the high school years. Journal of Educational Research, 1962, 56, 126-133
- Reddy, K.M. & Parameswaran, E.G. Some factors influencing the value patterns of college students. Research Bulletin of Osmania University 1966, 2, 7-17
- Rosenberg, M. Occupations and Values, Glence, Ill.: Free Press, 1957
- Sharma, B.R. Occupational values and business: A cross cultural comparison New Delhi: Indian Academy of Social Sciences, 1971.
- Spranger, E. Types of men (translated), New York: Stochert - Hafner, 1928

Ref. contd.

Thompson, O.E. Occupational values of high school students,
Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 850-853

Vaughan, G.M. & Mangan, G.L. Conformity to group pressure in relation
to the value of the tamo material. Journal of Abnormal and
Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 179-183

Vasanta, A. A study of work values of high secondary students of
Delhi in relation to their intelligence, achievement and socio-
economic status. Delhi University, Doctoral Dissertation in
Education; 1972.

Table 1
 "Which of the following will have a great influence on your choice of a career?"

FACTORS/RANKS	Sex		Previous academic background				Annual family income				
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1. Your family	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	6
2. Money that it will offer	2	4	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	3
3. Opportunity for meaningful contribution	3	2	4	2	3	2	4	2	3	3	2
4. Freedom of decide	4	1	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4
5. Level of hierarchy	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	5
6. Challenge in job	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Kendall-tau	.40		.73*	.87 [ⓐ]	.73 [ⓐ]	.60	.73*	.80 [ⓐ]	.60	.87 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]
			.93 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	.93 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	.87 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	.87 [ⓐ]	.87 [ⓐ]

A = Male; B = Female; C = Arts; D = Commerce; E = Engineering; F = Science; G = Below Rs:5000; H = Rs: 5001 - Rs:10000; I = Rs:10001 - Rs:15000; J = Rs:15001 - Rs:20000; K = above Rs:20000.

* = P < .05 (one tailed)
 ⓐ = P < .01 (one tailed)

Table 2
 "Having accepted a career which of the following will be your major concerns?"

FACTORS/RANKS	Sex		Previous academic background						Annual family income				
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K		
1. Freedom to make own decisions	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
2. Increase in salary	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4		
3. Maintaining good relations	2	2	3	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	2		
4. Control of large number of subordinates	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5		
5. Office decor	6	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6		
6. Meeting deadlines	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3		
Kendall tau	1.00		.73 [@]	1.00 [@]	.87 [@]	1.00 [@]	1.00 [@]	1.00 [@]	1.00 [@]	1.00 [@]	1.00 [@]		
			.60 [@]	.87 [@]	.87 [@]	1.00 [@]	1.00 [@]	1.00 [@]	1.00 [@]	1.00 [@]	1.00 [@]		

For explanation of alphabets see table 1.

* P < .05 (one tailed)
 @ P < .01 (one tailed)

Table 3
the following ideas do your personality subscribe?"

FACTORS/RANKS	Sex			Previous academic background			Annual family income				
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1. Hard work always pays	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2. No matter how menial the job may be doing it well is important	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3. People should stand on their own feet	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
4. Others generally show off	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
5. People are concerned with their own ends	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6. Unquestionable loyalty should not be demanded	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Kendall tau	1.00 [ⓐ]			1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]

For explanation of alphabets see Table 1

* = P < .05 (one tailed)
 ⓐ = P < .01 (one tailed)

Table 4
 Which of the following definitions of success reflect your own personal values?

FACTORS/RANKS	Sex		Previous academic background						Annual family income					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K			
1. Having love & respect of family	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3			
2. Bring needed change in society	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4			
3. Respect by friends & fellow employees	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2			
4. Living a religio life	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	6			
5. Making lot of money	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	5			
6. Personal sense of satisfaction in whatever you do.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Kendall tau	1.00 [ⓐ]		1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	.73*	.73*	.73*	.73*	.73*			
			1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]			
							1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]	1.00 [ⓐ]			
											1.00 [ⓐ]			

For explanation of alphabets see Table 1

* = P < .05 (one tailed)
 ⓐ = P < .01 (one tailed)

ADDENDUM

Data were also available separately on PGP I (N = 169) and PGP II (N = 145). The ranking of various factors under each of the five areas for these two subsamples are given in the tables A - E below along with the Kendall tau. One year of education at the Institute does not seem to change the pattern of their ranking on these variables.

Table A

Influence on choice of a career

Factors	PGP I	PGP II
1. Your family	6	6
2. Money that it will offer	2	2
3. Opportunity for meaningful contribution	3	3
4. Freedom to decide	4	4
5. Level of hierarchy	5	5
6. Challenge in job	1	1

Kendall tau = 1.00; $P < .01$

Table B

Major concerns of the job

Factors	PGP I	PGP II
1. Freedom to make own decisions	1	1
2. Increase in salary	4	4
3. Maintaining good relations	3	2
4. Control of large number of subordinates	5	5
5. Office decor	6	6
6. Meeting deadlines	2	3

Kendall tau = 1.00; $P < .01$

Table C

Personal values

Factors	PGP I	PGP II
1. Hard work always pays	1	1
2. No matter how menial the job may be doing it well is important	3	3
3. People should stand on their own feet	2	2
4. Others generally show off	6	6
5. People are concerned with their own ends	5	5
6. Unquestionable loyalty should not be demanded	4	4

Kendall tau = 1.00; $P < .01$

Table D

Definition of success

Factors	PGP I	PGP II
1. Having love & respect of family	3	3
2. Bring needed change in society	4	4
3. Respect by friends & fellow employees	2	2
4. Living a religious life	6	6
5. Making lot of money	5	5
6. Personal sense of satisfaction in whatever you do	1	1

Kendall tau = 1.00; $P < .01$

Table E

Generation profile

Factors	PGP I	PGP II
1. Compromising with things they don't like	6	4
2. Respecting authority	7	6
3. Fearful of financial insecurity	3	3
4. Tolerant of others point of view	5	7
5. Optimistic about future	1	1
6. Basically concerned with oneself	2	2
7. Trusting and trustworthy	4	5

Kendall tau = 1.00; $P < .01$