H. W. KITCHEN

Memorial University of Newfoundland

Differences in Value-Orientations:
The Broader Implications

Canada's educators, like its politicians (and like politicians and educators in other places), are confronted with what are perhaps the two essential data of this century — a society which is convergent but in which there are clearly distinguishable and rather permanent variations. The convergence, or tendency for Canadians to become more like each other, that is accompanying rural-to-urban migration, industrialization, improved roads and television, is largely in the direction of the urban, middle-class, large-scale-organization way of life; the persisting variations are chiefly socioeconomic and regional, although there are important religious and ethnic differences as well.

Using largely the value-orientations framework, aspects of which have been detailed elsewhere,[1] this paper will discuss the educational implications of the impact of convergence on the differences in the philosophies of life held by different groups of Canadians. First, there will be identified variant ways of Canadian life and the value-orientations associated with them. Next, an attempt will be made to describe precisely the convergence and its relationship to value-orientations. Finally, and at length, there will be discussed the profound implications for social policy, particularly in education, of convergence amid diverse value-orientations. From this, it is concluded that educational policies and programs should reflect exclusively neither the one datum nor the other, that schools should not be bent on training all Canadians to the same extent or in the same ways for urban, bureaucratic, middle-class life; nor should schools ignore the realities of convergence with futile attempts to per-

---

[1]H. W. Kitchen, "Differences in Value-Orientations: A Newfoundland Study," *The Canadian Administrator* V (December, 1965). The value-orientations framework was developed largely by the American anthropologist Florence Kluckhohn. She has suggested five problems common to all societies, five essential components of world view, the operational philosophy or picture of the world with which each person guides his behavior. For each problem she identifies a minimum of three possible value positions called "value-orientations." Four of these problems with their corresponding value-orientations are: MAN NATURE: Subject-to-Nature, Harmony-with-Nature, Mastery-over-Nature; TIME: Past, Present, Future; ACTIVITY: Being, Being-in-Becoming, Doing; RELATIONAL: Lineality, Collaterality, Individualism. The fifth problem deals with beliefs about the nature of human nature.

petuate outmoded ways of life that nobody wants. Rather should courses of study, teaching methods and administrative practice be preparing Canadians with relevance and vitality for patterns of culture more alike than formerly, but often necessarily different although similarly desirable.

SOME DIFFERENCES

The striking conclusion from ethnological studies in various parts of the world is not the soothing adage that human beings are the same the world over, but that they are so very different. The late Clyde Kluckhohn was able to identify only a few common values, namely, that no culture tolerates indiscriminate lying, stealing or violence within the in-group, that the incest taboo is essentially universal, that no culture values suffering as an end in itself, that there is no known culture where death is not ceremonialized, and that all cultures define as abnormal an individual permanently inaccessible to communication or whose actions are unpredictable. He was forced to conclude that "true universals or near-universals are apparently few in number."[2] Studies by Morris indicate that philosophies of life differ from one part of the world to another.[3] The "culture-personality" and "national character" schools of thought have presented rather strong evidence that there are within a society, more especially within a tightly-knit one, strong patterns of regularity in behavior, personality and values, by which the society can be distinguished from others.[4]

Within the United States, Florence Kluckhohn and her associates have produced evidence of the very different patterns of value-orientations among five cultural groups living within a fifty-mile radius in New Mexico — Zuni, Navaho, Mormons, Texans and Spanish Americans.[5]

The writings of students of the main stream of American society have suggested that different social classes have different value-orientations.[6] For the lower classes the good life apparently means more cooperation, more self-indulgence, and greater orientation toward the

---

[2]Clyde Kluckhohn, "Education, Values, and Anthropological Relativity," *Culture and Behavior: Collected Essays of Clyde Kluckhohn*, Richard Kluckhohn, editor (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1962), pp. 286-300.

[3]Charles Morris, *Varieties of Human Value* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956).

[4]For example, see Ralph Linton, *The Cultural Background of Personality* (New York: D. Appleton—Century Company, 1945); the many works of Margaret Mead; and Alex Inkeles and Daniel J. Levinson, "National Character, the Study of Modal Personality and Socio-cultural Systems," *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Gardner Lindzey, editor (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954), pp. 977-1020.

[5]Florence Rockwood Kluckhohn and Fred L. Strodtbeck, *Variations in Value Orientations* (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961).

[6]See Joseph A. Kahl, *The American Class Structure* (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1953).

present than is the case for the middle classes, who are said to place more emphasis on striving, the future, deferred gratification, and individual autonomy.[7] The upper classes appear less oriented than the middle classes toward work-success but more toward authority, the past and the development of the self.[8] There is some evidence that those who work in large organizations have different value-orientations from those who are self employed, particularly that they may be less individualistically-oriented, believe more in lineality (having decisions made by superordinates) and in collaterality or peer orientation.[9] Also, there is evidence that patterns of American life, particularly for urban young people,[10] may be changing away from beliefs in absolute morality, work success, and deferred gratification, toward relative morality, hedonism, and peer-orientation.[11] Rural-urban, regional, ethnic, religious, and other variations in values have also been suggested. It would seem that within the United States there are important variations in value-orientations.

This generalization seems appropriate for Canada as well, especially for differences among urban social classes. The writer's Newfoundland study, referred to above, found important differences in value-orientations especially between the city and tightly-knit fishing communities. One would expect the farming people of Western Canada, who live usually as scattered family units rather than in villages, to hold somewhat different values.[12] Canada has also powerful religious and ethnic differences to which differences in value-orientations may be related. Then there are the obviously different minorities — Indians of various tribes, Metis, Eskimo, Hutterites, Doukhobors — whose world views or operational concepts of the good life seem very different from each other and from those of other Canadians.[13] Despite a likely tendency of environmental convergence and improved channels of diffusion to reduce them somewhat,

---

[7] See Allison Davis, *Social Class Influences upon Learning* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), and other works by the same author and his associates.

[8] Charles McArthur, "Personality Differences between Middle and Upper Classes," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 50 (March, 1955), pp. 247-54.

[9] Daniel R. Miller and Guy E. Swanson, *The Changing American Parent* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 139-141.

[10] James S. Coleman, *The Adolescent Society* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961); H. Kirk Dansereau, "Work and the Teen-Ager," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 338 (November, 1961).

[11] George D. Spindler, "Education in a Transforming American Culture," *Harvard Educational Review* 25 (Summer, 1955), pp. 145-56; Richard Prince, "Individual Values and Administrative Effectiveness," *Administrator's Notebook* 6 (December, 1957). Robert S. Parry, "The Relational Value-Orientations of Grade X Students and their Fathers," unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Calgary, 1967.

[12] The findings of Parry (*op. cit.*) suggest that Alberta pupils are, unlike Newfoundland pupils, dominantly individualistic.

[13] John A. Hostetler and Calvin Redekop, "Education and Assimilation in Three Ethnic Groups," *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research* 8 (December, 1962), pp. 189-203.

one would hypothesize that there are important differences in the value-orientations held by Canadians.

CONVERGENCE

In deriving the educational implications of the impact of convergence in society on the value-orientations of different classifications of Canadians, it is important to have what are not presently available, namely, clear and detailed pictures of rural-urban migration, interprovincial mobility, movement from one socioeconomic class to another, the effects of mass media, and data about similar forces. From the information that is available, it seems as if convergence may be less ubiquitious and less intense than is sometimes taken for granted.

For example, interprovincial migration seems largely to have subsided. Although ratios were generally much higher in the five Eastern provinces, much lower in the West, only one Canadian in ten was, according to both the census of 1961 and that of 1951, living in a province other than where he was born. Moreover, Canadians did not in that decade wander randomly from one province to another. Rather were there directions, and certain kinds of people involved. People moved from the Atlantic Provinces to Ontario but few from Ontario to the Atlantic Provinces, from New Brunswick to Quebec, and, especially from Saskatchewan to Alberta and British Columbia, but rarely in the opposite direction. In 1961 although only forty-seven per cent of the people living in British Columbia had been born there, in Newfoundland ninety-seven per cent were native-born Newfoundlanders. Also, excluding migration to foreign countries, of all the Canadians in 1961 who had been born in British Columbia or Ontario or Quebec, over ninety per cent were still living there; the percentage for Saskatchewan was under sixty-four, for Manitoba, and Prince Edward Island about seventy-two. Thus, one aspect of convergence, interprovincial migration, involves few Canadians, exhibits certain geographic patterns and, although it is not explored in this paper, may involve some socioeconomic groups more than others.

Census and other data exhibit a trend for people to move from rural to urban areas. Again, few of the necessary details are available, but patterns of varying involvement are indicated. Although research into social mobility, the movement from one social class to another, in Canada is meagre, evidence collected in the United States suggests that whatever may have been the pattern of the frontier, of the era of early settlement, there now may be a hardening of the class structure, a greater tendency for people born into one relative socio-economic stratum to remain there.[14]

---

[14]Kaare Svalastoga, "Social Differentiation," *Handbook of Modern Sociology,* R. E. L. Faris, editor (Chicago: Rand, McNally, and Company, 1964), pp. 530-575.

It seems that although there are sizeable numbers of Canadians moving geographically, and perhaps socially, from some ways of life to others, and from certain profiles of value-orientation predominance to others, most Canadians are not moving.

SOME PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION

What are the implications for education of differing sectional profiles of value-orientations amid limited convergence?

For some time now, some sociologists have been suggesting that schools, often unknowingly and with the best of intentions, have been catering unfairly to one segment of society, namely the professional classes, and inculcating their value-orientations, thereby placing at an educational disadvantage and often alienating other children, particularly those of the lower classes.[15] Texts and other materials depict rarely, and with approval even more rarely, the lives and homes of the working classes, the non-white, the poor. Similarly biased, it is said, are school regulations and disciplinary practices that emphasize private property and the avoidance of improper language. So are teaching methods that stress "grammatical" speech and interpersonal competition. The clean, the well-groomed and the well-to-do find it easier to participate in the extra-curricular activities which confer establishment-approved peer-group status. From the time children begin school, grouping procedures favour middle-class children; in high school, children of the lower classes gravitate toward inferior programs or drop out. Trustees, especially in cities, tend to be drawn almost exclusively from the middle classes. Teachers identify with the middle class. Again, since lower socio-economic groups often live in older parts of the city or town, their school buildings often are older, sometimes are dilapidated and poorly equipped, and have inadequate playgrounds. They tend to lack neighborhood leadership, including strong PTA groups, that can wield political power or raise funds for important school extras. Similarly, the school's obsession with interpersonal competition and individualism, including punishing as cheating pupil effort at joint problem solving, may be poor preparation for those who are to work or otherwise live in bureaucracy. It can be claimed also that schools are biased against the rural child, the child of the fishing village, certain ethnic, linguistic and religious groups, and recent immigrants. Several policies are currently advocated to deal with the problem.

Many educators and politicians, themselves committed to convergence, urge a greater realization of the principle of equal educational opportunity for all children. They see education as the crystal stair to the good life, leading from illiteracy to acceptable social status, and believe very devoutly that every child regardless of class, race, creed, family, or

---

[15]A. B. Hollingshead, *Elmtown's Youth* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1949), and Frank Riessman, *The Culturally Deprived Child* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962).

ethnicity, must have his chance. They would rescue the culturally deprived child from his non-literate home, provide for his perceptual and linguistic development by early kindergarten, supply him with books and free education, have his intelligence measured by culturally fair tests, and ensure, as Head Start and other operations of the current United States war on poverty are trying to do, that environmental inadequacies are balanced by extra schooling, in a frantic attempt to keep the success race a fair one and to meet the needs of a converging, industrializing society.[16] We can be reasonably sure that for most people poverty, illiteracy and isolation are not theirs by choice. Few would disagree that those who need and desire such help should, where possible, receive it. However, that is an aspect of this principle of equality of opportunity of which educators must beware, lest in the enthusiasm to do good works, many children be done a grave disservice. For what is advocated is "cultural euthanasia." A minor objection, perhaps, is that this policy is based on somewhat questionable assumptions about the undesirability of poverty, illiteracy, and lower class life. More importantly, where may it lead? Whose children will next be summoned from their inferior values and culture by the educators, the politicians, and the urban professional classes, to suburban living — the Indian, the Maritimer, the farmer, the fisherman, the fundamentalist, the *habitant?* In eliminating quite properly the barriers for those who wish to be free of them, the different must not be confused with the disadvantaged. Those of the latter who desire help must receive it, but is it not arrogant and immoral to use the techniques of compensatory education to interfere with those who, because of differences in world view, would remain different, and whose differences do not seriously interfere with the rest of us? Those who are different and who consider themselves disadvantaged, educationally or otherwise, may require help to develop along lines somewhat of their own choosing. There may also be some justification for making people aware that they or others are different. It would, however, seem that since it does not recognize cultural variation, the principle of equal opportunity must in part be rejected, or interpreted differently. Different kinds of people with different views about the good life probably means different educational tasks and procedures.

That different segments of society differ in their value-orientations implies that we should beware also of the many current educational practices based largely on a one-dimensional interpretation of the principle of individual differences, namely, that schools should strive to develop the individual to his maximum capacity as measured by devices called intelligence tests. In practice these tests divide children into streams, tracks, or "non-graded" programs for different amounts of education. The individual differences catered to are largely along one

---

[16]This case is ably presented in Benjamin S. Bloom, Allison Davis and Robert Hess, *Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965).

dimension — IQ test intelligence — although talented children are some-
times encouraged to dabble in the fine arts of the well-to-do of European
origin. Many innovators in methodology — the learning programmers,
and those advocating the large-group, discussion-group, individual-study,
team-teaching method, for example — seem to be operating almost entirely
along this one dimension. Catering to individual differences has been
restricted to mean "catering to differing levels of intelligence." Here
again the point is overlooked that culturally distinguishable groups
within a society have different ways of life, and it is to these group
differences that the schools should, in part, be catering, rather than
exposing everyone to the same good life, or to the same good life in
different quantities or in the same way. The missing dimension is intra-
society differences in culture, especially in value-orientations.

The reality of our increasingly interdependent, industrial, mass exist-
ence with its social and geographic mobility demands a certain basic
and probably increasing uniformity in education throughout Canada.
Yet the need for common educational experiences with course credits
acceptable in all provinces is perhaps overemphasized by a highly vocal
mobile minority consisting largely of professional and managerial
people.[17] For as suggested above, the vast majority of Canadians are
not mobile, either geographically or socially. To a very important extent
are their lives permanently bound up in local occupational, religious,
ethnic and class ways of life. For education, this suggests catering in
part to a common Canadianism, but also to group and cultural differ-
ences. The educational diet of a particular child should consist of three
elements combined in unique proportions: the basic uniformity that is
necessary for him taking into account his probable mobility and expo-
sure to convergence, the culture including the value-orientations of the
societal groups to which he belongs, and, (thirdly) elements unique to
him.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS

What is known about differences in value-orientations suggests other
important implications for schools and their administration.

School procedures. A familiarity with the local value-orientations,
especially those of pupils, could improve teaching. For example, the
highly individualistic children of independent Newfoundland fishermen
and Alberta farmers seem more amenable to independent work patterns
than to the group projects and quiet discussions featured in some Amer-
ican urban schools. However, projects and discussions are perhaps high-
ly functional preparation for children who will be living and working in

---

[17]The Canadian Education Association estimates that annually only 1.5% of
Canadian pupils are involved in interprovincial transfer, and of these entering
Alberta less than 2% experience downgrading or lose a school year. See *Inter-
provincial Transfers: The Magnitude of the Problem* (Toronto: The Canadian
Education Association, 1965).

large-scale organizations. It is possible that teachers who urge these latter children to be individualistic, "creative" and divergent may be doing them a disservice. Perhaps an important educational feature of the large school is its incidental practice for life in large organizations. In lineally-oriented groups expecting direction from above, the teacher who stresses independent work habits would be operating at less than maximum efficiency. A knowledge of local value-orientations provides important cues to the teaching staff about appropriate discipline procedures. For example, exclusion from the age-peer group is perhaps not everywhere equally effective. Again, in cities where hedonistic and present-time value-orientations predominate, learning experiences might place more emphasis on fun, whereas in areas dominated by the work-success ethic where school is expected not to entertain, heavy work loads are more apt to be appreciated. Also, where it is history or sociology that is taught and how it is taught perhaps reflect the dominant time orientation. For educational change agents operating in areas of converging Canadianism, knowledge both of pupil's present value-orientations and those they need to acquire would be useful. Useful diagnostic tools for teachers, guidance counsellors and other school personnel would be cumulative records containing for each pupil periodic measurements of his value-orientations. Knowledge of his own value-orientations would perhaps increase the interpersonal effectiveness of a teacher or administrator. Knowing the scores of his staff may improve selection, placement, and organization policies.

This important notion that the methods by which children learn will vary according to their value-orientations is one that seems to offer exciting possibilities for experimentation and theoretical consideration by scholars in the fields of teaching methods and the psychology of learning. That there are important differences in the operational philosophies held by different segments of the school's public has implications not only for method but for content, and for the courses in curriculum and philosophy offered by teacher training institutions.

Thus, it would seem, whether one is dealing with the different or the disadvantaged, or with the disadvantaged different, that value-orientations should be an important dimension in selecting the curriculum, methods, organizational climate, optimum school size, and the teachers most appropriate for a given situation.

Field experiences. Secondly, school workers, especially change agents, need to be sensitive to differences in values, and the social and mental health problems that sometimes accompany value change. The University of New Mexico a few years ago introduced a three-year doctoral program in educational administration strongly oriented toward the behavioural sciences, which features participant-observer field experiences and an internship designed to give direct experience with educational change amid a multicultured population in the throes of acculturation and changing values. In Canada also, especially in rapidly changing

areas or where teachers or administrators operate among unfamiliar groups, training institutions might profitably supplement bookish studies of problems related to value differences, with field experiences and internships carefully designed to provide familiarity, not so much with the school system as with the people the schools supposedly serve. For example, in poor areas of the city these experiences might include visiting families, churches, welfare agencies, magistrate's court and the haunts of teenagers.

Value Research Unit. What educators need is a series of maps and models of Canada, its regions, its cities, indicating the gross contours of value-orientations, their tendencies to peak, and where conflicts occur. One way to encourage this might be to establish a Values Research Unit within an Institute of Education at some Canadian university. Besides mapping value-orientations, developing appropriate measuring devices, disseminating the findings, and exploring other cultural differences, the Unit might assess the impact on values of social reforms and of school programs, including those specially designed to change or to reinforce values. Researchers employed by the provincial department of education and by school districts could provide a very useful service in ascertaining the patterns of local values and culture, and in coupling these with their research findings about their area's economic and demographic trends. For instance, if farm youth in Prince Edward Island are moving into Ontario cities to work in large-scale organizations, their training for successful relocation should perhaps include not only technical and academic skills but a change in their value-orientations. These would likely include diminishing their individualism and fatalism, and increasing their belief in mastery-over-nature and their liking for living and working in groups. Also, if further research confirms our tentative findings that the values of pupils whose fathers are in large-scale organizations employed as blue-collar workers differ from those whose fathers are white-collar workers, then the kind of values stressed by schools in Ottawa and Calgary should perhaps differ from those emphasized in the factory cities of Windsor and Hamilton. Specialists in learning theory and teaching methods attached to the Unit or using its resources might research the impact on their fields of differences in value-orientations. Related research would include present and probable future migration and mobility patterns. What are the numbers and characteristics of the migrants, their origins and their destinations? What changes in their value-orientations are necessary for them to become effective organization men? To what extent would appropriate organizational climate and appropriate leader behaviour by principals of schools and superintendents of school systems vary with the value-orientations of staff, students and community? Which, if any, profile of value-orientations is most conducive to effectiveness in the large organization? What is envisioned is a research and development center in education that focuses its energies on differences and changes in value-orientations, and other cultural variables.

School district reorganization.   An important outcome of this research might well be data implying a restructuring of the machinery of educational decision-making.   Reform would presumably include a redrawing of the boundaries of local and perhaps provincial educational authorities to correspond more closely to currently important cultural realities and social requirements, and ensuring the presence on policy-making boards of someone speaking for, and perhaps selected by, significant groups having different value-orientations.   Our converging commonality and our real differences both need more structural support — preferably a structure that can be changed, albeit with some difficulty, as Canada, its societal groups and their values change.