Table 2. Traditionalist, modernist, postmodernist worldviews in relation to instrumental values

No.	Instrumental values	Culture stage	Tradition $\overline{x}$=52.39		Modernism $\overline{x}$=53.77		Postmodernism $\overline{x}$=48.47	
			r=	p=	r=	p=	r=	p=
i1.	Ambitious	$\overline{x}$=8.04	0.15	0.004	-0.08	n.s.	-0.04	n.s.
i2.	Broad-minded	$\overline{x}$=11.83	0.19	0.000	-0.14	0.005	0.02	n.s.
i3.	Capable	$\overline{x}$=12.62	0.05	n.s.	-0.08	n.s.	0.00	n.s.
i4.	Cheerful	$\overline{x}$=9.45	-0.07	n.s.	0.07	n.s.	-0.04	n.s.
i5.	Clean	$\overline{x}$=10.24	0.03	n.s.	0.05	n.s.	0.03	n.s.
i6.	Courageous	$\overline{x}$=9.90	0.02	n.s.	-0.09	n.s.	-0.00	n.s.
i7.	Forgiving	$\overline{x}$=10.13	-0.28	0.000	0.17	0.001	0.09	n.s.
i8.	Helpful	$\overline{x}$=6.90	-0.20	0.000	0.10	0.041	0.01	n.s.
i9.	Honest	$\overline{x}$=5.47	-0.18	0.000	0.13	0.010	0.00	n.s.
i10.	Imaginative	$\overline{x}$=11.87	0.22	0.000	-0.06	n.s.	-0.00	n.s.
i11.	Independent	$\overline{x}$=10.07	0.16	0.001	-0.05	n.s.	-0.07	n.s.
i12.	Intellectual	$\overline{x}$=9.34	0.20	0.000	-0.25	0.000	-0.03	n.s.
i13.	Logical	$\overline{x}$=10.36	0.18	0.001	-0.14	0.007	0.01	n.s.
i14.	Loving	$\overline{x}$=4.52	-0.12	0.019	0.10	0.048	0.02	n.s.
i15.	Obedient	$\overline{x}$=14.61	-0.20	0.000	0.04	n.s.	-0.04	n.s.
i16.	Polite	$\overline{x}$=9.15	-0.13	0.012	0.17	0.001	-0.01	n.s.
i17.	Responsible	$\overline{x}$=5.83	-0.11	0.032	0.07	n.s.	0.00	n.s.
i18.	Self-controlled	$\overline{x}$=10.51	-0.03	n.s.	0.08	n.s.	0.10	n.s.

r – Spearman's rank correlation coefficient

p – level of statistical significance

n. s. – statistically non-significant correlation coefficient

$\overline{x}$ – arithmetic mean of indicators of specific variables (instrumental values and three types of worldviews)

rank 1 – highest value preference, rank 18 – lowest value preference

Source: own elaboration.

It appeared that people with higher indicators of the traditionalist worldview assigned a higher rank to collectivist values (Tables 1 and 2). These are pacifist and egalitarian values – "a world at peace" (t17) and "equality" (t2) – that is, associated with protecting the broadly understood well-being of people and their position in the social structure. They also express a significantly bigger preference for values that protect the welfare of people with whom an individual interacts directly (the welfare of the group to which the individual belongs): "forgiving" (i7), "helpful" (i8), "honest" (i9), "loving" (i14), and "responsible" (i17). This worldview is associated with values that determine interpersonal harmony: "obedient" (i15) and "polite" (i16). The values listed above are referred

to as moral values. Central to the traditionalist worldview is the value associated with respect for religion, i.e. "salvation" (t11). It had the highest correlation coefficient (r=-0.52). In contrast, people with higher indicators of the traditionalist worldview rank lower the values associated with social status, prestige and personal success (material success): "social recognition" (t14), "a sense of accomplishment" (t13), "ambitious" (i1), "a comfortable life" (t1), as well as independence and intellectual competence: "independent" (i11), "imaginative" (i10), "broad-minded" (i2), "intellectual" (i12), "logical" (i13), and, lastly, hedonism and a need for stimulation (interesting, enjoyable, varied life): "happiness" (t6), "pleasure" (t10), "an exciting life" (t3). All the mentioned values have individualistic character. The obtained results confirm the assumptions included in hypothesis 1: the traditionalist worldview correlates positively with collectivist values and negatively with individualist values. Thus, if one is characterised by higher traditionalism, he or she attaches more importance to collectivist values and less to individualist values.

In turn, the modernist worldview reveals positive relationships with other values (Tables 1 and 2). These are values related to prestige and personal success: "social recognition" (t14) and "a sense of accomplishment" (t13) as well as independence of thought and intellectual competence: "broad-minded" (i2), "intellectual" (i12) and "logical" (i13). As it can be observed, these fall into the category of individualistic values. In contrast, higher indicators of the modernist worldview are associated with lower indicators of moral values, which condition the well-being of loved ones and harmonious relationships: "forgiving" (i7), "helpful" (i8), "honest" (i9), "loving" (i14), and "polite" (i16). "Salvation" (t11), a religious value, was also provided with lower acceptance indicators. The aforementioned values are of a collectivist nature and, as it can be seen, are not part of the modernist worldview. Taking into account the whole configuration of the obtained results, it should be stated that hypothesis 2 has been confirmed: the modernist worldview correlates positively with individualistic values and negatively with collectivistic values.

The analysis of the postmodernist worldview revealed some other solutions in the axiological sphere (Tables 1 and 2). The indicators of this worldview correlated positively with values related to social status and material success: "social recognition" (t14), "a comfortable life" (t1) as well as hedonism and the need for stimulation

(interesting, pleasant, varied life): "happiness" (t6), "pleasure" (t10), and "an exciting life" (t3). These are clearly individualistic features. Only one collectivist value was negatively correlated with this worldview: "salvation" (t11). In case of the postmodernist worldview, the number of statistically significant correlations with values were much smaller and there were no correlations with instrumental values, which, as a reminder, are defined as desirable ways of behaviour. However, based on the analysis of terminal values, i.e. goals of human existence, the direction of the correlation included in hypothesis 2 was found: the postmodernist worldview correlates positively with individualistic values. "Salvation", a collectivist and at the same time the religious value, had a negative correlation.

7 Summary and Discussion

The aim of the above presented study was to examine the relationship between two constructs: a worldview and values. The consequence of this relationship is the coherence of beliefs which refers to psychological comfort (reduction of unpleasant tension associated with incompatibility in the system of beliefs). The diagnosed worldviews reflect the essence of three cultural formations: traditionalism, modernism and postmodernism.

The most unambiguous (a number of statistically significant correlation coefficients and their sign) relationships were revealed between values and the traditionalist worldview. According to hypothesis 1, the distinguishing feature of this worldview is a higher preference for collectivist values and a lower preference for individualist ones. Here, significant are the values associated with egalitarianism, elimination of military violence, protection of other people's welfare (including the criterion of morality) and interpersonal harmony (elimination of tensions and conflicts in relations between people). The fact that this worldview is religious by nature manifests itself with its strong association (high correlation coefficient) with the value of "salvation". People with a traditionalist worldview respect less self-centred values as they are linked with social status, prestige and personal success (including material success), hedonism and the need for stimulation (interesting, enjoyable, varied life). Thus, the traditionalist worldview is based on collectivist values, and the We becomes more important than the I. Individualistic values stand in opposition to such worldview.

The axiological characteristics of the other two worldviews are much different, which is consistent

with the content of hypothesis 2. In their case, the "I" becomes more important than the "We". Positive correlations with the modernist worldview are evident in case of values related to social status, prestige and personal success, independence of thought and intellectual competence. Negative correlations were noted for moral values that determine the well-being of loved ones and harmonious relationships. "Postmodernists" ranked higher individualistic values associated with social status and material well-being, hedonism and the need for stimulation (happy, interesting, pleasant and varied life). It is also characteristic that as the indicators of both worldviews grew, the indicators of preference for the "salvation" value decreased.

The axiological differentiation of the traditionalist worldview in relation to modernist and postmodernist worldviews is consistent with the criterion of collectivism – individualism [cf. characteristics of collectivism - individualism 67-77]. It should be noted, however, that in the case of the first worldview, twenty-two (positive or negative) statistically significant correlation coefficients were recorded, in the case of the second – their number dropped to eleven. Only six such coefficients were revealed in the analysis of the relationship between values and the postmodernist worldview and, what is more interesting, they concerned terminal values, that is, the objectives of human existence.

The presented axiological characteristics of the traditionalist worldview proved to be consistent with the ideas promoted within it. As a reminder, the truth is revealed and applies to all people – at all times and in any place. Traditionalism is rooted in religion and is based on values proclaimed by the Church. Therefore, the analysis of behaviour should be based on the "virtue – sin" criterion. The quality of a person is determined by how he or she fulfils his/her obligations towards God and how he or she "stays moral" in his/her earthly life, especially in terms of his/her commitment to the surrounding people. This worldview is "imbued" with community, where interpersonal values (RVS scale of terminal values) and moral values (RVS scale of instrumental values) condition its preservation.

Modernism grew up as an opposition to traditionalism. The truth remained "only one and objective", but the trend also accepted detachment from community. An individual could be autonomous because he or she was intelligent and rational. The focus was placed on intellectual qualities of an individual and they were treated as a panacea for all evil (wiser people know better and can reach objective truth). Human functioning was

evaluated primarily in terms of the criterion "success – failure", which meant that the stress was placed on what a person achieved in life. Self-cantered values became attractive, the realization of which allows for distancing oneself from others and earn their admiration. In the above described research, the authors reveal modernist ideas in terms of preferred values: the respondents attributed greater importance to intrapersonal values which determine personal success (RVS scale of terminal values) and values related to competence and intellect (RVS scale of instrumental values).

In postmodernism, the focus was placed on human happiness in people's earthly lie. In the context of the obtained research results, it should be stated that only in the case of this worldview there was a positive relationship with the values: "happiness", "an exciting life" and "a comfortable life". Importance was attributed not only to autonomy, but even unlimited freedom. Modernist rationalism gave way to irrationalism, objectivity – to relativism (both cognitive and moral). While questioning "one truth", it was accepted that people can differ, express different opinions, live "their own way", create their own axiology and express it. Lack of emphasis on specific ideas (which is the credo of this cultural trend) results in differentiation of value systems (people are dissimilar in axiological terms). It becomes problematic to grasp dependencies at the level of statistical analysis. The obtained research may serve to explain smaller homogeneity of "postmodernist's" value systems by pointing that this worldview correlated (positively or negatively) only with six terminal values. The association between a large number of values and the traditionalist worldview can in turn be explained by the fact that religious institutions clearly promote and emphasize similarities among individuals functioning within a community. This encourages the emergence of homogeneous value systems.

8 Conclusions and Methodological Remarks

This study was devoted to the analysis of the relationship between three worldviews, i.e. traditionalist, modernist and postmodernist (they refer to the stages of Western culture described by Bauman), and the system of values. Values were analysed on the basis of Rokeach's theory and a research tool (RVS) developed by the author was used. The research results can be confronted with those described in an earlier publication [1]. There, Schwartz's theory of values was referred to and his

value measurement tool (PVQ-R3) was applied. Are the conclusions of the analyses in both articles compatible?

In both cases, it was found that [cf. the previous article by 1]:
• the traditionalist worldview is positively correlated with collectivist values and negatively correlated with individualist values;
• the modernist and postmodernist worldviews are positively correlated with individualistic values and negatively correlated with collectivistic values.

Despite the different way of obtaining value preference indicators, the same general conclusions can be drawn from both analyses. It should be emphasised that both tools, the RVS and the PVQ-R3, were constructed by Rokeach and Schwartz under the same theoretical assumptions: values are abstract concepts, they refer to desired goals and behaviours, they are ordered according to their relative importance and transcendent to the situation, and they guide the evaluation and selection of behaviours [4, 78]. However, the RVS and PVQ-R3 differ in the way indicators are derived. Rokeach claimed that the study of values should be based on their relative evaluation (hierarchisation). Thus, a certain number of elements – i.e. abstract concepts – should be placed inside a closed structure. Schwartz, however, abandoned the use of abstract concepts in the PVQ-R3. The respondents were asked to determine (on a scale of 1-6) to what extent they were similar to the person characterized in each statement. The assessed statements (57 in total) made it possible to identify nineteen types of values (respectively recalculated indices of 57 statements yielded indices of nineteen types of abstract values) which were located in two dimensions: openness to change – conservatism, and self-enhancement – self-transcendence [79-80]. Both the pool of values included in the RVS and the pool of value types included in the PVQ-R3 allow for selecting collectivist and individualistic values [80]. This classification makes it possible to characterize worldviews and show their axiological collectivism (traditionalist worldview) or axiological individualism (modernist and postmodernist worldview). The specifics of axiological individualism in the modernist and postmodernist worldview can also be described. However, by using the PVQ-R3, we rely on a more general model of values. The model takes into account motivational conflicts at the intraindividual, interindividual and cross-cultural levels (the system of values is seen more dynamically) and emphasises the structural organisation of value systems (identification of dimensions and types of values).

To gain a full insight into the relationship between worldview and values it is desirable to use other tools in measuring these constructs. Scheler's phenomenological approach seems particularly interesting [81]. It became an inspiration for the construction of a tool to measure values by [82-83] (Scheler's Values Scale allows for diagnosing five types of values: hedonistic, utilitarian, vital, spiritual and sacred; they have a hierarchical structure). Scheler maintained that the modern era can be characterised mainly by a change in people's attitude to values – an upheaval of values. It consisted in the degradation of higher values in favour of lower values. This approach in the interpretation of values seems to be helpful in the analysis of worldviews, especially when the emphasis is placed on their chronology. The results of this research will be presented in the next publication. It should be emphasised that the use of different tools allows for a better insight into value systems and a more complete description of them. It also makes it possible to show the worldview context of the value system.

Empirical research based on such an understood and diagnosed worldview and such understood and diagnosed values (various tools for measuring values) are not known in the literature. Their importance lies in the fact that they allow for penetrating the essence of human beliefs relating to the concept of the social world (the entire social system, as well as institutions) and the concept of human being (including the concept of one's own person), the concept of social bonds and the rules of undertaking social activity. Beliefs underlie the perception and interpretation of political and economic phenomena (which is particularly visible in the processes of political transformations), criteria of justice recognised by people (e.g. distributive justice), equity, rights, principles and forms of life (e.g. civil and political rights), traditionalism in the cultural and religious sphere. They stimulate human behaviour in various spheres – including the business sphere – which manifests itself in differentiated entrepreneurship, the need for achievement, competitiveness, tolerance for change, mental openness and emotional independence. These behaviours are more or less conducive to the economic success of societies and the development of democracy.

References:

[1] Czerniawska, M. & Szydło, J. The worldview and values – analysing relations, *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, Vol. 17, 2020, Art. #58, pp. 594-607.

[2] Bar-Tal, D. *Group beliefs. A conception for analyzing group structure, processes, and behavior*, Springer-Verlag Inc., New York 1990.

[3] Cieciuch, J. Czym jest światopogląd? Filozoficzny kontekst psychologicznego pojęcia, *Psychologia Rozwojowa*, 10(2), 2005, pp. 147-159.

[4] Rokeach, M, *The nature of human values*, Free Press, New York 1973.

[5] Rokeach, M. *Beliefs, attitudes and values*, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco 1968.

[6] Czerniawska, M. *Inteligencja a system wartości*, Trans Humana, Białystok 1995.

[7] Czerniawska, M. *Zmiany wartości i postaw młodzieży w okresie przeobrażeń ustrojowych. Kolektywizm versus indywidualizm. Studium interdyscyplinarne*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Białostockiej, Białystok 2010.

[8] Czerniawska, M. Teorie wartości Miltona Rokeacha i Shaloma H. Schwartza, *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny*, 4 (218), 2010, pp. 5-18.

[9] Borowiak, A. O czym mówimy, kiedy dyskutujemy o dyskursie postmodernistycznym?, In: *Psychologiczne studia nad językiem i dyskursem*, I. Kurcz, J. Bobryk (ed.), Wydawnictwo Instytutu Psychologii PAN i Wydawnictwo SWPS Academica, Warszawa 2001, pp. 141–175.

[10] Borowiak, A. Światopogląd postmodernistyczny a postulat tolerancji, In: *Tolerancja i wielokulturowość. Wyzwania XXI wieku*, A. Borowiak, P. Szarota (ed.), Wydawnictwo SWPS Academica, Warszawa 2004.

[11] Borowiak, A. & Golec, A. Poznawcze i światopoglądowe wyznaczniki preferencji politycznych, *Studia Psychologiczne*, 42 (2), 2004, pp. 5-16.

[12] Borowiak, A. & Szarota P. Światopogląd partnerów jako modulator miłości, *Studia Psychologiczne*, 42(3), 2004, pp. 15-26.

[13] Boski, P. *Kulturowe ramy zachowań społecznych. Podręcznik psychologii międzykulturowej*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Wydawnictwo SWPS Academica, Warszawa 2009.

[14] Karimov, A. & Kazakova, V. Perceptual Image in Worldview, *Rethinking Social Action. Core Values*, 2015, pp. 1123-1127.

[15] Lvov, A.A. Anthropological turn in worldview studies: Theoretical and practical aspects, *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta-Filosofiya i Konfliktologiya*, 36(2), 2020, pp. 279-290.

[16] Havrylenko, V.V. Human as a carrier of the worldview: individual and collective dimensions, *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 18, 2020, pp. 62-75.

[17] Schlitz, M.M., Vieten, C. & Miller, E.M. Worldview Transformation and the Development of Social Consciousness, *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 17(7-8), 2010, pp. 18-36.

[18] Manukyan, A. & Manukyan, M. Philosophical wisdom as a method of formation of worldview of an individual, *Wisdom*, 7(2), 2016, pp. 59-62.

[19] Varpio, L. & Ellaway, R.H. Shaping our worldviews: a conversation about and of theory, *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 26(1), 2021, pp. 339-345.

[20] Oesterdiekhoff, G.W. & Vonderach, G. World history and societal evolution: Historical periods and psychological stages, *Mankind Quarterly*, 61(4), 2021, pp. 820-853.

[21] Stenmark, M. Worldview studies, *Religious Studies*, 2021, pp.1-19.

[22] Ram, I.G. Management philosophy toward an ethical worldview, *Paradigm Shift in Management Philosophy: Future Challenges in Global Organizations*, 2019, pp. 155-175.

[23] Landrum, N.E. & Ohsowski, B. Identifying Worldviews on Corporate Sustainability: A Content Analysis of Corporate Sustainability Reports, *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 27(1), 2018, pp. 128-151.

[24] Walker, R.L., Alabi, D., Roberts, J. & Obasi, E. M. Ethnic Group Differences in Reasons for Living and the Moderating Role of Cultural Worldview, *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(3), 2010, pp. 372-378.

[25] Kozlova, N.V., Malkova, I.Y. & Shcheglova, M.S. Characteristics of Professional Worldview of Higher Education Students (Based on the Siberian Region), *Sibirskiy Psikhologicheskiy Zhurnal-Siberian Journal of Psychology*, 45, 2012, pp. 20-27.

Mirosława Czerniawska, Joanna Szydło

[26] Doktor, T. The "New Age" worldview of Polish students, *Social Compass*, 46(2), 1999, pp. 215-224.

[27] Van Egmond, N.D. & De Vries, H.J.M. Sustainability: The search for the integral worldview, *Futures*, 43(8), 2011, pp. 853-867.

[28] Trevino, J.G. Worldview and change in cross-cultural counseling, *Counseling Psychologist*, 24(2), 1996, pp. 198-215.

[29] Madden, B.J. Management's worldview: four critical points about reality, language, and knowledge building to improve organization performance, *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce,* 22(4), 2012, pp. 334-346.

[30] Johnson, K.A., Hill, E.D. & Cohen, A.B. Integrating the Study of Culture and Religion: Toward a Psychology of Worldview, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(3), 2011, pp. 137-152.

[31] Taylor, J.R. Communication is not neutral: "Worldview" and the science of organizational communication, *Handbook of communication in organisations and professions*, 2, 2011, pp. 103-118.

[32] Kriazh, I. Role of personal attitude in worldview formation, *Science and Education*, 1, 2015, pp. 108-114.

[33] De Kadt, M. Worldview Matters, *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 49(3), 2017, pp. 489-494.

[34] Moreno-Fernandez, F. Worldview, Discourse and Society, *Framework for Cognitive Sociolinguistics*, 2017, pp. 59-73.

[35] Kalman, C.S. What is the Students' Worldview?, *Successful science and engineering teaching: theoretical and learning perspectives, 2nd Edition*, 16, 2018, pp. 69-87.

[36] Sullivan, J. Worldview: The history of a concept, *Heythrop Journal-A Quarterly Review of Philosophy and Theology*, 46(1), 2005, pp. 96-98.

[37] Stacewicz, P. The Informational Worldview and Conceptual Apparatus, *Interdisciplinary Investigations into the Lvov-Warsaw School*, 2019, pp. 251-272.

[38] Tieku, T.K. Collectivist Worldview: Its Challenge to International Relations, *Africa and International Relations in the 21st Century*, 2012, pp. 36-50.

[39] Magee, R.G. Worldview beliefs, morality beliefs and decision-making referents: Implications for the psychology of morality and ethics instruction, *Advances in Psychology Research*, 100, 2014, pp. 1-24.

[40] Nilsson, A. Humanistic and normativistic worldviews: Distinct and hierarchically structured, *Personality and Individual Differences*, 64, 2014, pp. 135-140.

[41] Zanocco, C.M. & Jones, M.D. Cultural Worldviews and Political Process Preferences, *Social Science Quarterly*, 99(4), 2018, pp. 1377-1389.

[42] Williams, B. The worldview dimensions of individualism and collectivism: Implications for counselling, *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 81(3), 2003, pp. 370-374.

[43] Toews, J.E. Monism: Science, Philosophy, Religion, and the History of a Worldview, *Central European History*, 46(3), 2013, pp. 653-657.

[44] Savchenko, A. Sociocultural space: looking into the future, *National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*, 4, 2016, pp. 34-37.

[45] Rice, A.J., Colbow, A.J., Gibbons, S., Cederberg, C., Sahker, E., Liu, W.M. & Wurster, K. The social class worldviews of first-generation college students, *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 30(4), 2017, pp. 415-440.

[46] Vengoa, H.F. The global world. A history In conclusion: global history and contemporary worldview, *Mundo Global: Una Historia*, 2013, pp. 109-123.

[47] Czerniawska, M. & Szydło J. Conditions for Attitudes towards Native Culture, Religion and Church and Religiously Motivated Ethics, *European Research Studies Journal,* 23(4), 2020, pp.123-134.

[48] Czerniawska, M. & Szydło J. More or Less Pro-Liberal? Comparative Analysis of the Attitudes of Young People Entering the Labour Market, *European Research Studies Journal,* 23(3), 2020, pp. 564-580.

[49] Alontseva, N.V, Ermoshin, Y.A., Dugalich, N.M., Kupriyanova, M.E. & Dmitrieva, E.G. Worldview orientations of religious literature as an agent of socialization in the modern society, *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 15(3), 2019, pp. 157-166.

[50] Bawden, R. & Allenby, B. Sustainability science and the epistemic challenge: some matters philosophical and why we ought to

come to know them better, *Sustainability Science*, 12(6), 2017, pp. 901-905.

[51] Brandt, M.J. & Crawford, J.T. Worldview conflict and prejudice. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 61, 2020, pp.1-66.

[52] Fedotova, V.A. Individual values as predictors of positive or negative attitudes towards innovation among representatives of various generations of Russian people, *Psychology, Journal of the Higher School of Economics*, 14(4), 2017, pp. 717-734.

[53] Khlyscheva, E.V., Dryagalov, V.S., Topchiev, M.S., Romanova, A.P. & Bicharova, M.M. Postmodern rhizome and models of religious identity, *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 16(1), 2020, pp. 119-130.

[54] Kushkimbayeva, A., Dyussembina, G., Tutinova, N. & Khalimullina, N. The concept of people's cognitive model as a national and cultural worldview, *Opcion*, 35(22), 2019, pp. 440-453.

[55] Tang, N., Wang, Y. & Zhang, K. Values of Chinese generation cohorts: Do they matter in the workplace? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*,143, 2017, pp. 8-22.

[56] Bauman, Z. *Socjologia*, Zysk i S-ka, Poznań 1996.

[57] Bauman, Z. *Etyka ponowoczesna*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 1996.

[58] Bauman, Z. Śmierć i nieśmiertelność w ponowoczesnym świecie, In: *Humanistyka przełomu wieków*, J. Kozielecki (ed.), Wydawnictwo Akademickie Żak, Warszawa 1999, pp. 55-78.

[59] Gellner, E. *Postmodernizm, rozum i religia*, Wydawnictwo PIW, Warszawa 1997.

[60] Lyotard, J.F. *Kondycja ponowoczesna. Raport o stanie wiedzy*, Fundacja Aletheia, Warszawa 1997.

[61] Faleev A.N., Filatova M.N. & Mayer V.V. Postmodernism: Theoretical and methodological problems, *Astra Salvensis*, 2020, pp. 307-319.

[62] Kiereś, H. Kultura klasyczna wobec postmodernizmu, *Człowiek w Kulturze*, 1998.

[63] Hejnicka-Bezwińska, T. *Pedagogika ogólna*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2008.

[64] Rohan, M.J. A rose by any name? The values construct, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(3), 2000, pp. 255-277.

[65] Brzozowski, P. *Skala Wartości (SW). Polska adaptacja Value Survey M. Rokeacha*, Polskie Towarzystwo Psychologiczne, Wydział Psychologii Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa 1989.

[66] Golec de Zavala, A. & Van Bergh, A. Need for cognitive closure and conservative political beliefs: Differential mediation by personal worldviews, *Political Psychology*, 28(5), 2007, pp. 587-608.

[67] Czerniawska, M. Horyzontalna i wertykalna postać "indywidualizmu – kolektywizmu" a wartości, *Kultura – Społeczeństwo – Edukacja*, 2(18), 2020, pp. 275-291.

[68] Omar, S., Idrus, S. & Noordin, F. Individualism-Collectivism and Its Influence on Positive Organizational Behavior: An Exploratory Study, *Advanced Science Letters*, 21(5), 2015, pp. 1193-1196.

[69] Rhee, M., Alexandra, V. & Powell, K.S. Individualism-collectivism cultural differences in performance feedback theory, *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, 27(3), 2020, pp. 343-364.

[70] Topalova, V. Individualism/collectivism and social identity, *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 7(1), 1997, pp. 53-64.

[71] Zhang, C., Zhou, C.X & Liang, Z.M. The Relationship Among Individualism/Collectivism, Autonomous Motivation and Employee Creativity of Newcomers in Careers, *Proceedings of The Second Summit Forum of China's Cultural Psychology*, 2016, pp. 145-151.

[72] Hamamura, T. Are Cultures Becoming Individualistic? A Cross-Temporal Comparison of Individualism-Collectivism in the United States and Japan, *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(1), 2012, p. 3-24.

[73] Brewer, P. & Venaik, S. Individualism-Collectivism in Hofstede and GLOBE, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42(3), 2011, pp. 436-445.

[74] Vargas, J.H. & Kemmelmeier, M. Ethnicity and Contemporary American Culture: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of Horizontal-Vertical Individualism-Collectivism, *Journal of Cross-*

Cultural Psychology, 44(2), 2013, pp. 195-222.

[75] Beilmann, M., Koots-Ausmees, L. & Realo, A. The Relationship Between Social Capital and Individualism-Collectivism in Europe, Social Indicators Research, 137(2), 2018, pp. 641-664.

[76] Gardner, W.L., Reithel, B.J., Foley, R.T., Cogliser, C.C. & Walumbwa, F.O., Attraction to Organizational Culture Profiles Effects of Realistic Recruitment and Vertical and Horizontal Individualism-Collectivism, *Management Communication Quarterly*, 22(3), 2009, pp. 437-472.

[77] Binder, C.C., Redistribution and the Individualism-Collectivism Dimension of Culture, *Social Indicators Research*, 142(3), 2019, pp. 1175-1192.

[78] Schwartz S.H., Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. In: C. Seligman, J.M. Olson, M.P. Zanna (eds.), *The psychology of values: The Ontario Symposium*, Vol. 8, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. 1996.

[79] Schwartz, S.H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., Ramos, A., Verkasalo, M., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Demirutku, K., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Konty, M., Refining the Theory of Basic Individual Values, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(4), 2012, pp. 663-688.

[80] Cieciuch, J. Pomiar wartości w zmodyfikowanym modelu Shaloma Schwartza, *Psychologia Społeczna*, T. 8 1(24), 2013, pp. 22-41.

[81] Galarowicz J., *W drodze do etyki wartości. Fenomenologiczna etyka wartości*, Wydawnictwo PAT, Kraków 1997.

[82] Brzozowski P., *Skala Wartości Schelerowskich – SWS. Podręcznik*, Warszawa 1995.

[83] Brzozowski P., Uniwersalna hierarchia wartości – fakt czy fikcja?, *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, 3 (48), 2005, pp. 261-276.