Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum. 23 (S): 161 – 180 (2015)

PERTANIKA JOURNALS

SOCIAL SCIENCES & HUMANITIES

Journal homepage: http://www.pertanika.upm.edu.my/

Understanding the Individual Values of Working and Non-Working Wives in Malaysia

Dahlia Zawawi* and Samsinar Md Sidin

Faculty of Economics and Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia.

ABSTRACT

Changes in the socio-cultural environment such as the emergence of dual career for women are seen to be an influence to the values of the specified gender. Malaysian society differs from the West in terms of family composition and structure, values, norms and behaviour, which affect the role of wives. This study is considered preliminary and investigates the values of women, specifically the wives, across various areas in Peninsular Malaysia in an effort to further understand the uniqueness of this group. The methodology entails a survey approach using structured questionnaires on a sample of 1252 wives throughout Malaysia. Quota sampling was used to ensure representativeness of the Malaysian household's social diversity. Findings revealed a few similarities and also differences in terms of values between wives across the various locations and levels of education.

Keywords: Values, Malaysia, working and non-working wives

INTRODUCTION

Malaysia was inaugurated on 16 September 1963. By then, the country already had an influx of people of various origins, cultures, languages and religions. Now, Malaysia has grown to become a country with a population of more than 29 million people (The Star Online, 2014). The paper also quoted that according to the Malaysia Statistics Department's population projections, the figure will reach 38.5 million by the year 2040, comprising 19.6 million males and 19 million females.

In the past, studies done on the values in Malaysia focused mostly on the differences that might exist across countries, races, religions and genders. In

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received: 17 August 2014
Accepted: 3 December 2014

E-mail addresses:
dahlia@upm.edu.my (Dahlia Zawawi)
sms@upm.edu.my (Samsinar Md Sidin)
* Corresponding author

ISSN: 0128-7702 © Universiti Putra Malaysia Press

regards to the latter issue, psychologists are still baffled over the similarities and differences that exist between men and women (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1986; Unger, 1992). Regardless, Prince-Gibson and Schwartz (1998) continued to further understand the issue by probing into the value priorities of each gender and the definition put on the values by each gender. However, not many studies surfaced to highlight gender differences in values in detail.

In a multiracial country like Malaysia and others with similar diverse population, understanding this particular issue of values is deemed to be crucial and never ending. As such, a study should not be conducted to only see the variations across gender, but also the differences that might exist within one particular gender.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This study focused on investigating the impact of several demographic variables (specifically location of residence, monthly income and level of education) on the values among wives in various regions in Malaysia. Specifically, the study aimed to determine whether there are any significant differences in the values of the wives based on the selected demographic factors – location of residence and education. The study also compared the selected group in the context of working and non-working. It is hoped to be able to provide a better understanding on the issue of values in the context of women, in this case, the working and non-working wives across various settings and locations.

MAIN STUDIES ON CULTURE

When discussing culture in the context of Malaysia, a few major international studies that stand out include Harris and Moran (1979), Hofstede (1991), Trompenaars (1993), and the Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness (GLOBE) Study reported in Kennedy (2002). Harris and Moran (1979) intended to provide maps for geographic areas and create profiles of countries within a region. A few representative samples were chosen to explain culture specifics in terms of six major regions: North America, Latin America, Asia, Europe, the Middle East and Africa. Ten categories of cultures were identified - *sense of self and space, communication and language, dress and appearance, food and eating habits, time and time consciousness, relationships, values and norms, beliefs and attitudes, mental process and learning,* and *work habits and practices*. The study focused mainly on Malays described as not valuing the pursuit of wealth, placing more emphasis, instead, on relationships with friends and families, being hardworking and reliable. In 1980, Hofstede's emerged with his classic study of a survey conducted within 72 national subsidiaries of IBM, present in 40 countries. Carried out twice, around 1968 and 1972, the survey produced a total of 116,000 completed questionnaires. The four main dimensions revealed were *power distance*, *uncertainty* *avoidance*, *individualism/collectivism*, and *masculinity/femininity*. The results showed that Malaysians were very unequal in terms of power sharing, very flexible about the future compared to others, more focused on group relationships, and were neither tough nor soft in terms of their emotional and social roles.

Another study that utilised a vast global sample was carried out by Trompenaars (1993). The data included some 50,000 cases from over 100 countries, highlighting seven fundamental dimensions of culture: *relationships and rules* specifying *universalism/particularism, collectivism/individualism, neutral/affective, diffuse/specific,* and *achievement/ascription*; *attitudes to time*; and *attitudes to the environment*. Overall, Trompenaars suggested that Malaysia was more universalistic in its system, collectivist, affective and diffused, and that it had an ascription-oriented culture. The most recent large-scale project was conducted by GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness) (House *et al*., 2004). GLOBE's analysis of culture expanded Hofstede's (2001) five dimensions to nine societal culture dimensions. The study provided a general world map of which leadership and organisational practices matter the most and where they matter. Malaysia was also included in this study.

VALUES AMONG WOMEN

The study of values was initially sparked by the notion that an individual's personal value system would influence the person's behaviour. Values, in relation to the individuals, are often considered as 'causing' observed behaviours (Hitlin & Piliavin, 2004, p. 359). The root of value is valour (strength), which is said to be the basis of people taking action. England (1967, p. 54) defined the personal values system as a 'relatively permanent perceptual framework which shapes and influences the general nature of an individual's behaviour. Values are similar to attitudes, but are more ingrained, permanent and stable in nature.' Similarly, Rokeach (1973, p. 5 & 12) defined the system as 'an enduring organization of beliefs' that are 'general plans employed to resolve conflicts and to make decisions.'

The most extensive study so far on the main races in Malaysia regarding values was the one conducted by Abdullah (2001). Abdullah used findings obtained from a series of conferences, workshops and seminars conducted in 1990-1992 by the Malaysian Institute of Management (with sponsorship from the Konrad Adenauer Foundation) to come up with a list of ethnic values in Malaysia. The qualitative approach in this case produced a list of ethnic values specifics for the three main races – the Malays, Chinese and Indians. Based on the research, the study claimed that Malaysians can be generally described as collective (*more group-oriented*), and tended to put more importance on maintaining good relationships rather than completing satisfactory tasks (*relationship-oriented*). All of the three main ethnic groups showed respect to their elders through their speech and manners (*respect for elders*). Malaysians were, at the same time, considered very loyal with respect for their elders and managers (*loyalty*), and were very conscious of the social hierarchy in their society (*hierarchical*). They were religious, believed in religious and spiritual pursuits (*religious*), they had high needs to sustain some level of peace in any situation (*harmony*) and to preserve face whenever possible (*face-saving*).

When looking at gender, the research by Rokeach (1973) involved a representative of an American sample, where men and women were found to rank the same values as the most and least important. However, the results also revealed significant gender differences in value importance. As time passed, the study of values across gender marked a few inconsistencies. For instance, Bond (1988) discovered both the consistent and inconsistent effects of gender for the two survey instruments incorporated. In addition, gender was found to have very low correlations, indicating its minimal impact through studies done by Sagie, Kantor, Elizur and Barhoum (2005), while in the past, Beutel and Marini (1995) found evidence of important gender differences in US adolescents' value orientations. Interestingly, Fiorentine (1988) had observed that men's and women's value systems appeared to be convergent at times. In contrast, a research by Zawawi (2007) highlighted that the values of the employees in a multinational organization were not seen to be merging. Instead, the female employees continued to stick to their feminine types of values, which involved caring for humans, while the males preferred more masculine values that exhibited protection of all people and nature.

VARIATIONS OF VALUES ACROSS WIVES

Studies done on gender differences were largely waived in the past. Most studies either did not consider gender as a variable of interest or excluded female subjects in the framework. The later years reported a lesser number of studies identifying the differences among gender across values. In addition, studies done on wives were also found to be quite scarce. The current research done on wives seemed to focus on other management issues apart from values such as decision making (e.g., De & Moharana, 2010), family contributions (e.g., Tao, 2013; Zhang & Tsang, 2012), and work life balance (e.g., *Aryee* et al., 2005). In terms of values, very few studies looked specifically on the issues of wives. A study by Jalilvand (2000) indicated that lower income husbands tended to allow a higher proportion of wives in the labour force. The reason for this was due to them not being able to provide fully for the family. This particular study had proposed that working women appeared to have a personal value structure different from that of non-working women. Spranger's (1928) classification of six major groups of value orientations was tested, i.e.: i) the theoretical; ii) the economic; iii) the aesthetic; iv) the social; v) the political;

and vi) the religious. He discovered that the working and non-working wives had similar rankings of personal values, except that the aesthetic and social values were discovered to be inverted between the two groups. In addition, the relative importance of the above highlighted six personal values was also discovered to differ significantly for both groups of wives (Spranger, 1928). To the author's knowledge, there are not many recent studies conducted to look into the variations across gender in relation to values, and even lesser in terms of the segmentation of each gender.

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Past studies looked at the differences between genders, while some had moved further to investigate the issues of personal values among women only (e.g., Jalilvand, 2000; Sagie *et al*., 2005; Zawawi, 2007). This study therefore intended to understand the latter issues better by testing various demographic impacts on both the working and non-working wives specifically by location of residence and level of education. Based on the main objective of this study, the following hypotheses were proposed and tested.

H_1: *Values differed based on demographic differences.*

H_{1a}: *Values differed based on location of residence of the wives.*

H_{1b}: *Values differed based on education of the wives.*

The sample covered 1252 working and non-working wives of Malaysian families.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a quantitative method where five major cities in Malaysia were selected as the study locations, representing a number of regions in Malaysia. A total of 1252 wives participated in the study, residing in the five major urban cities of Kuala Lumpur, Kuantan, Johor Bahru, Penang and Kota Kinabalu. The first four cities were chosen to represent the west, east, south, and north areas of Peninsular Malaysia, while Kota Kinabalu was meant to represent the East Malaysia. The urban cities were selected as they represented the selected regions in Malaysia with ethnic, income and social composition diversities. Quota sampling is a non-probability sampling technique wherein the assembled sample has the same proportions of individuals as the entire population with respect to known characteristics, traits or focused phenomenon. This method of sampling was adopted on the basis of ethnicity, region and occupation (working and nonworking wives) to ensure the representativeness of the Malaysian household's social diversity in an urban setting.

One of the most replicated questionnaires adopted on values was developed by Rokeach (1967; 1973) called the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS). The RVS contains two sets of values: goals (terminal values) and modes of conducts (instrumental values). Other than the RVS, a series of large scale studies of values undertaken by Schwartz (1992, 1994) proposed ten motivational *individual-level value types,* which were Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-direction, Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, Conformity and Security. Later, Schwartz also proposed several *cultural-level value types* which are Conservatism versus Intellectual and Affective Autonomy; Hierarchy versus Egalitarianism; and Mastery versus Harmony. National cultures were able to be compared by the poles of this theory. For this particular research, the Values Survey (Schwartz, 1992) was applied. The instrument comprises of questions general enough to be understood by ordinary people and to cover a wide range of values. Ten individual values were derived from these requirements: Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-direction, Universalism, Benevolence, Tradition, Conformity and Security. The explanations of the individual values are stated in Table 1. Examples of the list of values are 'self-respect (belief in one's own worth),' and 'daring (seeking adventure, risk).' A 9-point Likert scale ranging from -1 (opposed to my values) to 7 (of supreme importance) was used in the study. The scale of -1 was used due to the understanding that the respondents might be opposed of a value instead of merely not adopting it. The questionnaire was obtained directly from the authors, along with the instructions and explanations. The measurement was chosen due to its wide compilations of values that might be relevant to the respondents. The questionnaire had been translated into English and then translated back to the Malay language to maximise the understanding of the items by the respondents. The pre-testing recorded the instrument to have an alpha of 0.967, indicating that it is reliable.

TABLE 1
Definitions of Schwartz's Individual Values

INDIVIDUAL VALUE TYPES
POWER: Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources (Social Power, Authority, Wealth). **ACHIEVEMENT**: Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards (Successful, Capable, Ambitious, Influential). **HEDONISM**: Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself (Pleasure, Enjoying Life). **STIMULATION**: Excitement, novelty and challenge in life (Daring, a Varied Life, an Exciting Life). **SELF-DIRECTION**: Independent thought and action-choosing, creating, exploring (Creativity, Freedom, Independent, Curious, Choosing own Goals). **UNIVERSALISM**: Understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature (Broadminded, Wisdom, Social Justice, Equality, A World at Peace, a World of Beauty, Unity with Nature, Protecting the Environment). **BENEVOLENCE**: Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact (Helpful, Honest, Forgiving, Loyal, Responsible). **TRADITION**: Respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provides (Humble, Accepting my Portion in Life, Devout, Respect for Tradition, Moderate). **CONFORMITY**: Restraint of actions, inclinations and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms (Politeness, Obedient, Self-discipline, Honouring Parents and Elders). **SECURITY**: Safety, harmony and stability of society, of relationships, and of self (Family Security, National Security, Social Order, Clean, Reciprocation of Favours).

Sources: Schwartz, S. 1994. Are there Universal Aspects in the Structure and Contents of Human Values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50*(4), 19-45.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The demographic profile of the respondents is shown in Table 2. In terms of the age, 67 per cent were above 40 years of age, while another 21 per cent were between 41-50 years of age. Only 12 per cent have reached the age of 51 years and above. In terms of the respondents' racial background, 59 per cent are Malays, 27 per cent Chinese, and 10 per cent Indians. Consistent with the race allocations, 62 per cent of the respondents are Muslims, 21 per cent are Buddhists, another 9 percent Christians, and the remaining 7 per cent Hindus. Out of the total respondents, 43.6 per cent are non-working wives, 54 per cent are considered to be working wives. In addition, 0.7 per cent and 1.7 percent were in the group of students and retirees, respectively. Almost similarly, 40.4 per cent were reported to earn no income with the rest of the respondents stating otherwise. All of the respondents have received a certain level of education in the past, where 42.3 per cent have an education of SPM and equivalent; 12 per cent with STPM qualification and equivalent; 20.6 per cent have a Diploma and equivalent; 16.2 per cent have a Bachelor degree and equivalent; 3.1 per cent have a Masters or PhD; and 5.8 per cent stated Others. Finally, the majority used the Malay language as the language spoken at home (61 per cent), while 11.3 per cent highlighted English as the main language spoken at home.

TABLE 2
Profile of the respondents

Demographic Variable		Frequency	Percent
Age	21-30 years	376	30
	31-40 years	460	37
	41-50 years	262	21
	51-60 years	145	11
	More than 60 years	7	1
Ethnicity	Malay	734	59
	Chinese	338	27
	Indian	123	10
	Others	56	4
Religion	Islam	777	62
	Buddhism	256	21
	Christianity	112	9
	Hinduism	92	7
	Others	14	1

Occupation	Management	155	12.4
	Professional	145	11.6
	Clerical	233	18.6
	Entrepreneur	56	4.5
	Retired	21	1.7
	Housewife	546	43.6
	Student	9	0.7
	Others	86	6.9
Monthly Income	No income	506	40.4
	Less than RM1000	100	8
	RM1001-RM5000	531	42.4
	RM5001-RM10000	98	7.8
	RM10001-RM15000	13	1
	More than RM20000	4	0.4
Education	SPM or equivalent	527	42.3
	STPM or equivalent	150	12
	Diploma or equivalent	256	20.6
	Bachelor degree or equivalent	202	16.2
	Masters or PhD	39	3.1
	Others	72	5.8
Spoken Language at Home	Malay	754	61
	Chinese	248	20.1
	Tamil	83	6.7
	English	139	11.3
	Others	11	0.9

Schwartz's Values and Location of Residence

To determine if there are significant differences between individual Schwartz's values and the location of residence, ANOVA was performed wherein, each of the 10 individual levels of Schwartz's values served as the dependent variable and "area" served as the factor variable. Each individual level value was computed as a sum of each respondent's total score. The ANOVA result is shown in Table 3 and the subsequent post-hoc analysis in Table 4. The mean values based on the location of residence are shown in Table 5 and the mean plots from Figures 1 to

10. The results of the ANOVA analysis in Table 3 indicates that there are significant differences for each of the 10 individual Schwartz's values ($p < 0.001$) based on the location of residence.

The post-hoc analysis in Table 4 shows that significant differences exist between the respondents in the five different areas of data collection for each individual Schwartz's value. These differences are further discussed in conjunction with Table 5 and Figures 1 to 10. Table 5, which gives the mean of Schwartz's values based on the location of residence and the mean plots from Figures 1 to 10, provides the structure or nature of the differences that exists between the ten individual Schwartz's values.

TABLE 3
The ANOVA results of Schwartz's values by location of residence

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Conformity	Between Groups	592.918	4	148.230	32.567	.000
	Within Groups	5675.775	1247	4.552		
	Total	6268.693	1251			
Tradition	Between Groups	542.346	4	135.586	17.680	.000
	Within Groups	9563.146	1247	7.669		
	Total	10105.491	1251			
Benevolence	Between Groups	747.746	4	186.937	24.420	.000
	Within Groups	9545.692	1247	7.655		
	Total	10293.438	1251			
Universalism	Between Groups	1738.304	4	434.576	20.544	.000
	Within Groups	26377.715	1247	21.153		
	Total	28116.019	1251			
Self-Direction	Between Groups	415.460	4	103.865	12.408	.000
	Within Groups	10438.054	1247	8.371		
	Total	10853.514	1251			
Stimulation	Between Groups	468.981	4	117.245	27.489	.000
	Within Groups	5318.655	1247	4.265		
	Total	5787.636	1251			
Hedonism	Between Groups	217.149	4	54.287	12.678	.000
	Within Groups	5339.620	1247	4.282		
	Total	5556.769	1251			
Achievement	Between Groups	508.089	4	127.022	22.563	.000
	Within Groups	7020.320	1247	5.630		
	Total	7528.409	1251			
Power	Between Groups	467.307	4	116.827	21.965	.000
	Within Groups	6632.441	1247	5.319		
	Total	7099.748	1251			
Security	Between Groups	767.862	4	191.966	28.461	.000
	Within Groups	8410.956	1247	6.745		
	Total	9178.818	1251			

TABLE 4
The post-hoc analysis of Schwartz's values by location of residence

Dependent Variable	(I) Location of residence	(J) Location of residence	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Conformity	Klang Valley	Johor Bahru	-1.34821*	.19063	.000	-1.8690	-.8274
		Penang	-.62421*	.19063	.010	-1.1450	-.1034
		Kuantan	-1.58676*	.19082	.000	-2.1080	-1.0655
		Kota Kinabalu	-1.89265*	.19025	.000	-2.4124	-1.3729
	Penang	Johor Bahru	-.72400*	.19082	.001	-1.2453	-.2027
		Kuantan	-.96255*	.19101	.000	-1.4844	-.4408
		Kota Kinabalu	-1.26844*	.19044	.000	-1.7887	-.7482
	Kota Kinabalu	Johor Bahru	.54444*	.19044	.035	.0242	1.0647
Tradition	Klang Valley	Johor Bahru	-1.47939*	.24745	.000	-2.1554	-.8034
		Kuantan	-.72168*	.24769	.030	-1.3983	-.0450
		Kota Kinabalu	-1.78235*	.24695	.000	-2.4570	-1.1077
	Johor Bahru	Penang	1.03200*	.24769	.000	.3554	1.7086
		Kuantan	.75772*	.24794	.019	.0804	1.4350
	Kota Kinabalu	Penang	1.33495*	.24720	.000	.6597	2.0102
		Kuantan	1.06067*	.24745	.000	.3847	1.7366
Benevolence	Klang Valley	Johor Bahru	-1.43477*	.24722	.000	-2.1101	-.7594
		Penang	-.70277*	.24722	.037	-1.3781	-.0274
		Kuantan	-1.57183*	.24747	.000	-2.2479	-.8958
		Kota Kinabalu	-2.24725*	.24673	.000	-2.9213	-1.5732
	Penang	Johor Bahru	-.73200*	.24747	.026	-1.4080	-.0560
		Kuantan	-.86906*	.24771	.004	-1.5458	-.1924
		Kota Kinabalu	-1.54448*	.24697	.000	-2.2192	-.8698
	Kota Kinabalu	Kuantan	.67542*	.24722	.050	.0001	1.3508
Universalism	Klang Valley	Johor Bahru	-3.29606*	.41096	.000	-4.4187	-2.1734
		Penang	-2.56806*	.41096	.000	-3.6907	-1.4454
		Kuantan	-2.17282*	.41137	.000	-3.2966	-1.0490
		Kota Kinabalu	-3.06740*	.41014	.000	-4.1878	-1.9470
Self-Direction	Klang Valley	Johor Bahru	-1.31713*	.25852	.000	-2.0233	-.6109
		Penang	-1.22113*	.25852	.000	-1.9273	-.5149
		Kota Kinabalu	-1.51872*	.25800	.000	-2.2235	-.8139
	Kuantan	Johor Bahru	-.84900*	.25903	.009	-1.5566	-.1414
		Penang	-.75300*	.25903	.030	-1.4606	-.0454
		Kota Kinabalu	-1.05058*	.25852	.000	-1.7568	-.3444

Dependent Variable	(I) Location of residence	(J) Location of residence	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Stimulation	Klang Valley	Johor Bahru	-1.64163*	.18454	.000	-2.1457	-1.1375
		Penang	-1.18163*	.18454	.000	-1.6857	-.6775
		Kota Kinabalu	-1.34363*	.18417	.000	-1.8467	-.8405
	Kuantan	Johor Bahru	-1.22872*	.18490	.000	-1.7338	-.7236
		Penang	-.76872*	.18490	.000	-1.2738	-.2636
		Kota Kinabalu	-.93072*	.18454	.000	-1.4348	-.4266
Hedonism	Johor Bahru	Klang Valley	1.00285*	.18490	.000	.4978	1.5080
		Penang	.56400*	.18508	.020	.0584	1.0696
		Kuantan	1.21801*	.18527	.000	.7119	1.7241
		Kota Kinabalu	.72790*	.18472	.001	.2233	1.2325
	Penang	Kuantan	.65401*	.18527	.004	.1479	1.1601
Achievement	Klang Valley	Johor Bahru	-1.56112*	.21201	.000	-2.1403	-.9820
		Penang	-.94112*	.21201	.000	-1.5203	-.3620
		Kuantan	-.94602*	.21222	.000	-1.5258	-.3663
		Kota Kinabalu	-1.84810*	.21159	.000	-2.4261	-1.2701
	Johor Bahru	Penang	.62000*	.21222	.029	.0403	1.1997
		Kuantan	.61510*	.21243	.031	.0348	1.1954
	Kota Kinabalu	Penang	.90698*	.21180	.000	.3284	1.4856
		Kuantan	.90208*	.21201	.000	.3229	1.4813
Power	Klang Valley	Johor Bahru	-1.604159*	.206070	.000	-2.16710	-1.04122
		Penang	-1.148159*	.206070	.000	-1.71110	-.58522
		Kota Kinabalu	-.983969*	.205660	.000	-1.54579	-.42215
	Johor Bahru	Kota Kinabalu	.620190*	.205866	.022	.05781	1.18257
	Kuantan	Johor Bahru	-1.459261*	.206483	.000	-2.02333	-.89520
		Penang	-1.003261*	.206483	.000	-1.56733	-.43920
		Kota Kinabalu	-.839071*	.206074	.000	-1.40202	-.27612
Security	Klang Valley	Johor Bahru	-2.15645*	.23206	.000	-2.7904	-1.5225
		Penang	-1.68845*	.23206	.000	-2.3224	-1.0545
		Kuantan	-1.77198*	.23229	.000	-2.4066	-1.1374
		Kota Kinabalu	-2.02337*	.23160	.000	-2.6560	-1.3907

TABLE 5
The mean values of Schwartz's values based on location of residence

	Klang Valley	Johor Bahru	Penang	Kuantan	Kota Kinabalu
Conformity	16.05	17.40	16.68	17.64	17.94
Tradition	18.85	20.33	19.30	19.57	20.63
Benevolence	19.69	21.13	20.40	21.27	21.94
Universalism	30.02	33.31	32.58	32.19	33.08
Self-Direction	19.28	20.60	20.50	19.75	20.80
Stimulation	10.41	12.05	11.59	10.82	11.75
Hedonism	10.71	11.72	11.15	10.50	10.99
Achievement	15.28	16.84	16.22	16.22	17.13
Power	56.04	57.64	57.19	56.18	57.02
Security	19.11	21.27	20.80	20.88	21.13

The mean values of Conformity by location in Table 5 show that the respondents in Kota Kinabalu scored the highest (17.94), whilst those in the Klang valley scored the lowest (16.05). The post-hoc analysis in Table 4 indicates that significant differences exist between the respondents in the Klang Valley and the respondents from the other areas of data collection; the respondents in Johor Bahru have significant differences with those in Kota Kinabalu; and the Penang respondents also have significant differences with the respondents from Johor Bahru, Kuantan and Kota Kinabalu.

The information in Table 5 regarding Tradition shows that once again, the respondents in the Klang Valley scored the lowest (18.85), whilst those in Kota Kinabalu scored the highest (20.63). The post-hoc analysis in Table 4 reveals that the respondents in the Klang Valley have significant differences with the respondents from Johor Bahru, Kuantan and Kota Kinabalu; the respondents in Johor Bahru have significant differences with those from Penang and Kuantan; and the respondents in Kota Kinabalu have significant differences with those from Penang and Kuantan.

The data in Table 5 show that the respondents in the Klang Valley scored the lowest (19.69) and those in Kota Kinabalu scored the highest (21.94) in terms of Benevolence. The post-hoc analysis in Table 4 shows that significant differences exist between the respondents in the Klang Valley and the respondents from the other locations of the data collection; the respondents in Penang and those from Johor Bahru, Kuantan and Kota Kinabalu and the respondents in Kota Kinabalu have significant differences with those from Kuantan.

The mean values in Table 5 show that for Universalism, respondents in Johor Bahru have the highest (33.31) scores and those in the Klang Valley have the lowest (30.02) scores. The post-hoc analysis in Table 4 reveals that significant differences exist between the respondents in the Klang Valley and the other four locations of the data collection.

With regards to Self-Direction, the information in Table 5 shows that the respondents in the Klang Valley scored the lowest (19.28) whilst those from Kota Kinabalu scored the highest (20.80). The post hoc results in Table 4 show that there are significant differences between the respondents in the Klang Valley and those from Johor Bahru, Penang and Kota Kinabalu. Likewise, there are significant differences between the respondents in Kuantan and those from Johor Bahru, Penang and Kota Kinabalu.

In the case of the Stimulation aspect of Schwartz's values, the mean values in Table 5 show that the Johor Bahru respondents have the highest (12.05) score and the Klang Valley respondents have the lowest (10.41) score. The post-hoc analysis shown in Table 4 reveals that the respondents in the Klang Valley have significant differences with the respondents from Johor Bahru, Penang and Kota Kinabalu. Similarly, the respondents in Kuantan have significant differences with the respondents from Johor Bahru, Penang and Kota Kinabalu.

As for the Hedonism aspect of Schwartz's values, the information in Table 5 shows that the Kuantan respondents have the lowest (10.50) score and the Johor Bahru respondents have the highest (11.72) score. Meanwhile, the post-hoc analysis in Table 4 indicates that the respondents in Johor Bahru have significant differences with the respondents from the other four areas of the data collection. It is also shown that there are significant differences between the respondents from Penang and Kuantan.

The information in Table 5 shows that the respondents in Kota Kinabalu scored the highest (17.13) and those in the Klang Valley scored the lowest (15.28) in term of Achievement. The post-hoc results in Table 4 show that the respondents in the Klang valley have significant differences with the respondents from the other four areas of the data collection; the Johor Bahru respondents have significant differences with the respondents from Penang and Kuantan; and the respondents in Kota Kinabalu have significant differences with the respondents from Penang and Kuantan.

The mean values in Table 5 show that for the Power aspect of Schwartz's values, the Johor Bahru respondents scored the highest (57.64) scores and those in the Klang Valley the lowest (56.04). The post-hoc results in Table 4 show that the Klang valley respondents have significant differences with those in Johor Bahru, Penang and Kota Kinabalu; there are significant differences between the respondents in Johor Bahru and those in Kota Kinabalu, and there are significant differences between the respondents in Kuantan and those from Johor Bahru, Penang and Kota Kinabalu.

In terms of Security, the mean values in Table 5 show that the Klang Valley respondents have the lowest (19.11) score and those in Johor Bahru scored the highest

(21.27). The post-hoc analysis in Table 4 indicates that the respondents in the Klang Valley have significant differences with the respondents from the other four areas of the data collection.

Schwartz's Values and Educational Level of Respondents

ANOVA was conducted to identify any significant differences in the individual Schwartz's values based on the level of education of the respondents. The ANOVA results shown in Table 6 indicate that only Hedonism (p = 0.005) has significant differences based on the respondents' level of education. The post-hoc analysis is shown in Table 7, and the mean values in Table 8.

TABLE 6
The ANOVA result of Schwartz's values based on the respondents' level of education

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Conformity	Between Groups Within Groups Total	26.579 6235.277 6261.856	5 1240 1245	5.316 5.028	1.057	.383
Tradition	Between Groups Within Groups Total	74.901 10005.103 10080.004	5 1240 1245	14.980 8.069	1.857	.099
Benevolence	Between Groups Within Groups Total	18.917 10270.441 10289.358	5 1240 1245	3.783 8.283	.457	.809
Universalism	Between Groups Within Groups Total	59.220 27947.133 28006.353	5 1240 1245	11.844 22.538	.526	.757
Self-Direction	Between Groups Within Groups Total	42.858 10784.686 10827.544	5 1240 1245	8.572 8.697	.986	.425
Stimulation	Between Groups Within Groups Total	46.963 5717.181 5764.144	5 1240 1245	9.393 4.611	2.037	.071
Hedonism	Between Groups Within Groups Total	75.263 5462.477 5537.740	5 1240 1245	15.053 4.405	3.417	.005
Achievement	Between Groups Within Groups Total	18.699 7466.698 7485.397	5 1240 1245	3.740 6.022	.621	.684
Power	Between Groups Within Groups Total	42.800 7019.121 7061.921	5 1240 1245	8.560 5.661	1.512	.183
Security	Between Groups Within Groups Total	27.057 9116.975 9144.032	5 1240 1245	5.411 7.352	.736	.596

TABLE 7
The post-hoc analysis of Schwartz's values based on the respondents' level of education

Dependent variable	(I) Education Level	(J) Education Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Hedonism	STPM or equivalent	Diploma or equivalent	-.79021*	.216	.0036	-1.4062	-0.1742348

TABLE 8
The mean values based on the respondents' level of education

	SPM or equivalent	STPM or equivalent	Diploma or equivalent	Bachelor degree or equivalent	Masters or PhD	Others
Conformity	17.22	17.11	17.11	16.95	17.74	16.99
Tradition	19.97	19.56	19.53	19.42	20.26	19.72
Benevolence	20.99	20.83	20.73	20.82	21.26	20.78
Universalism	32.37	31.93	32.29	32.01	32.85	31.86
Self-Direction	20.16	20.15	20.23	20.16	21.10	19.83
Stimulation	11.43	11.11	11.36	11.10	12.03	11.04
Hedonism	10.96	10.51	11.30	11.11	11.56	10.89
Achievement	16.35	16.39	16.41	16.29	16.62	15.90
Power	56.87	56.71	56.95	56.74	57.05	56.15
Security	20.61	20.65	20.70	20.59	21.36	20.38

The mean values in Table 8 show that the respondents with Masters or PhD qualifications scored the highest (11.56), while thosewith STPM or equivalent qualification scored the lowest (10.51). The post-hoc results in Table 7 reveal that there are significant differences between the respondents with STPM or equivalent qualifications and the respondents with Diploma or equivalent qualifications.

Schwartz Values and Working and Non-working Wives

The ANOVA analysis of the Schwartz values by wives' working status shown in Table 9 indicates that Tradition is the only significant individual Schwartz value with regards to the respondent's status as a housewife or not. The mean values are shown in Table 10.

TABLE 9
The ANOVA result of Schwartz's values by wives' working status

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Conformity	Between Groups	4.365	1	4.365	.872	.351
	Within Groups	6254.447	1249	5.008		
	Total	6258.812	1250			
Tradition	Between Groups	65.610	1	65.610	8.180	.004
	Within Groups	10017.437	1249	8.020		
	Total	10083.047	1250			
Benevolence	Between Groups	6.106	1	6.106	.744	.389
	Within Groups	10252.671	1249	8.209		
	Total	10258.777	1250			
Universalism	Between Groups	4.626	1	4.626	.206	.650
	Within Groups	28093.432	1249	22.493		
	Total	28098.058	1250			
Self-Direction	Between Groups	1.510	1	1.510	.174	.677
	Within Groups	10841.830	1249	8.680		
	Total	10843.340	1250			
Stimulation	Between Groups	.986	1	.986	.213	.644
	Within Groups	5775.600	1249	4.624		
	Total	5776.587	1250			
Hedonism	Between Groups	15.415	1	15.415	3.475	.063
	Within Groups	5540.326	1249	4.436		
	Total	5555.741	1250			
Achievement	Between Groups	.539	1	.539	.090	.765
	Within Groups	7509.031	1249	6.012		
	Total	7509.570	1250			
Power	Between Groups	.217	1	.217	.038	.845
	Within Groups	7084.955	1249	5.673		
	Total	7085.172	1250			
Security	Between Groups	20.279	1	20.279	2.770	.096
	Within Groups	9145.286	1249	7.322		
	Total	9165.565	1250			

TABLE 10
The mean values by wives' working status

	Housewife	Non-Housewife
Conformity	17.08	17.20
Tradition	19.99	19.53
Benevolence	20.81	20.95
Universalism	32.17	32.29
Self-Direction	20.15	20.22
Stimulation	11.36	11.30
Hedonism	10.89	11.11
Achievement	16.32	16.36
Power	56.80	56.83
Security	20.50	20.76

The mean values in Table 10 show that the non-working wives have the highest (19.99) score.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As stated in the beginning, this study is still in its preliminary stage. Knowing that similarities or differences exist among wives should open other opportunities for future research. Based on the results discussed previously, the findings of this study can be summarised as below:

1. There is a significant difference in the personal values of wives based on the different locations of residence in Malaysia.
2. There is a significant difference in personal values of wives based on the education level.
3. Personal values are different between working and non-working wives.

The major findings of this study highlighted the impact of location to the values possessed by the working and non-working wives in Malaysia. For example, the respondents in Kota Kinabalu seemed to value Conformity (politeness, obedience, self-discipline, honouring parents and elders) as opposed to the ones in the Klang Valley. Similar situations are apparent for the values of Tradition (humble, accepting portion of life, devout, respect for tradition, moderate), Benevolence (helpful, honest, forgiving, loyal, responsible), Self-Direction (creativity, freedom, independence, curiosity, choosing own goals), and Achievement (successful, capable, ambitious, influential). On the other hand, the respondents from Johor Bahru scored the highest in the values of Universalism (broadmindedness, wisdom, social justice, equality, a world at peace, a world of beauty, unity with nature, protecting the environment), Stimulation (daring, a varied and exciting life), Power (social power, authority, wealth), and Security (family security, national security, social order, clean, reciprocation of favours). As for the value of Hedonism (pleasure, enjoying life), the highest score was obtained by the respondents from Johor Bahru, but the lowest score went to the respondents from Kuantan. These findings highlighted that the respondents living in the Klang Valley seemed to be lowest in almost all the values, except for Hedonism. The situation may reflect the fact that many residents in the Klang Valley are from other parts of the country and this might therefore cause a dilution on the values held by them.

In addition, the relationship between Schwartz's values and the level of education is only significant for the value of Hedonism. Here, the respondents with Masters or PhD qualifications scored the highest, while the respondents with STPM or equivalent qualifications scored the lowest. Hedonism highlighted the fact that the former group seems to be more prone to pleasure and enjoyment of life.

Apart from the above findings, the working and non-working wives were found to be significantly different in the values of Tradition, where the latter reported the higher score. Non-working wives are seen to be more prone to being humble and devout, moderate, have more respect for traditions, and are more receptive of their lifestyle.

Overall, this study found that the values of working and non-working wives vary with certain demographic variables, especially the location of residence and the level of education. However, the findings should be interpreted with caution as the sample was taken from urban settings, and may not be reflective of the population in Malaysia in general. Future research is recommended to investigate the variations of values involving working and non-working wives from the other regions of Malaysia, and to include substantial respondents from the non-urban setting.

In conclusion, this study has shown that certain demographic variables, specifically the location of residence and the education level, are able to influence the type of values held by the working and non-working wives. Thus, the study has extended the understanding on past literatures (e.g., Jalilvand, 2000; Spranger, 1928) on these two groups, and further highlighted the differences of values that exist among women.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research is supported by Universiti Putra Malaysia under Research University Grant Scheme (Project Number 06-05-10-1100RU).

REFERENCES

Abdullah, A. (2001). Influence of Ethnic Values at the Malaysian Workplace. In A. Abdullah & A. Low (Eds.), *Understanding the Malaysian Workforce: Guidelines for Managers* (pp. 1-24). Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Institute of Management.

Aryee, S., Srinivas, E. S., & Tan, H. H. (2005). Rhythms of life: antecedents and outcomes of work-family balance in employed parents. *Journal of applied psychology*, *90*(1), 132-146.

Beutel, A. M., & Marini, M. M. (1995). Gender and Values. *American Sociological Review*, *60*, 436-448.

Bond, M. (1988). Finding Universal Dimensions of Individual Variation in Multicultural Studies of Values: The Rokeach and Chinese Value Surveys. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *25*, 1009-1015.

De, T., & Moharana, S. (2010). Influence of Working Wives in Family Financial Decision-Making and Consumption Process—Implication for Marketing Strategy. *Management Megatrends,* 117-126.

England, G. W. (1967). Personal Values Systems of American Managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, *10*(1), 53-68

Fiorentine, R. (1988). Increasing Similarity in the Values and Life Plans of Male and Female College Students? Evidence and Implications. *Sex Roles*, *18*, 143-158.

Hare-Mustin, R. T., & Marecek, J. (1986). Autonomy and Gender: Some Questions for Therapists. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *23*(2), 205-212.

Harris, P. R., & Moran, R. T. (1979). *Managing Cultural Differences* (4 ed.). London: Gulf Publishing Company.

Hitlin, S., & Piliavin, J. A. (2004). Values: Reviving a Dormant Concept. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *30*, 359-393.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Culture and Organisations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Jalilvand, M. (2000). Married Women, Work and Values. *Monthly Labor Review*, August, 26-31.

Kanyakumari, D. (2014, February 26). Malaysia's population to number 30 million on Thursday. *The Star Online*. Retrieved July 8, 2014, from http://www.thestar.com.my/News/Nation/2014/02/26/Malaysia-30-mil-population.

Kennedy, J. C. (2002). Leadership in Malaysia: Traditional Values, International Outlook. *Academy of Management Executive*, *16*(3), 15-26.

Prince-Gibson, E., & Schwartz, S. H. (1998). Value Priorities and Gender. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *61*(1), 49-67.

Rokeach, M. (1967). *Value Survey*. Sunnyvale: Halgren Tests.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press.

Sagie, A., Kantor, J., Elizur, D., & Barhoum, M. I. (2005). A Cross-cultural Investigation of Personal Values: The Israeli-Palestinian Case. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *2,* 148-157.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. In M. P. Zann (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. Boston: Academic Press.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there Universal Aspects in the Structure and Contents of Human Values? *Journal of Social Issues*, *50*(4), 19-45.

Spranger, E. (1928). *Types of Men*. Halle, Germany: Max Niemeyer Verlag. Translation by Paul J.W. Pigors. 1966. New York: Johnson Reprint Company.

Tao, H. L. (2013). Informational Ambiguity and Survey Bias: Husbands' and Wives' Reports on Their Contribution to Their Families. *Social Indicators Research*, *111*, 713–724.

Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Unger, R. K. (1992). Will the Real Sex Difference Please Stand Up? *Feminism and Psychology*, *2*, 231-238.

Zawawi, D. (2007). *Values and Performance: A Malaysian Study*. Unpublished PhD Thesis University of Reading.

Zhang, H., & Tsang, S. K. M. (2012). Wives' Relative Income and Marital Quality in Urban China: The Role of Perceived Equity. *Social Justice Research*, *25*, 406–420.