

## **Interplay between Subjective Wellbeing and Personality Values' Becoming**

*Lyudmyla Romanyuk,*

*Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine*

*Radosveta Dimitrova,*

*Stockholm University, Sweden*

*Ognen Spasovski,*

*Ss Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Macedonia*

*This paper investigated relations of personality values and subjective well-being. We examined how values influence life satisfaction of 234 Macedonian and 230 Ukrainian young adults who provided data on personality values (PVQ, Schwartz, 1994) and life satisfaction (Diener et al., 1985). Hypothesized direct relations of types of values to well-being based on “healthy” (self-direction, stimulation, achievement, benevolence, universalism) and “unhealthy” (power, security, conformity, tradition) values were tested in each sample. Results showed that a) Ukrainians compared to their Macedonian peers reported higher scores on all values except for power; b) conformity and security values correlated with well-being, as predicted, but only in the Macedonian sample. Results partly supported our hypotheses regarding the values conducive to well-being among students in both countries. Findings are discussed in terms of values' influence for well-being of youth in Macedonian and Ukrainian contexts.*

## *Introduction*

This paper investigates personality values underlying life satisfaction in Macedonian and Ukrainian students. We use Schwartz's (1992) theory of universals and structure of basic values, defined as desirable goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in people's lives. Thus, values are socially approved verbal representations of basic motivations (Schwartz, 1992). Schwartz proposed ten distinct types of values (self-direction, stimulation, achievement, benevolence, hedonism, universalism, power, security, conformity, and tradition) deemed to be comprehensive antecedents of motivations common to people across cultures. Extant research has provided considerable support for this theory (Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995) but their relation to well-being is less studied (Romanyuk, 2013). In fact, very few studies have taken in consideration the relationship between values and well-being and specifically in cross-national comparisons (Sagiv & Schwartz, 2000). Therefore, investigating these types of values allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between motivational antecedents and psychological well-being across various cultural groups. To this end, we present in this article a comparative perspective of the relationships between values and well-being by extending the available research in Macedonia and Ukraine.

This paper is based on the Schwartz's values model that provides insights into underlying processes of positive/negative influence of values on well-being in terms of life satisfaction. The model distinguishes ten basic values grouped in four dimensions: self-direction, stimulation (Openness to Change), achievement, power, hedonism (Self-Enhancement), security, conformity (Conservation) and benevolence, universalism, tradition (Self-Transcendence). Drawing on the conceptual model, this article addresses two research questions: (1) Are there group differences in personality values and life satisfaction between Macedonian and Ukrainian groups? (2) What is the relationship between personality values and well-being? In addressing these relevant issues, this article adds to the increasingly growing research and attention to rapidly changing Eastern European regions, while also providing an important addition to relatively small body of work using cross-national comparisons in these areas.

### *Personality Values and Well-Being*

As already mentioned in the introduction, we have based our approach on the Schwartz's (1992) theory of basic values (self-direction, stimulation, achievement, benevolence, hedonism, universalism, power, security, conformity, tradition). In the following, we give a brief definition of each value as to provide a more comprehensive understanding of their relationship to well-being in support of our comparative approach in Macedonia and Ukraine.

*Self-direction* regards independent thought and action derived from basic needs for control (Bandura, 1977; Deci, 1975) as well as autonomy and independence (Kluckhohn, 1951; Kohn & Schooler, 1983; Morris, 1956). *Stimulation* concerns excitement, novelty, and challenge derived mainly from the need to maintain an optimal level of activation and general functioning (Berlyne, 1960). *Hedonism* is defined as pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself. Hedonism values derive from needs for pleasure and the gratifications associated with satisfying them. Theorists from many disciplines (Freud, 1933; Morris, 1956; Williams, 1968) focus on hedonism as a primary need for human beings.

*Achievement* concerns personal success through demonstrating competence according to prevailing social standards. High achievement and performance generates resources necessary for individuals to survive and for institutions to reach their goals. Achievement values have a long tradition of attention in many disciplines (Maslow, 1965; Rokeach, 1973) and are emphasized by competence reached by cultural standards and general social approval in a specific context.

*Power* is defined as social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources (Parsons, 1951). A power values emerge also in most empirical analyses of interpersonal relations both within and across cultures (Lonner, 1980). Power values may also be transformations of individual needs that are primarily oriented towards dominance and control over others (Allport, 1961; Korman, 1974). It should be noted that both power and achievement values focus on social esteem. However, achievement values (e.g., ambitious) emphasize the active demonstration of successful performance in concrete interaction,

whereas power values (e.g., authority) focus on the preservation of a high social position within a more general social system.

*Security* is defined as safety and stability of society, of relationships, and of the self. Security values derive from basic individual and collective requirements (Kluckhohn, 1951; Maslow, 1965; Williams, 1968) and are represented by two subtypes of security values. One type regards individual interests (e.g., clean) and another type regards social group interests (e.g., national security). Both types, however have the goal of security for self or close/significant others and can therefore be unified into a more encompassing value.

*Conformity* regards restraint of actions and impulses likely to upset/harm others and violate social expectations/norms. Conformity values derive from the fact that people inhibit inclinations that might disrupt and undermine smooth interaction and group functioning. The majority of value analyses focus on conformity emphasizing self-restraint in everyday interaction with close social groups and or people (Freud, 1930; Kohn & Schooler, 1983; Morris, 1956; Parsons, 1951).

*Tradition* concerns respect and acceptance of customs and ideas of a given culture or religion. People develop practices, symbols and beliefs of their shared experiences that become valued group customs and traditions (Sumner, 1906). These practices symbolize the group's solidarity and uniqueness (Durkheim, 1912/1954; Parsons, 1951), thus representing religious rituals, beliefs, and behavioral norms. Tradition and conformity values are interrelated because of sharing the goal of subordinating the self in favor of socially imposed norms. Both tradition and conformity differ in the objects to which the self is subordinated. Conformity regards subordination to people in frequent interaction such as parents, teachers, supervisors, whereas tradition involves subordination to abstract ideas such as religious and culture related objects and customs.

*Benevolence* entails preserving and enhancing the welfare of people with whom a person is in frequent contact. Benevolence values derive from the basic need for effective group functioning (Kluckhohn, 1951; Williams, 1968) and the need for affiliation (Korman, 1974; Maslow, 1965). These values involve voluntary concern for others, while also promoting

cooperative and supportive social relations. It can be stated, therefore that benevolence values serve as an internalized motivational origin for such concerns and related behaviors. In this regard, they are similar to conformity values in motivating the same helpful and prosocial behaviors, and may be considered separately or together.

*Universalism* involves understanding, appreciation, and protection for the welfare of all people and the nature. Universalism values differ slightly from benevolence values in that they derive from survival needs of individuals and groups. Hence, we are not aware of these needs if we are not a situation of scarcity of natural resources. Consequently, in life-threatening strife, people may also realize that failure to protect the natural environment will lead to the destruction of life-protecting resources. Finally, universalism combines two subtypes of concern - one for the welfare of people in wider society and another for the world and overall nature.

The Schwartz's theory has been tested in cross-cultural research in more than 200 samples from over 60 countries (Schwartz, 1992, 1994; Schwartz & Sagiv, 2000) and strong evidence has been provided on the distinctiveness of the ten value types and the structure of relations among value types. However, research that compares values across cultures in relation to well-being is less prolific. In addressing this relationship, the available literature suggests that particular values contribute positively to well-being, whereas other values are less beneficial for well-being. For example, there has been a distinction of "healthy" and "unhealthy" values based on their positive and negative influence on well-being. Values of self-direction (e.g., autonomy, independence), benevolence (e.g., responsibility), achievement, stimulation, and universalism (e.g., self-awareness, personal growth) are considered "healthy" because they are positively related to well-being (Jensen & Bergin, 1988). "Unhealthy" values with negative relation to psychological outcomes are conformity, tradition, security and power.

Based on the above theories and research, as well as the hypothesis of this article on the relationship between values and well-being, we expect that "healthy" values of self-direction, benevolence, universalism, stimulation and achievement to correlate positively with well-being, whereas "unhealthy" values of conformity, security, power, and tradition

to correlate negatively with subjective well-being. Based on prior classifications (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987; 1990) and related theoretical and empirical studies (Schwartz, 1992, 1994), we did not consider hedonism values and do not advance clear hypotheses with regard to hedonism.

### *Context and Hypotheses*

The present paper reports on a study conducted in Macedonia and Ukraine, which are two European countries with important differences in terms of life satisfaction and general social circumstances. Ukraine is an Eastern Slavic state flourished from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries on the territory of contemporary Ukraine, with Kyiv as its capital. The country gained independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 and has since been seeking integration with Western Europe and Russia, which supplies most of the country's energy (BBC, 2014). Ukraine is considered Europe's second largest country that has strong historical origins with Russia as well as with European neighboring countries, mainly Poland. The most recent census in 1989 estimated a population of 51,452,000 residents, despite the negative population growth due to severe economic and environmental crises, including the Chernobyl disaster. There is also a significant presence of ethnic minority Russians who use Russian as their first language and have particularly strong influence in the industrialized sectors. In fact, in contemporary Ukraine, many former Soviet bureaucrats (the *nomenklatura*) retained their status and political influence as members of the new administration or as newly rich businesses. In general, the social system is characterized by stressful economic and social situations combined with the post-communist heritage and corruption mostly after the Orange revolution. Despite these negative trends, in contemporary Ukraine there is a new stage of national identity development that arises from self-determination and pride shared with others on the basis of a common language, cultural and family traditions, religion, and historical heritage. There is a lively reassessment of these national identity elements especially in the recent moves to join the EU, which fuelled tensions with Russia because the government decided to drop the agreement. This brought tens of thousands of protesters out onto the

streets of Kiev in November 2013 and the protests against the government have been particularly vivid.

Macedonia is situated in the Balkan Peninsula, and is the most southern republic of the former -Yugoslavia. The country has been independent since 1991 as a parliamentary democracy and its GDP is among the lowest in Europe with an unemployment rate of 30%. Macedonia is dominantly a collectivistic society (Kenig, 2006), where collectivism is understood as devotion to the values, norms, standards and criteria of the group and closer community. The total population is slightly above 2 million, with two major different communities. The biggest community is the one of ethnic Macedonians consisting of 66% of the population, with Slavic origin and mostly Orthodox Christians. The other group is with ethnic Albanian origin, numbering 24% of the total population, being mostly Muslim. In fact, in the last few decades, Macedonian society has been experiencing continuous inter-ethnic tensions.

Additionally, differences in life satisfaction between Macedonia and Ukraine have been reported. For example, findings from large multinational comparisons show that Ukraine scores a bit higher than Macedonia regarding overall satisfaction with life (Veenhoven, 2013). This study is designed to examine the relation between values and life satisfaction in Macedonia and Ukraine by addressing two main questions 1) Are there differences in values and life satisfaction between Macedonian and Ukrainian groups? (2) Do values influence life satisfaction? In relation to the first research question, we do not advance specific hypotheses. Overall, we do not expect big group differences in values between Macedonia and Ukraine because prior research has generally shown that these countries score very similar in human values based on PVQ (Vala & Costa-Lopes, 2010). However, Macedonians are expected to score lower on life satisfaction than Ukrainians, given that Macedonia on average scores lower on life satisfaction than Ukrainians (Veenhoven, 2013).

In relation to the second research question, the extent to which values predict life satisfaction of Macedonian and Ukrainian groups is examined. Based on prior work, we expect that “healthy” values (self-direction, benevolence, universalism, stimulation and achievement) to be

positively related with well-being, whereas “unhealthy” values (conformity, security, power, and tradition) to be negatively related with subjective well-being across groups. Therefore, it was hypothesized that young adults from both countries, who have strong and developed “healthy” values will feel better in life and vice versa, as far as the relation of “unhealthy” values and life satisfaction is concerned.

## *Methods*

### *Participants*

The present article considers a sample of 464 participants in total, coming from Macedonia ( $n = 234$ ) and Ukraine ( $n = 230$ ) of whom, 55% are females and 45% males. The average age was 20, 19 years ( $SD = 4.21$ ) (see Table 1). The two samples differed with respect to gender, with more girls in the Macedonian group than in the Ukrainian group,  $\chi^2(1, N = 425) = 111.78, p < .001$ . The groups did not differ with respect to age. Since the samples differed in gender, the effects of this demographic variable were statistically controlled for in subsequent analyses.

Participants for this study were recruited from two public universities in Kyiv (Ukraine) and Skopje (Macedonia). Prior to data collection, students were informed about the purpose and methods of the study to assure their participation. Data were collected during normal teaching time. They were also informed that participation was entirely voluntary and confidential and that they were free to discontinue their participation at any time. Students were also informed that if they were interested, they would receive a final report about the study.

### *Measures*

*Sociodemographic data.* All participants provided data on socio-demographic variables of nationality, gender and age.

*Personality Values.* We used the *Portrait Values Questionnaire* (PVQ; Schwartz et al., 1994, 2001). The instrument was adapted for the



Ukrainian context (Romanyuk, 2009). This questionnaire is composed of 40 items that were designed to measure ten value dimensions with examples given next to each dimension, namely: self-direction, (four items); (“She likes to do things in her own original way”), stimulation, (three items); (“He always looks for new things to try”), hedonism, (three items); (“He seeks every chance he can to have fun”), achievement, (four items); (“She likes to impress other people”), power, (three items); (“She wants people to do what she says”), security, (five items); (“It is important to him to live in secure surroundings”), conformity, (four items); (“He believes that people should do what they’re told”), tradition, (four items); (“She thinks it is best to do things in traditional ways”), benevolence, (four items); (“It’s very important to help the people around him”), and universalism, (six items); (“He believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life”). The questionnaire was administered in two versions, one for the female and one for the male students. The versions were identical except for the words that indicated the gender of respondents. The items were rated on a response scale 1 = *not like me at all*, 6 = *very much like me*). Internal reliability measured with Cronbach’s coefficient were  $\alpha = .82$  for the Macedonian and  $\alpha = .77$  for the Ukrainian sample.

*Well-Being* was measured with *The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)* (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). The scale consists of 5 items rated on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample items included “in most ways my life is close to my ideal”, “I am satisfied with life”, and “if I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing”. Internal reliability measured with Cronbach’s coefficient was  $\alpha = .81$  for the Macedonian and  $\alpha = .80$  for the Ukrainian sample. The SWLS is one of the most widely used measures of well-being and extant research on its validity across different cultures and nations has been conducted. Further support for the validity of the scale is provided by strong evidence on its psychometric properties across various cultural groups (Diener et al., 1985; Diener, Helliwell, & Kahneman, 2010; Ponizovsky, Dimitrova, Schachner, & van de Schoot, 2013).

## *Results*

### *Preliminary Analyses*

The main research questions were addressed in three steps. First, group differences in values and well-being between Macedonian and Ukrainian samples were examined by carrying out a MANCOVA, which included a total score of each personality value and life satisfaction measures as dependent variables and group (Macedonian and Ukrainian) as independent variables and gender as covariate. Additional MANCOVA was performed on the four value factors (i.e., Openness to Change, Self-Enhancement, Conservation, and Self-Transcendence) as dependent variables, and group (Macedonian and Ukrainian) as independent variables and gender as covariate. Second, the question of whether values are predictors of well-being for Macedonian and Ukrainian youth was addressed. We ran two separate regression models with nine values (self-determination, stimulation, achievement, power, security, conformity, benevolence, universalism, tradition) as predictors of life satisfaction for each group. Additionally, we reported Pearson correlations between values and life satisfaction for each group.

### *Group Differences in Values and Life Satisfaction*

Table 1 presents mean scores for Macedonian and Ukrainian groups. As can be seen from the data, a significant ethnic group difference was found for all value domains. Specifically, Ukrainians scored higher than Macedonians on self-determination ( $F(1, 424) = 1167.65, p < .001$ ), stimulation ( $F(1, 424) = 152.58, p < .001$ ), achievement ( $F(1, 424) = 312.49, p < .001$ ), security ( $F(1, 424) = 304.30, p < .001$ ), conformity ( $F(1, 424) = 201.49, p < .001$ ), tradition ( $F(1, 424) = 16.73, p < .001$ ), benevolence ( $F(1, 424) = 639.10, p < .001$ ), and universalism,  $F(1, 424) = 596.75, p < .001$ . Conversely, Macedonians scored higher than Ukrainians on power,  $F(1, 424) = 13.01, p < .001$ . No group differences on life satisfaction emerged. Additionally, Ukrainians scored higher than Macedonians on all four value factors of Openness to Change ( $F(1, 424) = 642.35, p < .001$ ), Self-Enhancement ( $F(1, 424) = 182.40, p < .001$ ), Conservation ( $F(1, 424) = 350.11, p < .001$ ), and Self-Transcendence,  $F(1, 424) = 504.36, p < .001$ .

Table 1 *Samples in Macedonia and Ukraine*

	Macedonian ( <i>n</i> = 226)	Ukrainian ( <i>n</i> = 200)	Group comparisons
Age, <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	19.84 (5.57)	20.49 (1.59)	n.s
Gender, <i>n</i>			
Boys	47	144	$\chi^2(1, N = 425) = 111.78^{***}$
Girls	178	56	
Values			
Self-direction	1.89 (.70)	4.62 (.66)	$F(1, 424) = 1167.65^{***}$
Stimulation	2.56 (.99)	3.99 (.88)	$F(1, 424) = 152.58^{***}$
Openness to Change	2.29 (.72)	4.31 (.56)	$F(1, 424) = 642.35^{***}$
Achievement	2.37 (1.03)	4.39 (.86)	$F(1, 424) = 312.49^{***}$
Power	4.16 (1.14)	3.67 (.93)	$F(1, 352) = 4.89^{***}$
Self- Enhancement	2.90 (.77)	4.14 (.74)	$F(1, 424) = 182.40^{***}$
Security	2.58 (.85)	4.13 (.65)	$F(1, 424) = 304.30^{***}$
Conformity	2.53 (.96)	3.93 (.66)	$F(1, 424) = 201.49^{***}$
Conservation	2.55 (.79)	4.00 (.80)	$F(1, 424) = 350.11^{***}$
Benevolence	2.08 (.76)	4.49 (.83)	$F(1, 424) = 639.10^{***}$
Universalism	2.17 (.72)	3.98 (.24)	$F(1, 424) = 596.75^{***}$
Tradition	3.26 (1.14)	3.78 (.70)	$F(1, 424) = 16.73^{***}$
Self- Transcendence	2.50 (.66)	3.25 (.98)	$F(1, 424) = 504.36^{***}$
Life Satisfaction	4.82 (1.24)	4.69 (1.09)	n.s.

Note: \*\*\*  $p < .001$ . n.s. = non significant

### *Values and Life Satisfaction: Relations across Cultural Groups*

The second research question was tested to see if values were related to life satisfaction for Macedonian and Ukrainian samples. It was expected that all nine components of the value model would be related to life satisfaction. To test this prediction, two series of linear regressions were

performed separately in each group. Coefficients of the regression models are represented in Table 2. As can be seen in Table 2, only conformity and tradition were significantly related to life satisfaction, but only for the Macedonian group. This result is in line with our expectations that “unhealthy” values are negatively related to well-being, although this relation was significant only for the Macedonian group.

Table 2. *Coefficients for Regression Models of Values and Life Satisfaction*

Value Predictors	Macedonian		Ukrainian	
	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i> -value	$\beta$	<i>t</i> -value
Self-direction	.002	.030 n.s	-.029	-.325 n.s
Stimulation	-.094	-1.34 n.s	-.054	-.635 n.s.
Achievement	-.390	-4.94 n.s	-.006	-.059 n.s.
Power	.037	.523 n.s	.077	.805 n.s.
Security	.056	.706 n.s	-.137	-1.79 n.s.
Conformity	-.255	-2.98***	-.040	-.526 n.s.
Benevolence	-.130	-1.75 n.s	.112	1.35 n.s.
Universalism	-.047	-.624 n.s	.077	1.01 n.s.
Tradition	-.174	-2.27*	-.074	-.935 n.s.

Note: \*  $p < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p < .001$ . n.s. = non-significant

Table 3. Correlation Coefficients for Values and Life Satisfaction across Groups

Values	Macedonian		Ukrainian	
	<i>R</i>	<i>p</i> -value	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i> -value
Self-direction	-.076	n.s.	.015	n.s.
Stimulation	-.084	n.s.	.038	n.s.
Achievement	-.091	n.s.	.019	n.s.
Power	.13	.05	.037	n.s.
Security	-.214	.001	-.114	n.s.
Conformity	-.40	.001	-.056	n.s.
Benevolence	-.32	.001	.046	n.s.
Universalism	-.24	.001	.048	n.s.
Tradition	-.36	.001	-.048	n.s.

Note: Significant correlation of values and life satisfaction at  $p < .05$  and  $p < .001$ . n.s. = non-significant

In addition, we presented Pearson linear correlations of nine values and life satisfaction (Table 3). Again, significant relationships emerged for Macedonian group only, where power was positively related to life satisfaction, whereas security, conformity, benevolence, universalism and tradition values were significantly negatively related to life satisfaction. No significant relationships for the Ukrainian groups emerged. Again, these results partly confirm our expectations on the relation of “healthy” and “unhealthy” values to well-being.

## *Conclusion*

This article aimed at examining differences in values and their relation to life satisfaction among Macedonian and Ukrainian samples. Overall our data and results supported the hypotheses and expectations. With regard to the first research questions, a group difference was found for all values (except for power), whereby Ukrainians scored higher on these factors compared to their Macedonian peers. We could also verify the existence of relationship between values of conservation (security and conformity) and self-transcendence (benevolence, universalism and tradition) for the Macedonian rather than Ukrainian group. In the following, we offer a discussion of these results as they relate to the existing literature.

With regard to the first aim, we could verify that Ukrainians scored higher than Macedonians on basic values as well as on major factors of openness to change, self-enhancement, conservation and self-transcendence. This is an interesting finding and we reasoned on possible explanations of these ethnic group differences. Therefore, we suggest that Ukrainian rather than Macedonian participants may be subjected to a context that is more favorable to issues related to their values options. Ukraine became an independent state after the end of the communism and the dissolution of the former USSR in the late '1990. In the last decades there has been a flourishing of independent political activities (e.g., The Orange Revolution) and openness toward the European Union as also mentioned in the country profile offered in the introduction. It may well be that these vivid social processes affected the Ukrainians and such context of dynamic change of the Ukrainian setting may explain group differences in values. Therefore, students in Ukraine may have a more turbulent environment that stimulates their value exploration options to a greater extent than in Macedonia. It may also be that in Ukraine, there is a longer history of independence struggles and political tensions compared to Macedonia; therefore, Ukrainian students may be more supportive and engaging in values explorations as a reaction to their national context circumstances.

There were no group differences for life satisfaction, which indicates that Macedonian and Ukrainian groups do not differ in overall well-being. A possible interpretation of why both groups score similarly might be the

similar socio-economic conditions in both countries. Although a slightly higher life satisfaction has been found in Ukraine (Veenhoven, 2013), these differences were rather small (mean score of 4.7 vs 5.00) therefore, we cannot detect large differences in life satisfaction between Macedonian and Ukrainian samples.

In relation to the second research question, regression models showed that values of conformity and tradition were significantly related to life satisfaction for the Macedonian group only. This result is in line with our expectations that “unhealthy” values are negatively related to well-being. In addition, correlation analyses showed significant negative relationships between security, conformity, benevolence, universalism and tradition to life satisfaction for Macedonian group only. Again, this result confirms our expectations on the relation of “healthy” and “unhealthy” values to well-being for the Macedonian group only.

The fact that no relationship between values and life satisfaction was evident for the Ukrainian group deserves thoughtful consideration. Our findings for the Ukrainian sample support the argument that there are very little or no relationships between the PVQ subscales and subjective well-being (SWL), although prior work has stated the implicit relationship between values and satisfaction with life. We therefore would like to offer several speculations of why this might be the case in our sample. As pointed out earlier by similar research, the Schwartz’s value typology may indeed be too broad in detecting strong relationships with indicators of well-being (Burroughs & Rindfleisch, 2002). Our findings mirror the suggestion by Sagiv and Schwartz’s (2000) that peoples’ satisfaction with their lives may be determined by the extent to which they assign importance to values, rather than by the importance they attribute to particular types of values. Additionally, Sagiv and Schwartz (2000) point out that cognitive well-being as measured by the SWLS may not depend on what people value, but on their success in attaining what they value and this may also explain our results. Additionally, scholars have pointed out that Diener’s (2006) definition of well-being as an umbrella for different valuations that people make embraces people’s values and that life satisfaction is a component of subjective well-being and therefore subordinate to well-being (Camfield & Skevington, 2008). It would thus be advisable for future research to

investigate the relationship between values and overall subjective well-being by including both cognitive and affective indices of well-being and particularly in Ukrainian samples.

Several limitations of the article need to be acknowledged. First, our findings are limited to Ukrainian and Macedonian settings and future investigations are necessary to generalize these results to other groups and cultural contexts. Future research may examine the value factors and their relations to well-being in other countries to see how these relations are embedded and perceived among students in other countries. Second, future studies are needed to expand on larger community samples rather than student samples only. Although student samples are most convenient and widely used groups in social sciences research, enlarged focus on larger community samples is desirable. These samples need to include younger as well as older segments of the populations, as intergenerational differences with regards to values may be particularly evident and more extreme in the context of rapid change in the post communist European countries. Third, we need to add additional measurement units to the study of personality values and well-being. For example, basic human values have been shown to relate to job satisfaction, overall social and occupational functioning (Axtell et al., 2002). Future studies are needed to address the role of cultural differences and context-specific indicators of personality values and well-being across diverse national contexts.



## References

- Allport, G. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Axtell, C., Wall, T., Stride, C., Pepper, K., Clegg, C., Gardner, P., & Bolden, R. (2002) Familiarity breeds content: The impact of exposure to change on employee openness and well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75(2), 217–231.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Ukraine country profile. (2013, December 18). In BBC News. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-18018002>
- Berlyne, D. *Conflict, arousal and curiosity*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1960.
- Burroughs, J. & Rindfleisch, A. (2002) Materialism and well-being: A conflicting values perspective. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(3), 348-370.
- Camfield, L. & Skevington, S. (2008). On subjective well-being and quality of life. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 13(6), 764-775.
- Deci, E. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum. 1975.
- Diener, E. (2006). Guidelines for national indicators of subjective well-being and ill-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7(4), 397-404.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, R., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49. 71-75. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4901\_13
- Diener, E., Helliwell, J., & Kahneman, D. (2010). *International differences in well being*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199732739.001.0001
- Durkheim, E. (1912/1954). *The elementary forms of religious life*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press..
- Freud, S. (1933). *New introductory lectures in psychoanalysis*. New York: Norton.

- Kuzio, T. (1998). *Contemporary Ukraine dynamics of post-Soviet transformation*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.
- Jensen, J. & Bergin, A. (1988). Mental health values of professional therapists: A national interdisciplinary survey. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 19, 290-297.
- Kenig, N. (2006). *Hofstedoviot model na dimenzii na kulturata: Možnosti za merenje vo grupen i individualen kontekst* [Hofsted's model of dimensions of culture: Possibilities for assessment in group and individual context] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ss Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, Macedonia.
- Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In T. Parsons & E. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action*, (388-433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kohn, M.L., & Schooler, C. (1983). *Work and Personality*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Korman, A. (1974). *The Psychology of Motivation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lonner, W. (1980). The search for psychological universals. In H. Triandis & W. Lambert (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology. Perspectives: Vol. 1*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Magocsi, P. R. (1996). *A history of Ukraine*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Motyl, A. (1993). *Dilemmas of independence: Ukraine after totalitarianism*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.
- Maslow, A.H. (1965). *Eupsychian management*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Morris, C.W. (1956). *Varieties of human value*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Ponizovsky, Y., Dimitrova, R., Schachner, M. K., & van de Schoot, R. (2012). The satisfaction with life scale: Measurement invariance across immigrant groups. *European Journal of*

*Developmental Psychology*, 1-7. doi:10.1080/17405629.2012.707778

- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Romanyuk, L. (2009). A problem of method in research of values: instruments, technologies, perspectives. In *Problems of empirical researches in Psychology 3*. Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. 69–75.
- Romanyuk, L. (2013). Personality values and Well-Being: Becoming in University Space of Socialization. In: S. Maksimenko (Ed.). *Actual problems of psychology, XI (6, II) Social psychology*, 259-273. Kirovograd: Imex-LTD.
- Romanyuk, L. (2013). *Values' Psychology: Becoming in Personality Development*. Kamyanets-Podilskiy: PE Moshinskiy V.S.
- Sagiv, L. & Schwartz, S.H. (2000). Value Priorities and Subjective Well-Being: Direct Relations and Congruity Effects. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(2): 177-198.
- Schwartz, S. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues* 50(4), 19-45.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying Culture-Specifics in the Content and Structure of Values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 92-116.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Sagiv, L. (2000). Value Priorities and Subjective Well-Being: Direct Relations and Congruity Effects. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 177-198.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. In M.P. Zanna (ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology*, (1-65). New York: Academic Press.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 550-562.

- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 878-891.
- Sochor, Z. A. (1996). No Middle Ground? On the Difficulties of Crafting a Political Consensus in Ukraine. *The Harriman Review*, 9(1-2), 57-61.
- Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways*. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1906.
- Vala, J., & Costa-Lopes, R. (2010) Youth attitudes toward difference and diversity: A cross-national analysis. *Análise Social*, XLV(195), 255-275.
- Veenhoven, R. (2013). Average happiness in 148 nations 2000-2009. *World database of happiness*. Retrieved from [http://worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl/hap\\_nat/findingreports/RankReport\\_AverageHappiness.php](http://worlddatabaseofhappiness.eur.nl/hap_nat/findingreports/RankReport_AverageHappiness.php)
- Williams, R. M., Jr. (1968). Values. In E. Sills (ed.). *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*. New York: Macmillan.