

Is there a Unique or non Unique Value Profile for Albanian Social Actors? (The Study Case of Tirana Electorate in 2003, 2008, 2010 and 2011)

Prof. As. Dr. Aleksandër Kocani

Department of Political Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences at Tirana University
E-mail: alkocani@gmail.com

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n1p185

Abstract

This paper shows the results of an empirique panel study carried out in 2003, 2008, 2010 and 2010. The start point for this paper was the notice of C.Brooks and J.Manza about the possibility for reaching opposite results if you repeat the Inglehart's interviews by other methods. Here one may ask: Is there a indicator of the problem related with the value's profile nature of social actors. In this case, you may consider two alternatives: 1) the social actor has only one value profile, or on the contrary 2) he does not has such a value profile. The last one may be separated into two cases: a) or there is not a value profile, but it is created by interaction between knowledge subject and object ; or b) there are two opposite value profile which are selected occasionally. The empirical testing is possible if one may find or not the influence upon the respondents during the intreviews. If there is only one value profile you can not find possible influencies. On the contrary you have to consider there is not one value profile.

Key words: *unique value profile, social actors.*

1. Introduction

When R.Inglehart, one of the most knownd researcher in the values studies fild, trays to depicte the cross-cultural variation of the basic values, he refers to an explaining model with two major dimension: (1) Traditional/Secular-rational and (2) Survival/Self-expression values. By his opinionion, "these two dimensions explain more than 70 percent of the cross-national variance on key variables, and each dimension is strongly correlated with scores of other important attitudes. The global cultural map shows how scores of societies are located on these two dimensions: moving from south to north reflects the shift from Traditional to Seculararrational values; moving from west to east reflects the shift from Survival values to Selfexpressional values"¹. Here we are in an "updated" expression of the old term "materialistic values", "post materialistic values" and "modern values", "postmodern values" used in the past by R.Inglehart². The Inglehart's concerns related with the explaining how and why moving from industrial societies to post industrial one's is accompnaged with the shift of basic values system from traditional (former "modern") to secular-rational (former "postmodern") and from survival (former "materialistic") to self-expression (former "post-materialistic") values. And how this process is closely correlated with the human development and the raising of democracy³.

Our concerns differ from one's choosed by R.Inglehart. It is based on the old philosophical problem about unique or multiple nature of beeing. The point of view wich hold the unique nature of beeing, as is largely known, has suported by old greek philosopher Parmenides⁴. By him the beeing as whole is unique and in a rest situation. While the most of other old greek philosophers suported the multiple point of view for the nature of beeing, which is in opposite with Parmenides' point of view. For them the beeing is something not unique, but multiple. In this conceptual frame, we want to know if it is possible for the basic values of a social actor to be structured insight him as a system which one may depicte with terms of "survival" ("materialistic") values system or "self-expression" ("post-materialistic") values system. And if this structuration as system is an intrisic (or, principal) feature for each social actor. Or, there is no values system

¹ Values change the world. World values survey. Brochure, www.worldvaluessurvey.org, p.6. [Notice: perhaps here it is needed to substitute the term "west" with the term "est"- A.K.]

² Inglehart, R., "Globalisation and postmodern values", *The Washington Quaterly* 23.1 (2000), p.222.

³ Idem, p.225-226; Values change the world. World values survey. Brochure, www.worldvaluessurvey.org, p.7-9.

⁴ Vergely, B., *La Philosophie, Les Essentiels*, Milan, 1996, p.26; Parmenides (Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy), <http://www.utm.edu/research/iep/p/parmenid.htm> (1 of 3) [4/21/2000 8:56:30 AM].

as intrinsic feature (or values profile) for the social actor and, if you find it, this is because of interaction process between knowledge subject and object. That means there are two possibility: (1) there are no basic values structured system insight social actors. This system emerge as production after interaction knowledge subject – object. (2) There are two such a opposite systems insight each social actor and the mentioned interaction, as an “osmosa” process, “give permission” for being exhibited to only one.

Historically as the start point for this paper was the notice of C.Brooks and J.Manza about the possibility for reaching opposite results if you repeat the Inglehart’s interviews by other methods⁵. By them, in the most of cases one can observe at the same person a mix of materialistic values with post materialistic one’s. That means where Inglehart finds survival values, you can also find self-expression one’s. Here one may ask: Is there a indicator of the “consistency” or “repeatability” (i.d., reliability) problem of your measures? Or the problem here doesn’t related with the violation of measure rules, but with the value’s profile nature of social actors. I.e. a problem of unique or non unique value system being for a social actor. In other words, can’t we provide a sufficient secure measure process, or the value’s profile of the social actors isn’t unique one’s? This is the point.

An experiment made upon the Tirana electorate tried for times (years 2003, 2008, 2010 and 2011) to test empirically a hypothetical proposition about the existence of a non unique value’s profile at the social actors. Practically it was considered impossible to distinguish insight of a non unique value’s model the case of value’s system absence from one’s considering a dyhotomic situation. That means, the existence insight of social actor of two opposite value’s system (“survival” and “self-expression”). So it was decided to focus on the empirical test of proposition which states being a non unique value’s profile for social actors. Each of the two first times (years 2003 and 2008) the empirical test consisted by two survey procedures. One was focused on the ordinary electorate of Tirana city and the other concerns only the opinions of student part of this electorate. The principal idea of this empirical test was the possibility to influence, in case of existing a non unique value’s profile for social actors, the answers of respondents by the questionnaire using the mechanism of conformism. I.d. it was calculated as reasonable to use the aspiration expressed by albanian population since 1991 to be like european people to influence on shifting their worldviews, attitudes and beliefs towards european one’s. For this purpose the questionnaire was structured into two different parts. The first part, following the ordinary rules, was composed with the aim to avoid as much as possible the interviewee s’ influence upon the respondent. While the second part, using in essence the same questions, on the contrary was structured to provide the maximum of influence by mean of a ingoing context puted in almost every question and emphasizing how react, comport and think individuals in european countries about the concerned problem. The questions was drawn folloing the Inglehart’s indicators of “survival” and “self-expression” value system. The basic assumption predicts (as implication) an statistical attendance between couples of similar questions at the same questionnaire in case of unique value’s profile and the absence of this attendance in opposite case. In 2003 from questioners was choosed 22 couples as signifiants for empirical test of hypothesis, while in 2008 the selection was for 20 such a couples and in 2010 and 2011 – the same (22 such a couples).

The results of statistical elaboration of data for both surveys made in 2003 (with electorate and students) indicate in a size of 85% the cases of statistical attendance belonging moderate, strong and very strong level. Regarding the significance at level 0.01, you may conclude there are statistical attendance between choosed couples as empirical fact. So it is possible to accept this empirical fact as an falsification testimony of model assuming a non unique value’s profile for social actors and reject it. I.d. as acceptability of unique model for value’s profile of social actors.

Analysis of the data belonging the two surveys carried out at 2008 reveals that crosstab of 20 couples choosed as potentially influenciabes show a statistical attendance significant at an acceptable level by Phi and Cramer’s indicators. Again empirical test is in favor of model assuming an unique value’s profile for social actor.

The results of survey made in 2010 and 2011 for 22 couples choosed as potentially influenciabes show in a size of 100% the cases a statistical attendance significant at an acceptable level by Phi and Cramer’s indicators.

Now the problem is to discuss if the conclusion about an unique value’s profile for social actors (Tirana ‘s electorate) is acceptable or it is needed to consider another option. Shortly, to consider as the meaning of C.Brooks and J.Manza’s mentioned notice *not* the existence of an unique value’s profile for social actor, but the existence of a reliability problem. I.d. the problem of non consistency of results if you repeat the surveys changing a little the questionnaire. In this case one may expect to have different results by two surveys carried out in 2003 on the Tirana city electorate and on Tirana city students electorate, because there was a repeat of survey and the questionnaire was changed a little. The same expectation is possible for the results of two surveys made in 2008 on the similar population. Again was made same questionnaire changes in rapport of them belonging surveys made in 2003. This situation did not change for the survey carried out in 2010 and 2011.

⁵ “Raisons de vivre.Raisons d’agir”. *Sciences Humaines*, N°79, 1998, p.32.

Against these expectations the results of two surveys groups show a evident similarity in the values of statistical attention regardless of repeat in defferent sample and time. So you may conclude here there is no a reliability problem, but only a value's profile nature problem for social actors.

Sources

Inglehart, R., Baker, W. E., Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values American Sociological Review, 2000, Vol.65 (February) ;
Inglehart, R., Globalization and Postmodern Values, Washington Quarterly 23.1 (2000) ;
Lecomte, L., Raisons de vivre. Raisons d'agir, Sciences Humaines, No 79, 1998;
Values change the world. World values survey. Brochure, www.worldvaluessurvey.org.

