

ABSTRACT

Two methods of measuring consumer values, the *List of Values* and the *Rokeach Value Survey*, are compared. Both involve some social desirability responding but both have convergent, discriminant, and empirical validity for consumer research. The *List of Values* may be preferable for some types of research because it detects more daily influence in people's lives and because it is simpler to administer.

Alternative Measurement Approaches to Consumer Values: The List of Values and the Rokeach Value Survey



**Sharon E. Beatty
Lynn R. Kahle
Pamela Homer
Shekhar Misra**

Rokeach (1973) states that the consequences of human values will be manifested in virtually all phenomena that social scientists might consider worth investigating and understanding. He claims that values guide actions, attitudes, and judgments. In an interdisciplinary analysis of personal values, Clawson and Vinson (1978) elaborate on Rokeach by suggesting that:

Values may prove to be one of the most powerful explanations of, and influences on, consumer behavior. They can perhaps equal or surpass the contributions of other major

constructs including attitudes, product attributes, degrees of deliberation, product classifications, and life styles. (p. 396)

With the pervasiveness and influence of values on many aspects of human lives, it is quite surprising to note the relatively sparse empirical literature on values vis-a-vis the more popular concept of attitudes. Rokeach (1973) suggested over ten years ago that this lack of emphasis on values research results from the lack of objective, meaningful measuring instruments; although a number of competing value scales were available (e.g., Allport, Vernon & Lindzey, 1960; Gordon, 1960). Rokeach created the *Rokeach Value Survey* (RVS), consisting of two sets of values, 18 instrumental and 18 terminal values, in order to fill the need for a more objective measure. Subjects rank each value list in order of each value's importance. Several years later Clawson and Vinson (1977) suggested that no standard method of measuring consumer values has the acceptance of scholars and that the value concept measured in consumer research has not been clearly defined. Clearly, methodological research is needed in the area of consumer values.

The objective of this study was to examine an alternative measurement approach to values (Kahle, 1983), the *List of Values* (LOV), comparing and contrasting this value measure with the widely used RVS measurement technique (examining only the terminal values instrument). By implication the theories underlying these measurement approaches are also being tested. These two value surveys will be compared and contrasted with one another on a number of relevant dimensions, including: (1) the degree to which each captures values of interest to marketers. (Values that influence individuals in their daily lives would be of higher relevance to marketers); (2) the degree to which each measurement system obtains responses laden with social desirability; and (3) the degree to which each measurement system aids in the assessment of attitudes, interests, and behaviors across three areas of consumption that values may influence—leisure activities, media preferences, and gift-giving. In a sense, this study is an application of the multi-trait-multi-method matrix technique (Campbell & Fiske, 1959).

IMPORTANCE OF THE VALUE CONCEPT

In spite of the lack of extensive empirical study of values in psychology and consumer behavior, a movement is growing in the direction of greater theoretical interest and empirical work in the area. Exemplary of this surge in interest is an excellent theoretical review of values (Spates, 1983). Quite recently Feather (1984) published an article relating values to the Protestant Ethic and conservatism. Rokeach and his collaborators continue their productivity (e.g., Grube, Weir, Getzlaf & Rokeach, 1984). Kahle (1983) edited a book on values. Another prudent theoretical thrust is the connection of values to consumer behaviors through means-end chain models, most recently and articulately espoused by Gutman (1982). In the summer of 1983, a conference was held to address the rela-

tionship between values and consumer behavior directly. A number of relevant articles emerged from the conference (see, for example, Prakash, 1984; Pitts & Woodside, 1984).

One current research thrust, which emphasizes the combined segmentation power of demographics, life style variables, and values, is Values and Life Style segmentation (VALS), marketed by SRI International. Although this methodology is highly acclaimed by its creators, it has come under widespread discussion and some criticism (see for example, Yuspeh, 1984).

VALUES AND CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

Williams (1979) addressed the question of whether values influence behavior. In a review of the general social science literature on value-behavior consistency from both laboratory and survey studies, he concluded that ample evidence shows values do influence behavior. Yankelovich (1981) reviewed survey data that corroborate Williams' assessment.

In marketing and consumer behavior, the results have been more complex. Henry (1976) used the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) values instrument, while Vinson and Munson (1976) used the RVS to segment the automobile market by car size. Pitts and Woodside (1983) found that for cars, deodorants, and vacations value structures were not strongly related to product class and brand preference or intention, but values did relate to product and brand choice criteria. Manzer and Miller (1978) found values relate weakly to contributions to charitable causes.

Bozinoff and Cohen (1982) demonstrated one interesting approach to the use of values in consumer behavior by assessing the combined impact of measuring values and situations to explain automobile importance ratings. They found that neither personal values nor situational effects explained, on the average, more than 5% of the variance; however, when the two influences were combined the variance explained nearly doubled. This perspective is indicative of the growing interest in an interactionist perspective (cf. Kahle, 1984a; Punj & Stewart, 1983).

Carman (1978) has developed a general model that integrates values as a determinant of consumer behavior. In his formulation values directly influence the individual's life style, which consists of interests, time-use activities, and roles. These variables, in turn, may significantly determine the individual's consumption, shopping, and media behavior patterns. For activities and interests, Jackson (1974) found that value orientation affected both the individual's choice between work and leisure and the selection among alternative leisure activities.

Becker and Conner (1981) found RVS values to predict mass media usage. Specifically, they found that heavy television viewers have more traditionally religious value systems, less concern for achievement and success; and more concern with developing satisfying interpersonal relationships. Heavy magazine readers, on the other hand, appear to be almost the mirror image of heavy television viewers. Heavy newspaper readers share values with each of the other groups but are

most similar to the heavy magazine readers. The authors suggest that, although media usage is also related to demographics and particularly education, values are much more of a causal factor than education. Rokeach (1968) and Kahle (1983) have both noted that people at different education levels possess different values. Thus, either those values predispose people to obtain additional education, or the education process induces a change in their values. In either case, values underlie the consumption behavior and are thus more inherently useful than demographics in understanding attitudes and behaviors.

One of the major problems in the study of the influence of values on behavior is that values and behaviors are at different levels of abstraction. Fishbein and Ajzen (1974) and Kahle, Kulka, and Klingel (1980) have shown that one can only expect attitudes and behaviors to converge with one another when they are measured at commensurate levels of abstraction. Thus, researchers should study a large number of behaviors if they hope to obtain a high degree of consistency between abstract values and behaviors (Kahle, 1983).

MEASUREMENT ISSUES

Rokeach's paradigm has come under some criticism. For example, Clawson and Vinson (1977) state that rank orderings are less informative than interval or ratio scaling. Wide gaps in preference are treated as no different from miniscule gaps. Further, no ties are allowed, although subjects may be hard pressed to express preference for some values over others. On the other hand, most attempts to develop interval and ratio scales have failed because of even more serious problems, such as positivity bias.

Due to the problems involved with the ranking task, a number of studies in marketing have replaced the original ranking procedure with Likert-type scales (e.g., Vinson & Munson, 1976; Vinson, Scott & Lamont, 1977). But this procedure leads to a rather constricted usage of the upper ends of the Likert-type scales and, as pointed out by Reynolds and Jolly (1980), it has significantly lower reliability than that obtained by the ranking procedure or paired comparison approach. Given the tediousness and the number of paired comparisons necessary, it was particularly noteworthy that the Reynolds and Jolly (1980) study found no significant reliability difference between the ranking procedure and paired comparison approach.

Rokeach (1973) has found that individuals have a difficult time ranking eighteen values. He found that respondents rank their more extreme values more reliably than the middle values. Presumably people are more certain of their extreme values and less certain of many of their other values. As Rokeach (1973) noted, his selection of eighteen values for both terminal and instrumental values was rather arbitrary. He felt reasonably certain that the 18 terminal values included the universe of relevant terminal values, but he could identify many more than eighteen

instrumental values. Clawson and Vinson (1977) suggest that, in fact, the *RVS* omits a number of other values that a substantial portion of the populace holds; however, it has been found people can only store about seven items, plus or minus 2, in short-term memory (Peterson & Peterson, 1959). Perhaps a more parsimonious scale would allow respondents to perform the ranking task more carefully (cf. Cox 1980). Furthermore, as with traits, we will probably never develop a complete list that will encompass all possible human values; but we really only need a list that will account for most of the important values common to most consumers. Comprehensiveness of the list must be evaluated in the context of all measurement issues, including respondent capacities, and measurement efficiency and effectiveness.

Other questions or issues we believe should be addressed in the study of values for marketers include: (1) the question of degree of influence of the various values on variables of interest to marketers and (2) the question of degree to which social desirability bias influences the ranking of values. The first question appears not to have been addressed elsewhere. Rokeach (1973) has acknowledged that some of the values in the survey are self-centered (e.g., self-respect) and some are society-centered (e.g., world at peace). Because most activities and attitudes of individuals are oriented at the micro rather than societal level, a wide disparity of relevance may distinguish among different *RVS* values in impact on people's daily lives. The personally oriented items are also likely to have greater relevance across a greater number of situations and roles than the society oriented items. This issue is particularly relevant for marketers because most marketing choices probably fulfill personally oriented goals rather than societally-oriented goals.

The issue of social desirability bias in the *RVS* seems to have only been addressed by one study (Kelly, Silverman & Cochrane, 1972). The *RVS* (terminal values only) was administered to 117 undergraduates under normal instructions and then under "social desirability" instructions, (i.e., "in the order that you think would make you appear most favorably in the eyes of the experimenter"). The resulting correlation between the Crowne-Marlowe social desirability scale scores and the rank-order correlations between the two administrations was only $-.09$, suggesting minimal significant relationship between the tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner and rankings of the value survey under standard instructions. Additionally, the authors calculated gain scores between the two administrations for each value, and differences in these scores between the experimental and control groups were tested for significance by means of t-tests. The values that moved up significantly in rank for the experimental groups, in contrast to the control group, were world at peace, world of beauty, equality, national security, and social recognition. Values that moved down significantly in rank were happiness, inner harmony, mature love, pleasure, and true friendship. The values that moved up tended to be societal in nature, with the exception of social recognition (which is nevertheless social), while the values moving down tended to be personally oriented values. This finding implies that subjects consider it socially de-

sirable to rank societal values more highly; although they may not consider societal values more important than personal values as principles guiding life. At the very least, the question of social desirability bias in the responses to the *RVS* warrants further exploration.

LIST OF VALUES (LOV)

An alternative value measurement scale and procedure has been developed by researchers from the University of Michigan (Kahle, 1983; Veroff, Douvan & Kulka, 1981) and was utilized to assess the values of Americans (Kahle, 1983), in conjunction with an effort to replicate and extend the data from the book, *Americans View Their Mental Health* (Gurin, Veroff & Feld, 1960). *The List of Values (LOV)* was developed from a theoretical base of Feather's (1975), Maslow's (1954), and Rokeach's (1973) work on values. It is theoretically tied to social adaptation theory (Kahle, 1983), in which individuals are conceptualized as adapting to various life roles, based in part upon value fulfillment.

The approach modified *RVS*'s terminal values into a smaller subset of values that were both generalizable across important life roles and situations and that were primarily person-oriented. In the initial administration the approach concentrated on gathering what people considered to be their first and second most important values from the list of 9, rather than requiring a full ranking of these values. Kahle (1983) and his associates derived a number of important conclusions about societal, role, and psychological adaptation in a national survey by only examining the top two values. In the present study these values were ranked from 1-9 to make the *LOV* comparable with the *RVS*. This approach to *LOV* has been successfully utilized in two other studies in which test-retest reliability was assessed. Respectively, 92% and 85% who picked any given first value ranked it first or second a month later. Readers wishing more detail on the development and properties of *LOV* should consult Kahle (1983). These reliability figures compare reasonably with an average test-retest reliability of 0.73 for Rokeach's terminal values across a number of diverse studies with time lags of three to seven weeks (Rokeach, 1983, p. 32).

The values composing the *LOV* include: sense of belonging, excitement, fun and enjoyment in life, warm relationships with others, self-fulfillment, being well-respected, a sense of accomplishment, security, and self-respect. These values can be used to classify people on Maslow's (1954) hierarchy.

When comparing and contrasting the two lists, one finds that two *LOV* items are also *RVS* items: *a sense of accomplishment* and *self-respect*. In other cases categories were combined from the *RVS* into one, more abstract value. The *LOV* includes *security*, whereas the Rokeach list includes both *family security* and *national security*. The *LOV* concept of security may have additionally captured the concept of economic security that Rokeach measured with *a comfortable life* (a prosperous life). *RVS* items that failed to attain the *LOV* standard of generality

across all of life's roles include a world of peace, beauty, equality, freedom, happiness, inner harmony, mature love, salvation, and wisdom. Other items in the *LOV* that are similar to *RVS* items but are, perhaps, a bit more general include excitement (similar to *RVS's* an exciting life), fun and enjoyment in life (similar to *RVS's* pleasure), warm relationships with others (similar to *RVS's* true friendship), and being well-respected (similar to *RVS's* social recognition). Finally, two values that *LOV* developers considered important that were not included in the Rokeach list were *sense of belonging* and *self-fulfillment*.

It is postulated that the *LOV* system has several advantages over *RVS*. *LOV* is simpler to administer and a much easier task for the respondent. The *LOV* ranking procedure takes less than half the time of the *RVS*, which can consume from 10 to 20 minutes of a respondent's time. Further, many of the values in the *RVS* list are not directly relevant in a consumer behavior context (e.g., national security, world at peace). The inclusion of items less relevant to individuals in their daily lives and purchasing behaviors may thus cloud important relationships ascertainable between values and consumption. The more parsimonious *LOV* scale attempts to avoid these problems. Thus, comparison of the two lists on value relevancy to daily lives and consumption behavior is an important thrust of the paper.

METHODOLOGY AND HYPOTHESES

The questionnaire consisted of the two methods of assessing values, *RVS's* 18 terminal values and *LOV's* 9 values, which respondents rank ordered. Two social desirability scales widely used in the social science literature were included: Bem's (1974) 20-item set of adjectives measuring social desirability and the Crowne-Marlowe (1964) social desirability scale, consisting of 33 true-false questions. To reduce order bias, in half of the questionnaires the Crowne-Marlowe scale and *RVS* were administered first, and in the other half Bem's scale and the *LOV* were administered first.

Prior to each value ranking task, respondents first checked any values that influenced any actions in their daily lives. The 9 or 18 values were listed separately from the ranking task, and respondents could check as few or as many of the values as they believed influenced their daily lives. We call this question the "influence question."

The second part of the questionnaire included a variety of consumption questions. The consumption areas selected for study were based upon postulated theory and previous empirical findings. As implied earlier, Carman (1978) suggests the influence of values is through a consumer's life-style, consisting of interests, time-use activities, and roles. Two of the most pervasive activities or interests in which people may engage are leisure activities and media usage. Further, these are areas in which previous empirical findings have validated the theoretical premise (see, e.g., Jackson, 1974; Becker & Conner, 1981).

A third consumption area we selected to study was gift-giving attitudes and behaviors. Although there appears to be no theoretical or empirical work available which links values and gift-giving, the linkage is a logical one. Both values and gift-giving are conceptually related to one's self-concept and to the presentation of one's self to others (Belk, 1979; Crosby & Taylor, 1983; Schwartz, 1967). Thus, values may drive self-concept, which, in turn, may drive certain gift-giving attitudes and behaviors.

The measures utilized to capture the three consumption areas were formed based upon several focus groups aimed at defining the issues and developing the measures. Leisure preferences and activities were captured by 25 behavioral frequency questions on 4-point scales and four 7-point preference questions. Media preferences were captured by attitudes towards 11 television shows and 14 magazines on 5-point scales. Gift-giving questions were composed of seven 7-point Likert-type scales assessing amount of giving (2 questions), effort (2 questions), reflection of tastes (2 questions), and one question on charitable giving. The final section included relevant demographic questions.

The questionnaire was self-explanatory and took approximately 30 minutes to complete. In an effort to obtain a well-balanced, heterogeneous sample, questionnaires were handed out to a number of individuals in neighborhoods, businesses, and churches. Both judgment and convenience were considered in selecting the sample. Only a small percentage (less than 10%) of those contacted refused to participate. Forty-two members of the sample came from administration of the questionnaire in a freshman-level class in order to obtain a sample of young college students. About an equal number of questionnaires were administered to M.B.A. students. The final sample of 356 was thus a convenience sample drawn from a variety of sources. When contrasting two measurement methodologies, sampling is probably less crucial than when estimating population parameters.

The area of the total sampling frame was a medium-sized university town in the Pacific Northwest. Thus, the goals have clearly been defined as ascertainment of the relationship between variables rather than generalizations of values held across some broader population group.

The hypotheses or research questions used to guide the questionnaire design and analyses included the following:

(H1): Similar items on the two value surveys will be highly related to one another, whereas dissimilar items will not be related to one another. That is, the two surveys should manifest both convergent and discriminant validity vis-a-vis one another.

Some of the following associations are postulated to be positive (i.e., convergent validity):

<i>LOV</i>	<i>RVS</i>
Fun & Enjoyment, Excitement	Exciting Life, Pleasure, Happiness
Warm Relationships w/others	True Friendship, Mature Love
Self-fulfillment	Inner Harmony

Being Well-respected	Social Recognition
Sense of Accomplishment	Sense of Accomplishment
Security	Family Security, National Security
Self-respect	Self-respect

(H2): Social desirability bias does influence value rankings.

(H3): The *LOV* contains a higher proportion of items that directly relate to individuals' daily lives than the *RVS*.

(H4): Personal values, whether captured through the *LOV* or *RVS*, do relate to individuals' choices of leisure activities, media preferences, and gift-giving attitudes and behaviors.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Comparability of Two Value Measures

The two value measures cannot be assessed for overall comparability because neither approach attempts to form any overall scale, thus ruling out internal consistency measures. One way to assess the comparability of two multi-item surveys is to assess whether items that are supposedly measuring the same construct are highly associated or correlated with one another (convergent validity) and to assess whether items that are supposedly measuring different constructs are not associated or correlated with one another (discriminant validity). These two items taken together provide a partial test of construct validity; therefore, Hypothesis 1 was tested by correlating the individual *LOV* items with the individual *RVS* items. Table 1 shows the results of those pairs of items correlated (Spearman Rho) at 0.2 or above. The items do indeed show the hypothesized relationships and indicate a reasonable degree of convergent and discriminant validity. Thus, *LOV* items appear to have this construct validity when contrasted with the widely used *RVS* items and (H1) is supported. It can also be noted that correlations between identical values are relatively low (all below 0.54) due to the somewhat different domains captured by the full set of values included in each survey.

Social Desirability Bias in Value Surveys

The two social desirability scales utilized (Bem, 1974; Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) were tested for internal consistency with coefficient alpha. Bem's social desirability scale alpha was 0.71, and the Crowne-Marlowe scale's reliability coefficient was 0.82. The correlation between the two multi-item scales was lower than anticipated at 0.39, $p < .05$.

Individuals were classified as either high or low in social desirability by splitting the sample at the median on the social desirability scales. Mann-Whitney U tests were then conducted on the value ranks for individuals, either predomi-

TABLE 1

Values Correlated At +.2 Or Above ($p < .001$)

LOV	RVS	r	n
Fun & Enjoyment	Exciting Life	.3338	349
Fun & Enjoyment	Pleasure	.3041	351
Fun & Enjoyment	Happiness	.2509	352
Warm Relationships with Others	True Friendship	.4834	351
	Mature Love	.2024	349
Self-fulfillment	Inner Harmony	.2162	350
Being Well-respected	Social Recognition	.3080	351
Excitement	Exciting Life	.5442	348
Excitement	Pleasure	.2214	350
Sense of Accomplishment	Sense of Accomplishment	.4080	351
Sense of Accomplishment	Wisdom	.2153	352
Security	Family Security	.3087	349
Security	National Security	.2404	348
Self-respect	Self-respect	.4404	352

Variables Correlated at $-.2$ or below ($p < .001$)

LOV	RVS	r	n
Sense of Belonging	Exciting Life	-.2025	348
Fun & Enjoyment	National Security	-.2113	350
Fun & Enjoyment	Self-respect	-.2249	352
Excitement	Family Security	-.3072	350
Excitement	National Security	-.2652	349
Sense of Accomplishment	Pleasure	-.2267	351
Security	Exciting Life	-.2240	347
Self-respect	Exciting Life	-.2155	349

nantly high or low in social desirability. Results significant at the .05 level are reported in Table 2.

The results imply that social desirability is somewhat of a problem. On the *LOV* people who respond in a socially desirable manner tend to rate self-respect and warm relationships with others more highly and self-fulfillment less highly. On the *RVS* people who respond in a socially desirable manner tend to rate family security, national security, salvation, inner harmony, self-respect, and wisdom more highly; and they tend to rate social recognition, true friendship, comfortable life, and pleasure less highly. These relationships are not strong, however, since the largest Spearman correlation between one of these items and a social desirability scale for the *LOV* is 0.15 and for the *RVS* is 0.26. Furthermore, the two measures of social desirability do not seem to converge in conclusions as often as may be expected. The two social desirability scales appear to capture somewhat conceptually distinct domains, calling into question the construct validity of social desirability. Of the two values measurement techniques, the *LOV* may be slightly less prone to social desirability bias. (H2) is not rejected, but neither is it viewed

TABLE 2
Social Desirability and Values

Values	Bem SD Sum of ranks				Crowne-Marlowe SD Sum of ranks			
	High sd	Low sd	z	p <	High sd	Low sd	z	p <
LOV								
Self-fulfillment	165.48	191.17	-2.37	.018				
Self-respect	191.44	159.19	2.99	.003	189.30	163.52	2.41	.016
Warm Relationships w/others					190.38	161.04	2.72	.006
RVS								
Social Recognition	167.33	189.79	-2.06	.040	160.61	196.77	-3.33	.001
True Friendship	166.06	191.46	-2.32	.020				
Comfortable Life Pleasure					156.61	200.37	-4.03	.000
					157.07	199.81	-3.93	.000
Family Security	199.01	146.53	4.81	.000				
National Security	191.84	154.78	3.43	.001				
Salvation	191.03	155.86	3.30	.001				
Inner Harmony					188.80	162.93	2.35	.017
Self-respect					189.27	162.19	2.49	.013
Wisdom					189.65	160.54	2.68	.007

as sufficiently true to justify abandoning research in the area of values due to social desirability bias. Interestingly, social desirability may in part be acceptable in the measures of values, since values are what people consider desirable. An anonymous reviewer suggested that one should desire high correlations between values and social desirability. Although we do not agree that one wants any *differential* response patterns from people who tend to respond in a socially desirable manner, we find this argument intriguing.

The Influence of Values on Individuals' Daily Lives

To assess (H3), whether the *LOV* contains a higher proportion of items that directly influence individuals' daily lives, the proportion of values that individuals checked as influencing their daily lives was compared for each value survey on the "influence question". This approach addresses the issue of which value set contains the higher proportion of values deemed relevant in people's daily lives. The mean aggregate proportion of *LOV* values checked was 0.784, whereas the proportion of *RVS* values checked was 0.644, $z = 2.93$, $p < .01$. This finding implies that the *LOV* contains a more relevant set of values than the *RVS*. Thus, (H3) is supported.

The percentage of people checking each value as influencing their lives suggests overall those values most and least relevant to our sample. Table 3 indicates these percentages. It is informative to note the similarity in the value surveys by noting the similar values in each survey that are checked most frequently. Addi-

TABLE 3
Percentage of Respondents Checking Each Value as Influencing Their Daily Lives

LOV	%	RVS	%
Warm Relationships with others	87.4	Self-respect	86.0
Self-respect	84.8	Happiness	83.1
Sense of Accomplishment	84.6	True Friendship	82.3
Fun & Enjoyment in Life	80.3	Freedom	79.2
Self-fulfillment	76.7	Sense of Accomplishment	77.2
Being well-respected	69.7	Family Security	76.1
Security	67.7	Mature Love	71.6
Sense of Belonging	67.1	Pleasure	70.8
Excitement	59.0	Exciting Life	69.7
		Comfortable Life	68.0
		Inner Harmony	68.0
		Wisdom	66.0
		World of Beauty	62.1
		Equality	57.0
		Social Recognition	56.5
		World at Peace	49.2
		Salvation	34.3
		National Security	28.4

tionally, the items showing little influence in daily lives are the *RVS* societal items (national security, salvation, world at peace, and equality), with the exception of social recognition.

Influence of Dichotomized Value Rankings in Marketing Contexts

The study of values will only be important to marketers if it can be established that values do influence people in their consumption attitudes, behaviors, and choices. For each value the sample was split into groups at the median rank value. T-tests were then conducted to detect differences in media preferences, leisure activities, gift attitudes, and behaviors or demographics (age, education and income), for those people who place higher importance on a particular value versus those people placing relatively lower importance on the value. Table 4 reports those relationships tested that were significant at .05 or beyond for each of the three areas studied. Obviously these results must be interpreted with caution due to the high number of associations assessed. They do, however, indicate a number of predictable relationships. The conclusion is that the study of values does aid in understanding and interpreting important areas of consumption attitudes and behaviors. Values do have concurrent or empirical validity for consumer behavior research.

The relationships ascertained in Table 4 provide interesting, descriptive information on individuals based on their value endorsements. For example, those

people endorsing sense of belonging more highly are heavily involved with leisure activities, particularly involving other individuals and groups. That is, these individuals seek out activities which allow them to fulfill their important values or needs. Individuals endorsing fun and enjoyment in life seem to prefer more exciting media, such as *Hill Street Blues* and *Playboy*, and more exciting activities, such as all types of sports, like jogging and skiing. Those respondents more heavily endorsing security seem to engage less in a number of high energy-level activities but like passive activities more, such as watching sports events and having hobbies. Additionally, a number of television shows and magazines are preferred by them. Some of the relationships are more straightforward than others, but the total picture suggests that assessment of value endorsement can aid in understanding consumption of leisure activities and media preferences.

Examining gift-giving relationships in particular, the values most strongly related to gift-giving appear to be (*LOV's*) self-respect, pleasure, and social recognition. Individuals endorsing social recognition exert more effort in giving, although their gift selections more heavily reflect their own tastes and they do not think it is as important to give. Individuals endorsing self-respect exert less effort with their gift selections, which reflect the receiver's taste. They do not believe they are expected to give. Those respondents endorsing pleasure exert considerable effort and select gifts more reflective of their own tastes, believing they are expected to give. These orientations may aid researchers in understanding gift-giving behavior better. For example, those respondents endorsing self-respect seem to give due to some internal motivation, while pleasure seekers give due to social norms and expectations. Quite possibly, individuals endorsing social recognition give gifts reflective of their own tastes after extensive search, anticipating this action will lead to greater social recognition by receivers. Given the useful relationships ascertained throughout Table 4, Hypothesis 4 appears to be supported.

Another analysis assessed the number of significant ($p < .05$, two-tailed tests) relationships ascertained between the two surveys and the consumption questions. The number of significant relationships per consumption area was divided by the number of values in the survey to establish the average number of significant relationships per value. On a per value basis, the *LOV* captured more instances than the *RVS* in which values significantly related to the leisure questions (6.55 vs. 5.11), while the other areas appeared quite similar. Median differences for *LOV* versus *RVS* (3.22 vs. 3.72) on media questions did not exceed 0.5, nor did gift-giving differences between *LOV* and *RVS* (1.33 vs. 1.22). Interestingly, which measure performed better with which scale varied as a function of these two content areas; therefore, as researchers have more alternative methods for measuring values available to them, they may find that some methods perform better with some consumption areas than others do. The choice becomes not whether values will capture important consumption relationships, but which value survey will provide for the greatest meaning in these relationships studied. This fairly simple analysis indicates a reasonable linkage between values and several con-

TABLE 4

Consumption Differences as a Function of Dichotomized Ranking of Values

Value	Individuals who more highly endorse this value . . . than individuals who less highly endorse this value
<i>LOV: Sense of Belonging</i> media preferences:	like <i>That's Incredible</i> , <i>Reader's Digest</i> , and <i>TV Guide</i> more
leisure activities:	read less, engage in competitive sports more, drink and entertain more, bicycle more, attend more movies, have more hobbies, ski more, attend more cultural events, use the personal computer more, watch sporting events more than engage in them, prefer group activities are older (34 vs. 29) and less educated
demographics:	
<i>LOV: Fun & Enjoyment</i> media preferences:	like <i>Hill St. Blues</i> , <i>Playboy</i> , <i>Rolling Stone</i> and <i>Cosmopolitan</i> more
leisure activities:	jog more, prefer group sports, team and individual competitive sports more, drink and entertain more, attend the movies more, listen to music more, ski more, dance, bicycle, backpack and camp more, attend more sports events
gift-giving:	buy gifts which are less reflective of receiver's tastes and give less to charity
demographics:	are younger (29 vs. 33)
<i>LOV: Warm Relationships with others</i> media preferences:	like <i>TV Guide</i> more
gift-giving:	give gifts for "no occasions" more
<i>LOV: Self-fulfillment</i> media preferences:	like <i>Three's Company</i> , <i>That's Incredible</i> , <i>Love Boat</i> and <i>Magnum, P. I.</i> less
leisure activities:	attend more movies, ski more, hunt or fish less
demographics:	are younger (29 vs. 34) and more educated
<i>LOV: Being well respected</i> media preferences:	like <i>Dallas</i> , <i>Magnum, P. I.</i> and <i>National Enquirer</i> more and <i>Rolling Stone</i> less
leisure activities:	walk, ski, bicycle, backpack, and camp less, have less hobbies, but bowl more
gift-giving:	more strongly believe they are expected to give gifts and give less for "no occasions"
demographics:	have larger incomes
<i>LOV: Excitement</i> media preferences:	like <i>Family Circle</i> and <i>TV Guide</i> less but <i>Rolling Stone</i> more
leisure activities:	jog more, prefer group sports, team and individual competitive sports more, engage in sports events more than watching them, drink and entertain more, ski, bicycle, backpack, camp, golf, and swim more
gift-giving:	more strongly believe they are expected to give gifts and give less to charity
demographics:	are younger (28 vs. 34)
<i>LOV: Sense of Accomplishment</i> media preferences:	like <i>Three's Company</i> , <i>Love Boat</i> and <i>Cosmopolitan</i> less.
leisure activities:	are less influenced by friends on choice of leisure activities, drink, entertain, listen to music, dance and play games less

TABLE 4
(Continued from previous page.)

<i>LOV: Security</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Hill St. Blues</i> less, but <i>Three's Company</i> , <i>That's Incredible</i> , <i>Love Boat</i> , <i>20-20</i> , <i>Family Circle</i> , and <i>National Enquirer</i> more
leisure activities:	prefer to watch rather than engage in sporting events, prefer group sports and team competitive sports less, jog, ski, dance, bicycle and attend sporting events less but have more hobbies and hunt or fish more
<i>LOV: Self-respect</i>	
leisure activities:	prefer group sports less
gift-giving:	exert less effort in selecting gifts, buy gifts which are more reflective of receiver's tastes and less reflective of own tastes, and believe less strongly that they are expected to give.
<i>RVS: Comfortable Life</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Dynasty</i> , <i>Three's Company</i> , <i>Playboy</i> , <i>National Enquirer</i> and <i>Cosmopolitan</i> more
leisure activities:	are more influenced by friends in choice of leisure activities, walk and backpack less
gift-giving:	buy gifts which are less reflective of receiver's tastes
demographics:	are less educated
<i>RVS: Exciting Life</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Magnum</i> , <i>P. I.</i> and <i>Playboy</i> more
leisure activities:	prefer to engage in sporting events more so than watching them, prefer group sports and team and individual competitive sports, drink and entertain, jog and ski more, and attend more sports events
gift-giving:	give more gifts to family but give less to charity
<i>RVS: Sense of Accomplishment</i>	
leisure activities:	are less influenced by friends on choice of leisure activities, have more hobbies
<i>RVS: A World at Peace</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Love Boat</i> , <i>20-20</i> and <i>Family Circle</i> more but <i>Playboy</i> and <i>Business Week</i> less
leisure activities:	are less influenced by friends in choice of leisure activities, engage in individual competitive sports less, drink, entertain and ski less but attend more cultural events
gift-giving:	give more to charities
demographics:	are older (33 vs. 29) and less educated
<i>RVS: A World of Beauty</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Happy Days</i> , <i>Playboy</i> , <i>People</i> , <i>Time</i> and <i>Cosmopolitan</i> less but <i>Rolling Stone</i> , <i>New Yorker</i> and <i>Scientific American</i> more
leisure activities:	are less influenced by friends in choice of leisure activities, prefer group sports less, walk, read, bicycle, backpack, and camp more but drink and entertain less, have more hobbies and attend more cultural events
demographics:	are older (33.5 vs. 28.5), more educated, but earn less income

TABLE 4
(Continued from previous page.)

<i>RVS: Equality</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Motor Trend</i> less
leisure activities:	walk more but bowl less
gift-giving:	buy gifts which are less reflective of own tastes and more reflective of receiver's tastes
demographics:	earn less income
<i>RVS: Family Security</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Family Circle</i> , <i>Reader's Digest</i> and <i>National Enquirer</i> more
leisure activities:	prefer watching sports events to engaging in them, engage in less competitive sports, drink, entertain, ski and backpack less, do less aerobics, but watch more television and participate in more family outings
gift-giving:	give more to charities
demographics:	are older (34 vs. 29)
<i>RVS: Freedom</i>	
leisure activities:	bicycle less
gift-giving:	buy gifts less reflective of own tastes
<i>RVS: Happiness</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Business Week</i> , <i>People</i> , <i>Reader's Digest</i> and <i>Time</i> more
leisure activities:	are less influenced by friends in choice of leisure activities, would prefer engaging in sports rather than watching sports events, attend more sports events and engage in more team competitive sports plus jog more but attend less cultural events
demographics:	are younger (29 vs. 33)
<i>RVS: Inner Harmony</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Three's Company</i> , <i>Playboy</i> and <i>Motor Trend</i> less but <i>Bon Appetit</i> more
leisure activities:	are less influenced by friends in choice of leisure activities, read and bicycle more
demographics:	are more educated
<i>RVS: Mature Love</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Dallas</i> , <i>60 Minutes</i> , <i>Family Circle</i> , <i>Business Week</i> , <i>New Yorker</i> , and <i>Scientific American</i> less
leisure activities:	camp and swim more
gift-giving:	buy gifts which are more reflective of own tastes
demographics:	are younger (29.5 vs. 33)
<i>RVS: National Security</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>That's Incredible</i> , <i>Love Boat</i> , <i>Family Circle</i> , <i>People</i> , <i>Reader's Digest</i> , <i>National Enquirer</i> and <i>TV Guide</i> more, but <i>Rolling Stone</i> and <i>New Yorker</i> less
leisure activities:	would prefer watching sports events rather than engaging in them, engage in less team and individual competitive sports, jog, drink, entertain, ski, and bicycle less, attend movies and cultural events less, but fish or hunt more
gift-giving:	exert less effort in selecting gifts
demographics:	are older (34.5 vs. 28.5) and less educated

TABLE 4
 (Continued from previous page:)

<i>RVS: Pleasure</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Dynasty</i> and <i>Playboy</i> more but <i>Bon Appetit</i> less
leisure activities:	would prefer engaging in sports events rather than watching them, prefer group sports and engage in team competitive sports, walk less and attend less cultural events
gift-giving:	select gifts more reflective of own tastes and less reflective of receiver's tastes, but exert more effort in gift selection, believe more strongly that they are expected to give but give less to charities
<i>RVS: Salvation</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Three's Company</i> , <i>That's Incredible</i> , <i>Dallas</i> , <i>Happy Days</i> , <i>Family Circle</i> , <i>Reader's Digest</i> and <i>National Enquirer</i> more but <i>Rolling Stone</i> less
leisure activities:	walk, read and drink and entertain less, attend less movies and cultural events, but hunt or fish more
gift-giving:	believe more strongly that they are expected to give gifts
demographics:	are less educated
<i>RVS: Self-respect</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>60 Minutes</i> and <i>Playboy</i> more
leisure activities:	read more but hunt or fish less
gift-giving:	select gifts less reflective of own tastes
<i>RVS: Social Recognition</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Playboy</i> more and <i>Scientific American</i> less
leisure activities:	walk, read, bicycle, camp, and hunt or fish less, attend less family outings and have less hobbies
gift-giving:	select gifts more reflective of own tastes, and less reflective of receiver's tastes, exert more effort in gift selection although believe less strongly in the importance of giving are more educated
demographics:	
<i>RVS: True Friendship</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>National Enquirer</i> less
leisure activities:	prefer group activities and are more influenced by friends in choice of leisure activities, attend more movies
gift-giving:	believe less strongly that they are expected to give but give more for "no occasions"
demographics:	are younger (29 vs. 33)
<i>RVS: Wisdom</i>	
media preferences:	like <i>Love Boat</i> , <i>A-Team</i> , <i>Playboy</i> , <i>People</i> and <i>National Enquirer</i> less
leisure activities:	read more, use personal computer more, attend cultural events more but sporting events less, camp, hunt or fish and play games less
demographics:	are more educated

sumption areas, which closely relate to life style and self-concept. We hope both future theory and empirical research will facilitate further examination of these issues.

CONCLUSIONS

The major goals of this paper included: (1) presentation to consumer researchers of an alternative value survey, the *LOV*, (2) assessment of the social desirability bias present in two value measurement techniques, *LOV* and *RVS*, and (3) ascertainment of the validity of the study of values to the understanding of consumption activities and preferences. The *LOV* survey was shown to contain a higher percentage of items that people say influence them in their daily lives. Further, the items in the two value surveys were related to each other in a pattern that shows each measure has convergent and discriminant validity with appropriate subsets of the other. Both have a degree of empirical or concurrent validity. The *LOV* approach seems more parsimonious and appears to be equally valid; however, social desirability bias seems to have a small influence on both surveys and may lead to the overrating or underrating of certain values. This problem seems unavoidable but can only be attacked by knowledge and understanding of the problem through further research efforts in this area. The *LOV* has the advantage of being easier to administer and easier to complete quickly. These advantages are important in surveys with cost limits.

Both surveys proved helpful in understanding several important consumption areas, which theoretically should be linked to values—leisure, media, and gift-giving. Understanding that people who endorse certain values more highly than others engage more heavily in certain activities, prefer certain programs or magazines, or give gifts differently than others can be useful in designing appeals, product positioning, or designing and packaging products. Thus, the possibilities and potentialities of value research are great for marketers and should be vigorously pursued. Yuspeh's (1984) assertion that values cannot aid segmentation seems inaccurate.

Future research would do well to probe additional areas of consumption (e.g., telephone usage, computing), additional populations, and additional methods of measuring values (such as Allport et al., 1960). Furthermore, we need more information on the links between values and behavior (such as Gutman, 1982). Specific consideration of how values interact with situations may be especially useful.

The growing interest in values by consumer researchers should be welcomed by marketing managers, who for a long time have recognized the importance of understanding and appealing to values in order to market their products. As suggested by Clawson and Vinson (1977), marketing appeals have traditionally been highly value oriented. For example, the Marlboro man attracts people who value the *respect* associated with rugged and independent cowboys. The Camel theme

("Where a man belongs") invokes a *sense of belonging*, and Salem promotes *warm relationships with others* ("Share the spirit"). *Fun and enjoyment in life* seem to dominate many cigarette advertisements, such as Merit's theme, "The pleasure is back" (Kahle & Beatty, 1984).

REFERENCES

- Allport, G., P. Vernon, & Lindzey, G. (1960). *Study of values*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Becker, B. W., & Connor, P. E. (1981). Personal values of the heavy user of mass media. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 21, 37-43.
- Becker, B. W., & Conner, P. E. (1982). The influence of personal values on attitude and store choice behavior. In B. J. Walker, et al. (Eds.), *An assessment of marketing thought and practice* (pp. 21-24). Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Belk, R. W. (1979). Gift-giving behavior. In J. Sheth (Ed.), *Research in marketing*, Vol. 2, Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, Inc.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.
- Bozinoff, L., & Cohen, R. (1982). The effects of personal values and usage situations on product attribute importance. In B. J. Walker, et al. (Eds.), *An assessment of marketing thought and practice* (pp. 25-29). Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 81-105.
- Carman, J. M. (1978). Values and consumption patterns: A closed loop. In H. K. Hunt (Ed.), *Advances in consumer research*. Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research, 5 (pp. 403-407).
- Clawson, C. J., & Vinson, D. E. (1978). Human values: A historical and interdisciplinary analysis. In H. K. Hunt (Ed.), *Advances in consumer research*, (pp. 396-402). Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research.
- Cox, E. P., III (1980). The optimal numbers of response alternatives for a scale: A review. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 407-422.
- Crosby, L. A., & Taylor, J. R. (1983). Psychological commitment and its effects on post-decision evaluation and preference stability among voters. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 413-431.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive*. New York: Wiley.
- Feather, N. T. (1975). *Values in education and society*. New York: Free Press.
- Feather, N. T. (1984). Protestant ethic, conservatism and values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1132-1141.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1974). Attitudes toward objects as predictors of single and multiple behavioral criteria. *Psychological Review*, 81, 59-74.
- Gordon, L. (1960). *Survey of interpersonal values*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Grube, J. W., Weir I. L., Getzlaf, S., & Rokeach, M. (1984). Own value system, value images, and cigarette smoking. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 10, 306-313.
- Gurin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. (1960). *Americans view their mental health*. N.Y.: Basic Books, 1960.
- Gutman, J. (1982). A means-end chain model based on consumer categorization processes. *Journal of Marketing*, 46, 60-72.
- Henry, W. A. (1976). Cultural values do correlate with consumer behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 13, 121-127.
- Jackson, R. G. (1974). A preliminary bicultural study of value orientations and leisure attitudes. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 5, 10-22.
- Kahle, L. R. (1983). (Ed.). *Social values and social change: Adaptation to life in America*. N.Y.: Praeger.
- Kahle, L. R. (1984a). *Attitudes and social adaptation: A person-situation interaction approach*. Oxford, U.K.: Pergamon.

- Kahle, L. R. (1984b). The values of Americans: Implications for consumer adaptation. In R. E. Pitts and A. Woodside (Eds.), *Personal values and consumer psychology*, (pp. 77-86), Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Kahle, L. R., & Beatty, S. E. (1984). The social values of Americans: strategic implications. *Strategy and Executive Action*, 1, 26-28.
- Kelly, K., Silverman, B. I., & Cochrane, R. (1972). Social desirability and the Rokeach value survey. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*, 6, 84-87.
- Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston: Row, Peterson.
- Manzer, L. L., & Miller, S. J. (1978). An examination of the value-attitude structure in the study of donor behavior. Presented at American Institute for Decision Sciences annual meeting, St. Louis, November.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. N.Y.: Harper, 1954.
- Peterson, L. B., & Peterson, M. J. (1959). Short-term retention of individual verbal items. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 55, 193-198.
- Pitts, R. E., & Woodside, A. G. (1983). Personal value influences on consumer product class and brand preferences. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 119, 37-53.
- Pitts, R. E., & Woodside, A. G. (1984), (eds.). *Personal values and consumer psychology*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Prakash, V. (1984). Personal values and product expectations. In R. E. Pitts, Jr., and A. G. Woodside (Eds.), *Personal values and consumer values*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Punj, G. N., & Stewart, R. W. (1983). An interaction framework of consumer decision making. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10, 181-196.
- Reynolds, T. J., & Jolly, J. P. (1980). Measuring personal values: An evaluation of alternative methods. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 531-536.
- Rokeach, M. (1968). *Belief, attitudes and values*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. N.Y.: The Free Press.
- Schwartz, B. (1967). The social psychology of the gift. *American Journal of Sociology*, 73, 1-11.
- Spates, J. L. (1983). The sociology of values. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 17-49.
- Veroff, J., Douvan, E., & Kulka, R. A. (1981). *The Inner American*. New York: Basic Books.
- Vinson, D. E., & Munson, J. M. (1976). Personal values: an approach to market segmentation. In K. L. Bernhardt (Ed.), *Marketing: 1877-1976 and beyond* (pp. 313-317). Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Vinson, D. E., Scott, J. E., & Lamont, L. M. (1977). The role of personal values in marketing and consumer behavior. *Journal of Marketing*, 41, 44-50.
- Williams, R. M., Jr. (1979). Change and stability in values and value perspectives: A sociological perspective. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *Understanding human values: individual and societal*. N.Y.: Free Press.
- Yankelovich, D. (1981). *New rules: searching for self-fulfillment in a world turned upside down*. N.Y.: Bantam.
- Yuseph, S. (May, 1984). Syndicated values/lifestyles segmentation schemes: Use them as descriptive tools, not to select targets. *Marketing News*, pp. 1, 12.

Sharon E Beatty is an assistant professor of Marketing in the Marketing Department at DePaul University.

Lynn R. Kahle is a professor of Marketing in the Department of Marketing at the University of Oregon.

Pamela Homer and Shekhar Misra are both doctoral students in Marketing at DePaul University.