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Various methods have been adopted in teaching organizational values to employees. The traditional methods commonly used include orientation, organization’s documents, and postings on walls of offices (Klein & Weaver, 2000). This study examined the communication of organizational values through non-formal educational activities at a non-profit organization. A convenience sampling method was employed, and a total of 23 employees were surveyed. The study tested the hypothesis that employees of Foundation to Mankind (FTM) rate organization’s values higher than non-organization’s values. The study also examined the degree of importance employees ascribed to the FTM values. The non-formal educational activities examined were, Yearly Staff Orientation, Supervisors’ Orientation, and Farmer Recognition Day Celebration organized by FTM. These activities made the staff more aware of the organizational values. The t-test revealed a statistically significant difference between FTM and non-FTM values. In addition, mean ranking of the employee ratings revealed FTM values ranked higher than non-FTM values. Staff mentioned consistently diversity, social justice, building relationships, helpfulness, and unity as the values emphasized by the non-formal educational activities they participated in.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Basic values have predictive and explanatory potential, both at the individual and societal levels. Moreover, values can reflect major social change in societies and across nations. And values may influence the direction of social change and its speed (Davidov, Schmidt, & Schwartz, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

Although a lot more studies have been conducted on values and organizations over the period, the observation of a knowledge gap in organizational theory by Connor and Becker (1975) is still valid. However, sociological, psychological, and administrative theory does contain studies of values as a general human property. As noted by Houston (1974) as a plural society, the United States seems to have important variations in values as influenced by ethnic, racial, religious, rural, urban, suburban and socioeconomic factors. “One fundamental characteristic that both employees and organizations share is “Values” (Finegan, 2000, p. 149). Employees and organizations share fundamental characteristics because of a reduced in the discrepancy between individually held values and organizational values through organizational socialization (Tripathi, 1990; Roe & Ester, 1999). In a qualitative study of a multinational company in India, (Tripathi, 1990) found that there was a great deal of similarity between personal values and organizational values, and that the length of service of managers in a multinational organization was related to the personal-organizational value discrepancy. The discrepancy was greatest for respondents with 10-20 years length of service (Tripathi, 1990, p. 729).
Packard (2001) asserts that “the development of organizational vision statements - typically descriptions of an ideal future, reflecting the organization’s mission, values, and strategic directions - has become increasingly prominent in recent years, but less has been written about the dissemination and use of such statements” (p.38). The numerous studies conducted on organizational values focused on values relationship to organizational performance, commitment, and culture. For instance Packard (2001) indicated that members’ awareness and commitment to organizational values were significantly related to the use of the values to guide decisions made. Similarly, members’ commitment to organizational values significantly related to their having positive views of clients and being committed to high performance. Given that few studies have focused on socialization or orientation for the learning of organizational norms and values by newcomers, this study seeks to examine organizational activities as a means of communicating organizational values to employees. Moreover, there are few studies done in organizations. In a meta analysis of studies on values, Herbst and Houmanfar (2009) concluded that there were only two studies examining values as independent variables done in organizations. This study aims at contributing to the existing literature on exploring values through the use of an organizational field sample. I was interested in exploring the extent to which employees recognize the values of their organization. Furthermore, the study examines whether employees’ participation in non-formal educational activities of the organization serves as opportunities for learning the organizational values.

Rational of the Study

Foundation to Mankind (FTM) is a not-for-profit community development and human services organization operating in the United States. The organization provides services to low income families and economically depressed families. Services provided by the organization
include education and training for youth, support services for victims of domestic violence, and ESL classes for particularly migrant farm workers. The majority of the clients the organization works with are underserved or disadvantaged members of society, and they include migrant farm families. According to the organization, its mission is to build individual and family self-sufficiency by strengthening farm worker, rural and urban communities. In addition, FTM promotes social justice through programs and advocacy. Through its advocacy activities, the organization emphasizes the creation of equal opportunity, respect for human worth, and rights of their clients to basic services such as education, health, and the right to use minority language. By virtue of its mission statement, FTM developed a set of core values to guide its operation, and has put in place an orientation model to teach incoming and existing employees the organizational values.

Purpose of the Study

The study examines the extent to which employees of FTM recognize the organizational values they are expected to internalize according to the demands of the work environment within which they operate. Secondly, the study examines whether selected non-formal activities serve as opportunities for employees to learn the organizational values. The specific objectives relate to the questions below.

Study Research Questions

The study is organized around one main research question informed by two sub-questions which addresses specific components of the communication of organizational values through non-formal educational activities. The main question of the study is as follows: What organizational values are communicated to staff through non-formal educational activities?
Sub-Questions

The sub-questions concern the degree of importance ascribed to FTM values, and the difference in ratings of FTM and non-FTM values by employees of FTM.

1. To what degree do staffs ascribe importance to the organizational values of FTM?
2. Does a difference exist in ratings by staff between organizational values of FTM and non-FTM values?

Hypothesis

I hypothesize that staff of FTM will rate FTM values higher than Non-FTM values.

Significance of the Study

The significance attached to a particular value by organizational members may be viewed and assessed in relation to the significance attached by the members to other selected values (Connor & Becker, 1975). Connor and Becker suggest a stable relationship between values of an organization’s members, and components of the organizational context (p. 555). Their study is significant in the sense that individuals have their personal values which may or may not be in congruence with the organizational values, despite the suggestions that organizations employ individuals with values as close as possible to the values of the organization, and as such strive to eliminate possible value conflicts. This study is aimed at contributing to the existing knowledge gap in the nature of the relationship among organizational members’ values and various organizational components. In addition, the study is aimed at contributing knowledge on non-formal educational activities that can further contribute to the communication of organizational values to new employees during the socialization phase. Dose (1997) concluded that organizational values about which there is consensus in the organization are the ones newcomers will proactively seek information about. Finally, the study of values provides the potential for
relatively more interdisciplinary collaboration, since values play a role throughout the social sciences as well as management (Rokeach, 1968). “Although differing organizational and personal values may be tacitly accepted by organizational members, they will often have strong and negative reactions when the expressed values of the organization are consistently different from its actual values” (Graber & Kilpatrick, 2008).

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study “organizational value” refers to the principles that guide the activities of the organization as well as interactions with the constituency members it serves (Tipathi, 1990). I adopt the definition used by Burke (2008). For the term “nonprofit organization” refers to those legally and formally organized corporations established within a state's political jurisdiction within the United States. Such organizations have been established in accordance with particular state's Corporation Commission's laws and regulations pertaining to the "public good" mission, purpose, and conduct of charitable philanthropic, nonprofit organizations. In furtherance, the purpose of an organized nonprofit corporation is to carry out an agreed-on mission without the objective of making a profit, and adhering to the promise not to distribute the organization's assets to benefit individuals other than the clients the nonprofit was formed to serve. All excess funds are retained by the corporation for exclusive use in furthering the charitable purpose of the organization (Burke, 2008; p. 207). “Non-formal education”, according to Bekerman and Silberman-Keller (2004) refers to any organized educational activity carried on outside the regular formal educational system to provide selected types of learning to particular populations. I define non-formal educational activity in the context of Bekerman and Silberman-Keller (2004) definition. I apply the definition to the activities of non-for-profit organizations. Therefore, a “non-formal educational activity” in the study refers to
organizational activities that do not have designed syllabi, and takes place outside of the formal classroom setting. Lastly I use the terms “staff” and “employees” interchangeable in the study.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the study of the organizational values of not-for-profit organizations, it is essential to gain an understanding of not-for-profit organizations in the context of the United States, and the available research on organizational values and the impact on different aspects of organizations. Some of the key aspects here include performance, commitment, and culture. In this chapter I use “organization’s values” and “organizational values” interchangeably. I first focus on the different activities non-profit organizations generally undertake. Next I focus on the concept of values, and make a distinction between values and attitudes. Thirdly, I present the theoretical framework of the study. In the final two sections, I focus on values of not-for-profit organizations, and how they are taught to members of the organization.

Background of the study: Not-for-profit organizations

In the United States, the establishment of a not-for-profit organization is determined and governed by state rather than federal law. According to the International Center for Not-for-profit Law (ICNL) (2009, p. 39), there are three basic types of not-for-profit organizations which can be identified in the United States. These are:

1. Nonprofit corporations. The most common vehicle for not-for-profit activities. Similar to for-profit/business entities, nonprofit corporations provide legal entity status, limited liability and perpetual duration. They are governed by a board of directors with a broad discretion to decide how best to pursue their objectives. The major difference between for-profit and nonprofit corporations is that the latter are created for public benefit, and accordingly dedicate their assets to their charitable, nonprofit purposes and do not distribute assets or profits to members, shareholders, or insiders (with the exception of paying employees for services rendered).
2. Trusts. This is the alternative to nonprofit corporations. A trust is a device by which one or more legal persons hold legal title to property, but do so for the benefit of some other person, class, or purpose. In this case, the trustees use the property for purposes deemed fit by the creator of the trust, and not for the private purposes of the trustees. Trusts can be either private or charitable.

3. Unincorporated Associations. Groups of individuals can form unincorporated associations governed only by their mutual agreement, and requiring no registration with the state. These membership associations are extremely flexible, but possess the drawback of having no legal structure and of exposing all members to potential liability for actions and debts of the association.

Activities of Not-for-Profit Organizations

Not-for-profit organizations typically engage in humanitarian services such as the provision of drinking water, clothing, shelter, and medicine without necessarily focusing on policy issues (ICN, 2009). However, as early as 1945 the activities of not-for-profit organizations moved from humanitarian or service provision to advocacy on public policy (Cakmak, 2004). For instance, NGOs in general can testify in a public hearing on a law or policy, advocate for changing a law or a regulation for the benefit of the public, in as recent as 2005 engaged in political activities (ICN, 2009). It is not uncommon to see not-for-profit organizations engage in awareness raising activities through conducting workshops or conferences educating the public on issues of importance without taking a position on such issues. For example, not-for-profit organizations arguing that a country should accede to the World Trade Organization (WTO). The organizations could also advocate that it is important to create an enabling environment for civil society. The only restriction for this activity relates to a 501(c) (3) organization taking a
position on pending legislation; in this case, the organizations’ activities would be considered lobbying, and therefore would be subject to special lobbying limits. Furthermore not-for-profit organizations can criticize government policy or officials either in a domestic forum or at an international forum such as the UN Human Rights Council by for example, highlighting corruption or complaining about human rights violations (ICN, 2009).

The activities that not-for-profit organizations engage in are often driven by the organizational values, which are also expected to guide members in the implementation of these activities. Values are an essential part of the identity of not only not-for-profit organizations but organizations in general, and influence the attitudes and behavior of their members in their interaction with others within and outside of their organizations (Tripathi, 1990; Dose, 1997; Mujtaba & Sims, 2006).

Concept of Values

Values theorists argue for the importance of research on values as opposed to attitudes (Rokeach, 1968; Schwartz, 1994; Calogero, Bardi, & Sutton, 2009). Therefore, to examine the relationship between values and attitudes it is necessary to understand the differences between the two concepts. According to Rokeach (1968, p.160), while an attitude seems to be a specialized concern in the field of psychology and sociology, values have long been given theoretical attention across many disciplines such as philosophy, political science, education, economics, anthropology, in addition to psychology and sociology.

What is a value? A value is defined in Webster’s Dictionary as “something (as a principle or quality) intrinsically valuable or desirable” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2005). A value refers to a single belief of a very specific kind, concerning “a desirable mode of behavior or end-state that has a transcendental quality to it, guiding actions, attitudes, and judgments, and
comparisons across specific objects and beyond immediate goals to more ultimate goals”
(Rokeach, 1968, p. 160). Values are thus abstract ideals, positive or negative, not tied to any
specific attitude object or situation, representing a person’s beliefs about ideal modes of conduct
and ideal terminal goals (Rokeach, 1968, p. 124). Rokeach offers three basic assumptions
regarding values. Firstly, values are more stable and motivating than attitudes. Secondly, values
tend to determine attitudes and behaviors, and thirdly, values are economic tools which humans

According to Spini (2003), values have been used as independent variables to understand
attitudes and behavior, and as dependent variables of basic differences among social groups and
categories. For instance, words such as “success”, “justice”, “freedom”, “social order”, and
“tradition” are the vocabulary of socially approved goals used to motivate action, and to express
and justify the solutions chosen. Socially approved goals are the desirable mode of behavior or
end state (Rokeach, 1968). The socially approved vocabulary according to Rokeach’s definition
is the values or principles that guide the lives of people of that society (Schwartz, 1999, Devos,
Spini, & Schwartz, 2002). In other words, values are temporary abstractions of generalized
principles to which most individuals or groups emotionally relate. After a value is internalized it
becomes, consciously and unconsciously, a standard or criterion for guiding action, for
developing and maintaining attitudes toward relevant objects and situations, for justifying one’s
and others’ actions and attitudes, for morally judging self and others, and for comparing self with
further assert that whether acknowledged or not, values guide most what a person does or thinks,
and are a large part of the window through which we view ourselves and others. Values have
therefore a strong motivational component as well as cognitive, affective, and behavioral
components (Rokeach, 1968). Hofmann-Towfigh (2007) found in a longitudinal study that changes in values among students in different types of schools and age groups were very small. In this study while power and achievement increased during the school year, benevolence and universalism slightly decreased. Despite the considerable amount of literature on values, there is still confusion about the concept of values. The basis of values include respect, inclusion, shared understanding, personal worth, informed partnership, explicitness, and accessibility (Byng, Cairns & Duchan, 2002).

Values may be divided into instrumental and terminal. Terminal values are self-sufficient end states of existence that a person aspires to achieve (comfortable life, wisdom). These are values pursued for their own sake. Instrumental values on the other hand are modes of behavior such as helpfulness, honesty, justice. They are a reflection of the means to achieving the end states or goals (Rokeach, 1973, Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987). Houston (1974) in her investigation of the relationships that existed between values and educational purposes, found differences in the ranking of instrumental and terminal values among teachers, principals, community parents, and non-community parents. For instance, on a scale of 1-10 where 1 equaled highest, family security was ranked (2) by community non-parents, (3) by community parents, (4) by staff, (4.5) by principals, and (8) by teachers. However, the author noted that these differences were small and instead emphasized that there were more similarities in values between the groups. Houston (1974) concluded that role affiliation of members within a group “appeared to differentiate value differences among the members more than group membership alone” (p. 134). Following Rokeach’s initial work, Schwartz (1994) developed a theoretical framework regarding the structure and content of value systems.
The present study is embedded in the framework of universal values developed by Schwartz (1992). According to this framework, values are a representation in the form of conscious goal responses to three universal requirements with which all individuals and societies at large must cope. These are the needs of individuals as biological organisms, requisites of coordinated social interaction, and requirements for the smooth function and survival of groups.

Theoretical Framework

Theories of values in organizations rely on basic human values. Rokeach (1973) has been one of the pioneering forces in the social sciences in clarifying the essence of values, measuring values, and comparing the structure of one’s values to other phenomena such as prejudice. Value Theory is based on the following five assumptions: (a) people have relatively few values (i.e., especially fewer than beliefs), (b) humans possess the same number of values, but to different degrees, (c) values form value-systems, (d) values are rooted in culture, society, and institutions (or organizations), and (e) values manifest in messages and therefore are able to be examined.

Following the controversy generated by Rokeach’s work, Schwartz extended Rokeach’s work in an effort to resolve the issues of the definition of values and value contents. In doing so, Schwartz modified the earlier definitions of values (Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987). Schwartz & Bilsky defined values as desirable trans-situational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in the life of a person or other social entity. Implicit in this definition of values as goals is that (1) they serve the interests of some social entity, (2) they can motivate action—giving it direction and emotional intensity, (3) they function as standards for judging and justifying action, and (4) they are acquired both through socialization to dominant group values, and through the unique learning experiences of individuals.
The theory of basic human values (Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987) has two core components. First, it specifies ten motivationally distinct types of values postulated to be recognized by members of most societies and to encompass the different types of values that guide them. Second, it specifies how these ten types of values relate dynamically to one another. In other words, the theory specifies which values are compatible and mutually supportive, and finally which are opposed and likely to conflict with one another. The crucial content aspect that distinguishes among values is the type of motivational goals they express. A typology of the different contents of values was derived using the reasoning that in order to cope with the challenges inherent in human existence, groups and individuals translate the needs and demands they experience into concepts about which they can communicate, expressing them in the language of values (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987).

Values represent therefore, in the form of conscious goals, responses to three universal requirements with which all individuals and societies must cope: needs of individuals as biological organisms, requisites of coordinated social interaction, and requirements for the smooth functioning and survival of groups (Rokeach, 1973). Furthermore, Schwartz (1992) describes values as cognitively representing universal needs of individuals for their own well-being, and collectively for coordination among individuals within a society. They are the socially recognized terms through which individuals communicate these needs in society. According to Schwartz, whereas individual needs for creative exploration of the world may be expressed through the values of being imaginative or intellectual, societal needs for collective action may be expressed as individual needs of conformity and obedience, and / or being helpful and caring to others. From these basic goals, Schwartz (1994) derived the ten motivational value types: (a) achievement: personal success through the demonstration of competence according to social
standards; (b) benevolence: concern for the welfare of close others in everyday interaction; (c) conformity: restraint of actions, inclination, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms; (d) hedonism: pleasure and sensuous ratification for oneself; (e) power: attainment of social status and prestige, and control or dominance over people and resources; (f) security: safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of the self; (g) self-Direction: independent thought and action; (h) stimulation: excitement, novelty, and challenge in life; (i) tradition: respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that one’s culture or religion impose on the individual; (j) universalism: understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature. An alternative theory of values is that they are emergent and intensely social phenomena that arise daily between people engaged in a collective enterprise (Mowles, 2008).

The figure 2.1 is a representation of the circular arrangement of value types, based on the conflicts and compatibilities inherent in the relations among them. This circular arrangement implies the pattern of associations likely to be found between the importance ratings between the value types and any outside variable.
Furthermore, identification of a structure of value relations is underpinned by the assumption that actions taken in pursuit of each value type has psychological, practical and social consensus that may conflict or be compatible with the pursuit of other values. An analysis of the conflicts and compatibilities likely to arise when people pursue these types of values simultaneously suggests a potentially universal set of relations among values. In a study comparing and integrating psychological perspectives of human rights attitudes and behavior,
Cohrs, Maes, Moscner, & Kielmann (2007) concluded that Schwartz’s value theory explained a human rights orientation. On the self-transcendence versus self-enhancement axis, universalism values (orientation towards social justice, equality, broadminded, a world of peace, tolerance, and inner harmony) increased human rights endorsement among German nationals. Self-transcendence versus self-enhancement reflects a conflict between acceptance of others as equals and concern for their welfare versus the pursuit of one’s own relative success and dominance over others. Therefore, the subjective importance of human rights seems to be a reflection of self-transcendence (Schwartz, 1992). In an organizational setting, the ideal situation for the members is to achieve a consensus in the values espoused by the organization and to be influenced by these values. According to Denison (1997), effectiveness or lack of it is a function of the values and beliefs held by the members of an organization (p. 5). Furthermore, a shared and widely understood system of belief, values, and symbols by members of an organization has a positive impact on their ability to reach consensus and carry out coordinated actions (Denison, 1997). More so, the more members of an organization favor openness to change values, the more they will support the improvement in human rights and minority rights (Kusdil & Simek, 2008).

Values and Not-for-profit Organizations

Organizational policies, documents and statements reflect basic values and stated organizational values. For instance, in current U.S health care organizations words such as “excellence”, “competition”, “profit”, “business”, “consumer rights”, “cost-effective care”, “taking risks”, “cost containment”, “productivity”, and “innovation” represent the values of the organization (Hendel & Steinman, 2002). These values (words) influence the behavior of healthcare professionals as they interact with one another and their clients as they provide services.
In view of the strong social desire of values, there are somewhat strong pressures for individuals to publicly express and validate values irrespective of whether or not they are held internally. As such, when an individual’s values are different from the values prevalent in his or her society or organization, the societal or organizational value may influence what members say, but may not necessarily predict the actual behavior of the members (Maglino & Ravlin, 1998). Moreover, according to Maglino and Ravlin, the culture of the organization where shared values are is an essential element, as it encourages interaction among employees in the workplace. Among the key fundamental issues that every organization needs to address include beliefs and values. For example, when an organization’s members ask themselves, “What do we believe in as an organization?” they are addressing their core values. Therefore, reaching a common understanding by members of the organization provides a basis for exploring further norms and behavior that ultimately contribute in defining the organization’s culture (Tannenbaum, 2003).

Furthermore, an organization’s values answer that question of “how do we act?” Tannenbaum (2003) outlines the characteristics of organizational core values as shared core values and purpose which ultimately defines every individual’s membership in the organization. In addition, the core values define the desired goal or end state of the culture of the organization. Moreover, people have a fundamental need to belong to something of which they can feel proud. As such, the shared core values fulfill the deepest needs of every person and create a committed workforce. However, core values cannot be determined, rather, they are extensions of authentic personal values. Finally, core values are instilled in organizations not by what its members say but by what they do or practice.
The commitment of not-for profit organizations to organizational values are the key means to attracting staff and also to maintaining and improving organizational performance (Cheverton, 2007). The differences manifest themselves in the beliefs and attitudes of service providers about the purpose of the organization and the types of relationships that are appropriate with service users and local people (Brown, 2001). Therefore, when values articulated are ignored, an important part of the shared vision effort is shut away. By contrast, when values are made a central part of the organization’s shared vision effort, and put out into full view, they become like a figurehead on a ship: a guiding symbol of the behavior that will help people move toward the vision (Denison, 1997; Senge, Ross, Smith, & Kleiner, 1994 cited in Packard, 2001, p.36). According to Denison (1997), a strong organizational culture with well socialized members on the values and beliefs of the organization, improves effectiveness because it facilitates the exchange of information and coordination of organizations’ behavior.

Packard (2001) notes that the development of organizational values statements can be powerful, but it is certainly not the end of the process. For example, many employees can tell stories of management going off site to do some mysterious work related to mission, vision, strategic planning, and other exotic topics, and then see the effort end with a brief announcement or memo about the new things that will be happening. This lack of follow through, including a failure to connect such change processes to larger strategies of the organization and day-to-day activities, leads to cynicism and a return to the status quo. Therefore, alignment of values and beliefs central to the organization with actual policies and practices of management systems to obtain a high degree of integration and coordination is essential for organization effectiveness and success (Denison, 1997). Specifically, Kouzes and Posner (1996, p. 105) found in their research that shared values, among other things foster strong feelings of personal effectiveness
and promote strong norms about working hard and caring, concluding that “leaders must be able to gain consensus on a common cause and a common set of principles, they must be able to build a community of shared values” (as cited in Packard, 2001). Allison and Kaye (1997) cited in Packard (2001) offered this advice:

The values, beliefs, and assumptions component of the mission statement highlights the important connection between the nature of the organization’s work and the inspirations guiding the individuals involved. Ideally, the personal values of staff, as well as external constituents and supporters, will align with the values of the organization. When developing a written statement of the organization’s values, stakeholders will have a chance to contribute to the articulation of these values and evaluate how well their personal values and motivation match those of the organization. This process will help build stakeholders’ commitment to the organization and will provide the foundation upon which individuals can do their work.

Andolsek and Stebe (2004) assert that values are universally important only in the dimension of efficiency motivation. According to Andolsek and Stebe, they are positive and mostly significant in almost every society. However, in individualistic oriented countries such as the US, the experience of an individual with his or her organization is more important, especially with respect to remuneration and level of employee autonomy. If positive, the employees are prepared to develop a feeling of attachment to the organization. Furthermore, the values of the organization’s leader should reflect the organization’s values that are accepted by its members (Graber & Kilpatrick, 2008). It is not uncommon for organizations to include principles in their mission statements that specify the courses of action or behavior expected of their members.
Take for instance the following statement; “Our hospital is committed to serving our patients and their family members by providing the highest level of patient care quality”. The underlying value of this principle might be “quality care” (Graber & Kilpatrick, 2008). Furthermore, for an organization to fit into the community and achieve some degree of community goodwill, it should reflect and embody some measure of the community’s values. According to Graber and Kilpatrick (2008), organizations may even be recognized for their professed and enacted values. Therefore, values are conceived as critical contributors to the image and the success of an organization and its leaders.

Although values are internal and do not necessarily imply actions, norms on the other hand involve actions and behavior (Graber & Kilpatrick, 2008). Nonetheless, personal values form the basis of norms. Therefore, organizations may wish to first establish the organizational values, and subsequently use that as a foundation for identifying the key norms in different department or units through a participatory approach to reach a consensus (Graber & Kilpatrick, 2008). Graber and Kilpatrick (2008), assert that organizational values probably constitute the main element in the culture of seemingly dynamic organizations. Accordingly, effective and influential leaders involve the different internal groups in identifying the organizational values and seek to be the sole source of the organizational values. In addition, a continuous communication of the values ensures that these organizational values are enacted within the organization. Organizational values do not only create a unique and dynamic culture, but also contribute to the competitiveness and success of the organization.

Tripathi (1990) noted in his study of the interplay of values in the functioning of South Asian Indian organizations that terms such as “cultural values”, norms, normative beliefs attitudes, expectations and needs are used interchangeably with organizational values.
Organizational values are therefore conceived as preferences of a relatively stable nature which result from both the interaction among members of an organization and with members of other organizations. By their very nature, organizational values are historical in the context of the organization; they direct the preferences and reactions of members. It is the consistent reaction of organization members to a specific situation that forms the basis for the development of organizational norms. In essence, norms serve to evaluate the behavior of organizational members as “appropriate” or “inappropriate”. Therefore, normative behaviors exhibited in an organization by its members reflect the organizational values. The author notes that just as social values are a property of a social system, so also are organizational values. They are stable and yet change with time. Thus, organizational values do not readily change; rather, they change as the organization evolves and grows.

Rather than the values which have not stood the test of time, it is the relatively stable values which are used in the design of alternative forms of human organizations or organizational cultures (Tripathi, 1990, p. 716). Two kinds of values can be identified in organizations: social and work values. The social values are the values used in the design of organizations and organizational culture, while the work values are used in the design of jobs, reward systems and procedures for reliable job performance. These two sets of values are interdependent and influence each other (Tripathi, 1990).

Discussion of values in organizations is essential because values help create the conditions for solidarity among staff within an organization. However, at the same time values are the source of demoralization and conflicts because the prevailing perceptions of values as instruments of management render power relationships between staff and managers as “undiscussable” (Mowles, 2008). According to the Mowles, values need not be thought of as an
instrument of management above all idealization but should rather be viewed as emergent and intense social phenomenon that arises daily between people engaged in a collective entity. In addition to a reasonable amount of effort expected of employees at the work, they are expected to be loyal and to share the values and goals of their organization. Although there may be differences in individual and organizational values, Hult (2003) notes that while values within a particular system of norms may relate logically to each other, they may be logically inconsistent to values within a different system. Therefore, when individuals are confronted with such a situation in an organization, they need to conform more to one system than the other to overcome the conflict.

Values are significant in the functioning of organizations because they provide the basis for the development of human organizations. Particular kinds of people are attracted to particular settings and those who do not fit in that setting leave and those who remain are similar and more homogenous than those initially attracted to that setting (Schneider 1987). According to Katz and Kahn (1978) cited by Tripathi (1990), efficient organization functioning requires that members of the organization have minimal variability in organizational behavior. Moreover, various organizational designs suggested by organizational theorists seek to reduce the variability in human behavior within organizations (Tripathi, 1990, p.715).

Non-Formal Educational Activities

Non-formal learning occurs in a planned but highly adaptable fashion in places such as institutions, organizations, and other situations beyond the spheres of formal or informal education. Formal learning takes places in well structure environments designed for the sole purpose of education. It has designed and structured syllabus, whereas informal learning occurs in situations that come about spontaneously (Eshach, 2007). According to Toth (2007), a much
higher number of adults participate in non-formal learning than in formal learning, and non-formal learning has significant benefits for the economy, wealth, health, and quality of life.

Teaching organizational values

Individuals learn through both formal and informal means to behave in ways that are acceptable in their social environment (Herbst & Houmanfar, 2009). As noted by Herbst and Houmanfar (2009), learning values of the general society, takes place early in life. However, with respect to specific institutions or organizations, learning takes place primarily during organizational entry or socialization processes such as formal and informal orientation through organizational documents.

Socialization is the process through which members of a family, society, as well as organization learn the modes of behavior and know what is “right” and what is “wrong” according to the standards of that family, society or organization (Mujtaba & Sims, 2006). Individuals are therefore guided by these in values in their personal and professional decisions. These values are formed in part during the process of socialization at the family level and later through organizational socialization. Thus, the methods or techniques adopted by the management of organizations to teach new as well as already employed members important values and modes of behavior can be classified as part of the organization’s socialization process. Through socialization and over time, one’s understanding of right and wrong are created and formed. However, socialization does not end in childhood. Adults begin the socialization process all over again every time they accept new employment. Within the organization, socialization ensures that new employees learn the accepted ways of responding to each situation and the expected ways of working with others (Mujtaba & Sims, 2006, p. 262). Even in less
severe socialization or teaching techniques, conformity pressures can influence socially desirable values (Dose, 1997).

Employee socialization may be “formal”, as might take place during orientation meetings training sessions, workshops, and the assignment of mentors, or it may be informal as might take place when employees learn by watching their supervisors and co-workers. In either case, employees learn or are socialized to display patterns of behavior that are expected within the organization (Mujtaba & Sims, 2006). Packard (2001), for instance, studied socialization processes at a homeless shelter in an urban setting. In order to continually remind members of the organizational values, the management of the homeless shelter adopted a number of mechanisms. First and foremost, a half-day orientation session was used to raise the issue of organizational values in the agency, and as part of the orientation for new employees, the value statement was circulated in agency documents and on walls.

In furtherance, leaders of the agency consciously mentioned the values at staff retreats and in-service training sessions to constantly remind employees of the core values (compassion, respect, empathy, empowerment, and dignity) of the agency (Packard, 2001). The use of several communication strategies made employees of the agency aware of the organizational values. From the study, at least 69% of employees said they were made aware of the values through each of these strategies (new employee orientation, agency documents, wall postings, supervisors, administrators, and other employees mention of the values, staff retreats, and in-service training) ranging up to 90% of respondents having seen them in documents used by the agency. Each method had a positive effect on at least 73% of staff, with reports of no effect ranging from 9% (12 employees) to 18% (25 employees). According to Packard (2001), the methods adopted by
the agency resulted in making employees aware of the organizational values and use these values to guide their decisions.

Through organizational socialization processes, cultural, institutional, societal and personal forces act and shape the individual’s values and value systems. As total systems, societies or organizations differ significantly in their values or in the way people organize their values in order of importance (Komin, 1990), and the higher the order of importance, the more likely the value system can be activated to action in behavior. While values may change, they are fairly stable to provide continuity to personal and societal or organizational existence (Komin, 1990). Written evaluations and anecdotal evidence suggest that employees feel that the socialization aspects of orientation programs are valuable in helping them to acclimate to the organization's culture, understand its language and values, and to build relationships (Ballard & Blessing, 2006, p. 246). Furthermore, the role of supervisors in the orientation of employees is critical. For instance, supervisors model employee awareness, confidence, and well-being as organizational values (Ballard & Blessing, 2006).

Conclusion

Organizations, just as societies, are guided by core principles or values, and members are made aware of these values through socialization processes such as orientations and documents. Thus a value is a single belief concerning a desirable mode of behavior or end state that guides the actions, attitudes, and judgments of members, and is a central component of any society or organization. Values are indicative of one's identity, self-worth and worldview. As such, they have major implications for individuals’ lives and their interactions with others. In view of the amount of time spent in a working environment, shared organizational values are particularly significant and salient, and clearly have influence on the effectiveness of socialization methods.
as well as the extent to which members learn and internalize them (Dose, 1997). Theories of values in organizations rely on basic human values. These basic human values are a result of responses to needs as biological organisms, requisites for coordinated social interaction, and requirements for the smooth function and survival of groups.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methods I adopted in conducting the study. It describes the following components; my research questions, the research design, the participants, the development of the instrument, and the data collection process and analysis.

Research Questions

The main objective of the study is to determine which values of Foundation to Mankind (FTM) are communicated to staff through selected non-formal educational activities. Newcomers are taught or socialized on organizational values through strategies such as staff orientations. Moreover, awareness and commitment to the organization’s values are significantly related to using the values to guide one’s decision making (Parkard, 2001, p. 35). I derived sub-research questions to address the main objective of the study by examining the importance employees attach to FTM values. I furthermore examine the difference between employee ratings of FTM and non-FTM values.

Research Design

The study is a survey with a cross – sectional design. This is because it involves the examination of differences in the recognition of organizational values among staff of FTM. Moreover, staff were surveyed at the same point in time (Mertler & Charles, 2008).

Participants

The potential participants for the study were all staff of FTM in the network of offices in the seven states that FTM operates within. However, it was not feasible to survey all potential participants, as the target population included personnel in New York, Pennsylvanian, Ohio, New Jersey, Indiana, Vermont and Virginia offices making up the nearly 500 employees. The only characteristic for participation was to be a staff member of FTM. Finally I adopted a
convenience sampling method to identify the target population of thirty three staff for the study. The sample of the study was the staff working in the local offices of FTM in the state of Ohio.

Instrumentation

In a meta-analysis, Meglino and Ravlin (1998) found that value congruence between individuals and units or organizations requires that one assess the aggregate values of the unit which can be done either directly, or by: (a) using content analysis to extract values from the unit’s publications, (b) measuring the personal values of the unit’s gate keepers, (c) measuring the personal values of the unit’s special agents, (d) assessing the values of the units as perceived by the unit’s gatekeepers, and (e) assessing the values of the unit as perceived by the unit’s “targets” or “general clients”. For this study I adopted a content analysis of organizational publications to extract the values. However, Meglino and Ravlin (1998, p. 357) note that even though the above methods can be used in assessing unit-level values, organizations do not really posses values apart from the values of their members.

The FTM organizational publications I analyzed were staff orientation manual and annual reports. From these I developed an initial list of 29 core principles or values of FTM, and subsequently I eliminated value items that were synonyms to a list of 20 values. I further compared the list of FTM values with the value items from the established Schwartz’s (2004) Values Survey Instrument constituting the 10 motivational values. Through matching the FTM value items with specific value items under each of the 10 motivational values, I eliminated the value items similar in meaning to avoid duplication of such value items, and had a final FTM value items list of 12. For purposes of equal comparison, specific a list of 12 Schwartz Value Survey item were selected. Therefore, a final list of 24 value items consisting of FTM values and
Schwartz Value Survey, all at the same level of understanding was used to develop the data collection instrument.

There are however potential drawbacks to conducting this type of value measurement. Meglino and Ravlin (1998) for instance assert that measuring values specific to particular organizations constrains values research to studies in single organizations, and hence such study is of limited generalizability (p 359). Furthermore, such measurements make the study of values complicated by eliminating the use of common instruments (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). In consideration of the above, I adopted the technique of requiring participants to rate the extent to which they endorse a list of items or statements describing a value or set of values as normative, because the independently rated values allows the researcher the possibility of capturing absolute differences between the values (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). The values scores obtained were independent of each other. The field survey instrument (questionnaire) was developed in Likert-type questions on a continuum. Participants rated each of the value items on a 5-point scale as follows; 1 = less relevant, 2 = somewhat relevant, 3 = relevant, 4 = very relevant, and 5 = extremely relevant. With the exception of the demographic data the rest of the question were closed ended. According to Mertler and Charles (2008), closed ended questions are suitable for measuring opinions, attitudes, knowledge or behavior (p. 229). In addition, closed ended questions provide greater consistency across respondents since they are selecting from the same set of options.

Pre-testing

In order to improve upon the questionnaire; I conducted a pilot test on a cross-section of students in the College of Education at Bowling Green State University, Ohio. The pilot study group was made up of the Graduate Assistants who had six months to two years of working in
the departments of Cross-Cultural and International Education, and Leadership Studies. A total of five questionnaires were administered, and revisions made to some questions for clarity before the actual data collection. Following (Mertler & Charles, 2008), revisions were made to statements of instruction and questions based on the feedback from the pilot test.

Data Collection Procedures and Analysis

In addition sending email to the email addresses I received for staff in other office locations, I requested for another email to be sent to the staff from the leadership of FTM. I delivered the questionnaire to FTM staff in person as well as through email to staff in the local offices in the state of Ohio. I administered the questionnaire to staff at the Liberty Center office. Among those who received the questionnaire by email, while some completed and returned it online others sent the completed questionnaire by post. Thirteen and twenty questionnaires were delivered by hand and email respectively. All thirteen questionnaires hand delivered were returned, while ten out of the twenty sent by email were returned. Of the total number of surveys returned, twenty-three were completed, representing a responds rate of 70 percent. The breakdown from the different offices was as follows; Liberty Center, N = 13, Painesville, N = 1, Alliance, N = 1, Fremont, N = 3, Albion, N = 1, Jeffersonville, N = 1, Tipp City, N = 3. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science Students (SPSS). Specifically, descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means, and paired t-tests were conducted. The results are presented in the next chapter.

In summary, the study is a survey of a cross sectional design. A census sampling technique was adapted in administering the questionnaire to staff in the local offices. This was because the target was to collect the data from all the staff of FTM in the offices across the United States. The instrument was developed through a two-stage process. Firstly, I reviewed
FTM documents and publications to identify core organization values and I subsequently compared them with Schwartz’s values instrument. Secondly, I pre-tested the instrument before the data were collected and subsequently analyzed the data using the SPSS.

Limitations of the Study

The main limitation of the study is that the results cannot be generalized to other not-for-profit organizations because of the small sample size and likely differences in type of organizations and activities. More so, only the organizational values were explored, and although the employees highly rated the values, the study did not explore its relevance with respect to employees’ personal values. Secondly, the data was collected via email and in person. And while the instructions and definitions of values were provided, this process was vulnerable to creating different environments for the respondents to complete the survey and the differential response rates for email versus person.

Thirdly, the scale appeared more ordinal than interval, which limited the type of analysis I could use. Moreover, the scale limited the responses of the participants to five scale points of: less relevant, somewhat relevant, relevant, very relevant, and extremely relevant (Lee, Soutor, & Louviere, 2008). Lastly, assessing the organizational value was a challenge, including identifying the set of values prevalent in the organization as well as areas of conflict between individual predisposition and organizational positions (Padaki, 2000, p. 425).
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the data analyzed. The purpose of the study is to determine the extent to which the values of FTM are communicated to staff through non-formal educational activities. The results are organized by research sub-questions. First I tested the hypothesis that FTM values will be rated more highly than non-FTM values. Second, I present the rank order of all values. Third, I present tests for statistically significant difference in ratings across values. Finally, I examined the organizational values communicated through the selected non-formal educational activities.

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The following demographic data were collected to provide a description of the characteristic of the respondents; sex, ethnicity, and length of employment with FTM. There were twenty-three respondents of FTM. Out of the twenty-three respondents, twenty-one (91.3%) were females and two were males. Fourteen (60.9%) of the respondents were Hispanic, and 7 (30.4%) and 2 (8.7) were Whites and Black/African Americans respectively. The results reveal a mean years of employment of 8.16, standard deviation of 7.32 with .33 and 22 years as the minimum and maximum years of employment with FTM respectively.

Hypothesis and Sub-Questions

Hypothesis

I hypothesize that staff of FTM will rate FTM values higher than Non-FTM values

The hypothesis of the study was tested for significance. A paired sample $t$-test of the mean scores of participants revealed statistically significant difference between the summed rating of all FTM values (Mean = 10.109, SD = 1.777, N = 23) and compared to non-FTM values (Mean = 8.026, SD = 1.386, N = 23), $t$ (22) = 7.986, p < 001, two – tailed. Thus,
employees rated the organizational values higher than the non organizational values. The null hypothesis was thus rejected.

Sub-Question One

To what degree do staffs ascribe importance to the organizational values of FTM?

Similar to the analysis by Schwartz (1999) regarding the mean relevance of the value types, I averaged the relevance that members of the organization attributed to each of the set of values presented on scale of 1 to 5, 1 = less relevant, and 5 = extremely relevant. The mean relevance rank is shown in Table 4.1. The rank order reveals that the employees rated FTM values higher than non-FTM values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual respect*</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non violence *</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non discrimination*</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of different customs*</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice*</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non oppression*</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity integration*</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness to others*</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful coexistence*</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family security*</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity of views*</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing own goals</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of position in life</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying life</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relationships*</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.253</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social power</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience to norms</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority to control others</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on others to ones side</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Foundations to Mankind values

The rank order of means in Table 4.1 reveals that with the exception of the FTM value (building relationships), all the other FTM values ranked higher than the non-FTM values of all the twenty four values.
Sub-Question Two

*Does a difference exist in ratings by staff between organizational values of FTM and non-FTM values?*

In order to determine significance of the existence of any difference in employee ratings between individual FTM and non-FTM values, a paired sample $t$-test was conducted across the values. The average rating of each value of FTM was tested against the average ratings of each non-FTM values. A total of twenty four pairs of $t$-tests were conducted across the values, and a summary of the results is in Table 4.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTM Values</th>
<th>Non FTM Values</th>
<th>Peaceful Coexistence</th>
<th>Diversity Integration</th>
<th>Non Violence</th>
<th>Non Discrimination</th>
<th>Building Relationship</th>
<th>Non Oppression</th>
<th>Highliness</th>
<th>Marital Respect</th>
<th>Accept Different Cultures</th>
<th>Unity of Views</th>
<th>Social Justice</th>
<th>Family Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social power</td>
<td>t ~ -4.848***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.864***</td>
<td>t ~ -5.902***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.234***</td>
<td>t ~ - .942</td>
<td>t ~ -4.277***</td>
<td>t ~ -5.095***</td>
<td>t ~ -6.098***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.841***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.322***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.706***</td>
<td>t ~ -3.322***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>t ~ - 4.278**</td>
<td>t ~ -3.980***</td>
<td>t ~ -5.967***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.240***</td>
<td>t ~ -1.449</td>
<td>t ~ -3.751***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.499***</td>
<td>t ~ -5.412***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.537***</td>
<td>t ~ -3.716***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.077***</td>
<td>t ~ -3.600***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>t ~ - .940</td>
<td>t ~ -.526</td>
<td>t ~ -2.865**</td>
<td>t ~ -1.996</td>
<td>t ~ 2.440*</td>
<td>t ~ -.491</td>
<td>t ~ -1.299</td>
<td>t ~ 3.148**</td>
<td>t ~ -1.373</td>
<td>t ~ -4.39</td>
<td>t ~ -2.021</td>
<td>t ~ -.267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>t ~ -7.780***</td>
<td>t ~ -8.902***</td>
<td>t ~ -9.721***</td>
<td>t ~ -8.410***</td>
<td>t ~ -2.526*</td>
<td>t ~ -6.988***</td>
<td>t ~ -7.120***</td>
<td>t ~ -10.095***</td>
<td>t ~ -9.721***</td>
<td>t ~ 6.739***</td>
<td>t ~ 11.369***</td>
<td>t ~ 5.231***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>t ~ -2.517*</td>
<td>t ~ -1.915</td>
<td>t ~ -4.413***</td>
<td>t ~ -2.453*</td>
<td>t ~ -2.598*</td>
<td>t ~ -2.049</td>
<td>t ~ -3.52**</td>
<td>t ~ -3.458**</td>
<td>t ~ -2.626**</td>
<td>t ~ 1.860</td>
<td>t ~ -2.179*</td>
<td>t ~ 1.189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying life</td>
<td>t ~ -1.447</td>
<td>t ~ -1.286</td>
<td>t ~ -2.552*</td>
<td>t ~ -1.979</td>
<td>t ~ 1.882</td>
<td>t ~ -2.012</td>
<td>t ~ -1.904</td>
<td>t ~ -2.954</td>
<td>t ~ -1.973</td>
<td>t ~ -1.000</td>
<td>t ~ -1.638</td>
<td>t ~ - .810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority over others</td>
<td>t ~ -5.298**</td>
<td>t ~ -7.231***</td>
<td>t ~ -5.978***</td>
<td>t ~ -6.622***</td>
<td>t ~ -1.981</td>
<td>t ~ -5.994***</td>
<td>t ~ -7.880***</td>
<td>t ~ -7.332***</td>
<td>t ~ 5.591***</td>
<td>t ~ 5.509***</td>
<td>t ~ 4.997***</td>
<td>t ~ 3.185***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>t ~ -3.433**</td>
<td>t ~ -4.091***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.635**</td>
<td>t ~ -4.800***</td>
<td>t ~ -.272</td>
<td>t ~ -3.741***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.629***</td>
<td>t ~ -5.564***</td>
<td>t ~ 4.715***</td>
<td>t ~ 4.041***</td>
<td>t ~ -2.389*</td>
<td>t ~ 3.185***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing own goals</td>
<td>t ~ - .591</td>
<td>t ~ - .530</td>
<td>t ~ -1.679</td>
<td>t ~ -1.449</td>
<td>t ~ -2.398*</td>
<td>t ~ - .720</td>
<td>t ~ -1.156</td>
<td>t ~ -2.598*</td>
<td>t ~ 1.447</td>
<td>t ~ - .225</td>
<td>t ~ -1.045</td>
<td>t ~ - .176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>t ~ -.749</td>
<td>t ~ -1.096</td>
<td>t ~ -2.102*</td>
<td>t ~ -1.891</td>
<td>t ~ -2.919**</td>
<td>t ~ -1.045</td>
<td>t ~ -1.283</td>
<td>t ~ -2.472*</td>
<td>t ~ -2.077</td>
<td>t ~ - .569</td>
<td>t ~ -.927</td>
<td>t ~ -.289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of position</td>
<td>t ~ -1.886</td>
<td>t ~ -1.789</td>
<td>t ~ -2.954**</td>
<td>t ~ -3.924***</td>
<td>t ~ -2.019</td>
<td>t ~ -1.891</td>
<td>t ~ -2.247*</td>
<td>t ~ -4.447**</td>
<td>t ~ -3.867**</td>
<td>t ~ 1.447</td>
<td>t ~ -2.102</td>
<td>t ~ 1.141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience to norms</td>
<td>t ~ -3.230*</td>
<td>t ~ -3.943***</td>
<td>t ~ -4.016***</td>
<td>t ~ -3.943***</td>
<td>t ~ -.539</td>
<td>t ~ -3.148</td>
<td>t ~ -3.684**</td>
<td>t ~ -4.457**</td>
<td>t ~ -3.959**</td>
<td>t ~ 3.440**</td>
<td>t ~ 3.281*</td>
<td>t ~ -2.514*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 23  * p = .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
The results show that the difference across the values in most cases was significant at $\alpha = .05$; at least four out of the twelve $t$-test conducted was significant for each pair of non-FTM and FTM values analyzed as shown in Table 4.2. For instance, there was significant difference in the rating between the value influence others (Non-FTM value) and all the FTM organizational values, $t(22) = -2.179 \leq t \geq -11.369, p \leq .05$, two-tailed.
Main Research Question

What organizational values are communicated to staff through selected non-formal educational activities?

The main question is addressed by examining the frequency distribution of the responses of employees to attendance of the selected non-formal educational activities, and whether these activities further emphasized the organizational values. In addition, participants indicated the top three values that were emphasized by the non-formal activities. Table 4.3 presents the frequency distribution of attendance by participants to the non formal educational activities mentioned earlier.

Table 4.3: Did Staff of FTM Who Participated in the Selected Non- Formal Educational Activities Learn FTM Values?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Staff Orientation</th>
<th>Supervisor Orientation</th>
<th>Farmer Recognition Day Celebration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NA represents those who did not participate in the activities.

The frequency distribution in the Table 4.3 reveals that almost all of the respondents believed that they learned something about the organizational values. For the respondents who attended the Yearly Staff Orientation and Farmer Recognition Day Celebration, 17 (94%) and 18 (86%) of them respectively learned about the organizational values. The proportion represents
the majority of the respondents who participated in these two activities with the exception of one in three respondents who said they did not learn about the organizational values. Although eight (34.8%) respondents participated in the individual follow up staff orientation, all of the eight respondents did learn something about the organizational values.

Furthermore, to establish which specific values respondents claimed to have learned through their participation in these non-formal educational activities, the participants were asked to list those organizational values learned. For the majority of employees who learned FTM values at these non-formal educational activities, they listed the top three values emphasized.

The results are presented in Table 4.4. The results reveal that diversity, social justice, helpfulness, unity, building relationships, and mutual respect were values mentioned consistently as being among the top values by the employees of FTM. All the values mentioned were among the values of FTM. As shown in Table 4.4, the six values were consistently mentioned by employees at least six times with a maximum frequency of 15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values mentioned by employees</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Values mentioned by employees</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Non violence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Relationships</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Non oppression</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Respect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Curious</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acceptance of different customs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client’s welfare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Influence others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non discrimination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Appreciation of others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing own goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No stereotype</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open mindedness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful coexistence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social power</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Role of staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Individual gave Multiple (3) Responses. Frequencies are the number of times each value is mentioned, not the number of people who mentioned the value.
Summary of Findings

The analysis of the data reveals that the mean scores of FTM values rank higher than non-FTM values based on the degree of relevance ascribed to the values by the employees of FTM. Furthermore, the outcome of the $t$-test reveals a significant difference in ratings between FTM values and non-FTM values, $t(22) = 7.986$, $p < .001$, two-tailed. Thus the hypothesis was supported. Furthermore, the $t$-test analysis of each pair of non-FTM and FTM values revealed statistically significant difference in most cases. Finally, the employees did learn the organization values of FTM through the selected non-formal educational activities. Diversity, social justice, helpfulness, unity, building relationships and mutual respect were consistently mentioned among the top values emphasized.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

This study used field survey data to examine the values taught to employees of FTM through selected non formal educational activities. The selected non-formal educational activities were the following: Yearly Staff Orientation, Orientation by Supervisors, and Farmer Recognition Day Celebration. Similarly the hypothesis was tested using the 2010 field survey data. This chapter is organized according to the sub-questions and main question of the study. The results from the analysis reported in the previous chapter are presented within the context of the literature reviewed.

Sub-Question One

*To what degree do staffs ascribe importance to the organizational values of FTM?*

The analysis showed that employees of FTM attached a great deal of importance to the organizational values. Employees rated the organizational values higher than non-organizational values. As low as about 14 percent and as high as about 67 percent of the employees rated the organizational values either very or extremely relevant, as opposed to as low as about 4 and high as about 48 percent for the non organizational values. As members of the organization, employees probably share in the organizations’ value system. Thus, the higher scores indicate that the employees attached greater importance to the FTM values (Lee, Soutar, and Louviere, 2008).

In addition, responses to each of the 12 value types were averaged and ranked. The rank average or mean scores of the value types revealed differences in the order of rankings. About half of the FTM values were ranked as the first nine out of the twenty four value types. In general a couple of the values shared the same ranking. The results further support the attachment of greater importance to organizational values by the employees. Houston (1974)
found differences in the ranking of instrumental and terminal values among teachers, principals, community parents, and non-community parents. The study asserts that members of the organization have likely been culturally conditioned in the value system of the organization, and are therefore more likely to rate values of the organization higher than the value types that were foreign to the organization (Komin, 1990). However, Maio, Roese, and Seligman (1996) are of the view that the employees may have rated the values identically because they have not devoted sufficient care and thought to differences between the types.

Sub-Question Two

*Does a difference exist in ratings by staff between organizational values of FTM and non-FTM values?*

Statistical analysis revealed significant difference between the organizational values of FTM and the non-FTM values. Employees of FTM rated the organizational values higher than the non-organizational values. As anticipated, the results supported the study hypothesis that members of FTM will rate higher the organizational value types. Hendel and Steinman (2002) in a study of Israeli nurse managers’ organizational values in today’s health care environment found significant differences between mean scores that head nurses ascribed to personal and professional values on one hand, and organizational values on the other \((p = 0.000)\). However, in the same study, the authors observed that the head nurses ascribed significantly lower importance \((p = 0.001)\) to the specific organizational values of competition, risk taking and status, compared with other value components.

Further *t*-test analysis of each pair of FTM and Non-FTM values showed significant difference in ratings for the majority of the values. The study results suggest that FTM values are more relevant to employees of the organization than non organizational values. Furthermore, it
could be an indication of a strong consensus in shared organizational values among members (Padaki, 2000).

According to De Verennes (1999) the values of tolerance, coexistence and integration underpin the essential content of the respect for the worth and dignity of human beings and provide the foundation for human rights. Among the values ranked higher were integration and peaceful coexistence, which suggests a link between the organizational values of FTM and international or global human rights values. To promote further value congruence between the organizational values and environments within which FTM operates, the non-formal educational activities such as the Farmer Recognition Day Celebration can be used strategically to communicate the values of the organization to employees and clients. Furthermore, FTM’s activities highlight the fundamental human rights values identified earlier in the paragraph. As such the study observes that FTM contribute, in the least indirectly to the advancement of human rights values.

Communication of FTM values through non-formal educational activities made the employees aware of the organizational values. The values, diversity integration, social justice, unity, building of relationships, mutual respect and helpfulness, were emphasized during the non-formal educational activities. Employees attached a higher level of importance to the organizational values than non-organizational values, and thus rated the former higher supporting the study hypothesis.
Main Research Question

*What organizational values are communicated to staff through selected non-formal educational activities?*

The frequency distribution indicates that the majority of the employees learned the organizational values through their participation in the non-formal educational activities of the organization. These selected non-formal educational activities organized by the agency made them more aware of the organizational values. The study found out only one in three employees did not learn the organizational values through their participation in the yearly staff orientation and Farmer Recognition Day Celebration. Unlike the other two activities, the Farmer Recognition Day Celebration was probably not aimed at communicating the organizational values to employees. It was neither teacher-led, nor was there guidance as far as learning the organizational values was concerned. From my participation in the 2009 Farmer Recognition Day Celebration, the activities organized were aimed at showcasing the work of FTM but no deliberate attempt was made to teach staff and clients the organizational values. More so, unlike the yearly and supervisor orientations there was no expectation for the staff to learn the organization’s values at the Farmer Recognition Day Celebration. It is likely that the employees learned the values from this activity due to their intrinsic motivation and propensity for adult learning (Eshach, 2007). More so the methods adopted by the agency resulted in making employees aware of the organizational values. The methods are a yearly staff orientation based on a staff orientation handbook, followed by an orientation provided by supervisors individually to newcomers, and the Farmer Recognition Day Celebration. About 94 and 86 percent of the employees of FTM said they learned the organizational values through their participation in the yearly staff orientation and Farmer Recognition Day Celebration respectively. Similar results
were obtained by Packard (2001), where at least 69% of employees said they were made aware of the organizational values through communication strategies or methods used by the agency. Moreover, Klein and Weaver, (2000) found in their study of the effectiveness of an organizational level orientation training program in socializing new hires that program attendance impacted on socialization of employees on the dimensions of goals/values and the history of the organization.

Furthermore, the values mentioned consistently by employees as being among the top values were diversity, social justice, building relationships, helpfulness, unity and mutual respect. These were the values emphasized through the non-formal educational activities of the agency. However, it was interesting to observe in the rank order that building relationships was the only organizational value ranked lower than more than half of the non-FTM values, despite the important role of this value in the work of FTM with the clients. Among the least mentioned values by employees were acceptance of different customs, people, appreciation of others, social power, open-mindedness, and influencing others. These values were least mention because the organization’s educational activities least emphasized these values particularly acceptance of different customs, empowerment and appreciation of others which are FTM values. Values may be thought of as global beliefs about desirable end-states underlying attitudinal and behavioral processes, which make behavior to be viewed as a manifestation of values and attitudes (Connor & Becker, 1975). Although not hypothesized, there seems to be congruence between the social values associated or implied by the activities of the organization, and the norms of acceptable behavior in the larger social system which they are part (Dowling & Pfeffer, 1975). Furthermore an indirect influence can be assumed at the societal level about values and norms as elements
that elicit and guide collective action (Christenson, James, Houglan, Thomas, & Sheperd, 1998).

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the values mentioned consistently among the top values (diversity integration, social justice, unity, building of relationships, and helpfulness) are among the values that are fundamental to human rights. Human rights including minority rights are based on the acknowledgment and acceptance of the human person in all his or her diversity (De Varennes, 1999). FTM can find the right balance based on the values or principles fundamental to human rights. For instance, acceptance and acknowledgment of all human diversity may enable individuals to participate in the life of the linguistic or cultural community to which they belong as well as in the life of the wider society of the state as a whole (De Varennes, 1999). Furthermore, Klein and Weaver (2000) assert that having a better understanding of the history, traditions, and values of the organization may help new employees to engage coworkers in discussion, join in conversations, and be more quickly accepted by members of the organization. Therefore, emphasis of these values to employees by FTM management can strengthen the organizational culture and indirectly promote human rights.

Furthermore, despite the unavailability of additional data to determine the location of the values mentioned among the top values within Schwartz’s (1999) universal human values structure and definitions, these values communicated to employees through the non-formal educational activities seem to be located within universalism, benevolence, and security. These value types are in close proximity in the universal value structure, and according to Schwartz and Bilsky (1987), people tend to give high or low priority to identifiable sets of mutually compatible motivational domains, rather than assigning priorities to these sets of values in a random pattern.
CHAPTER VI: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Communicating organizational values through a variety of strategies or methods can ensure that members within the organization have a strong shared value system. Articulation of the organizational values may contribute to internalization by members. The leadership of FTM may have to continue to explore and use non-formal educational activities such as the Farmer Recognition Day Celebration as part of a series of yearly employee orientation activities. Furthermore, the study observed that the activities of FTM are aimed at advancing the rights of the minorities with respect to access to education, language rights, and respect the worth of individuals despite their diversity, therefore, contributing to the preservation of distinctive group identities. For instance, English and Spanish are the two main languages used by the organization to communicate with clients. Consequently, educational materials are produced in both languages.

Policy Recommendation

Furthermore, the values that emerged highly rated by the employees can be used as the starting point by management in examining its compatibility with the management system of FTM and accordingly adopt non-formal educational activities to articulate the values and occasionally revisit those values. More so the FTM values that were least mentioned need to be emphasized more to staff. As observed by Ballard and Blessing (2006), in addition to the general orientation sessions, individual meetings with supervisors can re-echo the values of the organization particularly to new employees. Employees cannot embrace an organization’s goals or values if they are not made aware of those goals and values (Klein & Weaver, 2000, p. 51). More so, the significance of organizational values in management is gaining a steady recognition by management practitioners (Roe & Ester, 1999).
Even though the study did not explore with the participants the relationship between the organizational values and universal minority rights, it will be worthwhile to use these non-formal educational activities to highlight organizational values in the context of international standards on human rights. Furthermore, by the nature of its activities, FTM advances human rights values. As far as international education is concerned, non-formal education activities forms a component of international education that can be used to advance human rights values globally.

The finding that values can be communicated through non-formal educational activities indicates that through international education, human rights values can potentially be promoted internationally. Employees who favor openness to change organizational values tend to support improvement in human rights and minority rights (Kusdil & Simsek, 2008). However, before employees become aware of organizational values and commit to them, there is the need for continuous awareness creation on the importance of the values in all activities of the organization not limited to the traditional methods of awareness creation. Attention to the values of tolerance, coexistence, and integration are part of the very foundation of a modern democratic state and this does not involve a loss of sovereignty or a threat to unity. On the contrary, their careful application may help avoid and resolve tensions and conflicts involving minority issues in a democratic country (De Varennes, 1999).

Recommendations for Future Research

For future research, a similar study can be conducted with more than one organization. Such organizations could all be not-for-profit organizations, or a comparative study might be conducted of a not-for-profit organization and a public agency or institution in order to generalize the findings. Secondly, one method of data collection can be adopted in future studies to create similar conditions for all participants. Also the adoption of rating of values will assist in
the identification of more values related to human rights. Maio, Roese, and Seligman (1996) have made a convincing case in support of ratings. Furthermore, future studies can explore further the extent to which the values are shared by members beyond just the existence of a consensus. The current study identified diversity integration, social justice, unity, building of relationships, mutual respect, and helpfulness as some of the values fundamental to the human rights. Future research can explore further the relationship between the values of organizations and internationally espoused values such as human rights. Future research may also further examine the extent to which organizations contribute to the promotion of human rights at the micro level and the impact that has on the society.

Conclusion

The findings of the current study highlight the communication of organizational values through non-formal educational activities. Members of the organization are made aware of the organization’s values through their participation in these non-formal educational activities such as yearly staff orientation, supervisors’ orientation, and Farmer Recognition Day Celebration. Therefore, activities which are not identified among the traditional methods or strategies of communicating organizational values to employees provide opportunities for the learning of organizational values. In addition to organized orientation sessions for staff, value guided non-formal educational activities such as Farmers Day Celebration can be used as part the strategies or methods in communicating organizational values to employees and clients. Orientation activities need to enable employees to share and recognize the importance of the organizational values in implementing their activities.

In addition, as the current study found, members of the study organization (FTM) recognized the organization’s values, and attached higher importance to those values than non-
organizational values. This study also provide evidence for exploring difference in values by comparing organization values to value items on the Schwartz Value Survey apart from values of individuals emerging from society. This is supported by the statistically significant difference observed between FTM and Non-FTM values based on employee ratings. Similarly, educators can encourage the learning of institutional values among students by adopting out-of-class activities to emphasizes the institutional values. Thus, human rights education aimed at the promotion of positive attitudes towards human rights as well increasing the knowledge on specific human rights may directly or indirectly influence behavior (Cohrs, Maes, Moschner, & Kielmann, 2007).
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APPENDIX: INSTRUMENT

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY: SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

Values Recognition Measure among Staff of Foundation to Mankind (FTM) in Ohio

Section I: Demographic Information

Please Tick the appropriate box

Sex [ ] Female [ ] Male

Ethnicity [ ] Hispanic [ ] White [ ] Black/African American [ ] Asian

[ ] Other (Name): ..................

How many years have you worked with the organization?............

Section II: Values

Using a scale of 1 – 5, where 1 = less relevant and 5 = extremely relevant, rate the following values in order of importance to your organization. Please check box below you choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social power (social recognition, accepted)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful coexistence (social order, peace)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (means, riches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity (integration of people of different backgrounds, race, nationality)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success (sense of accomplishment, achievement, attainment)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non violence (seek redress without physical harm to others)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence (concerned with getting others to one’s side)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non discrimination (denial of opportunity on race, color)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure (excitement, enjoyment, leisure)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building relationships (rapport in office and field)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying life (gratification, comfortable, well off)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non oppression (freedom, choice, liberty)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority (control or direct others)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness (assist, support or working for welfare of others)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daring (challenging)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual respect (respect for one another, human dignity)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing own goals (independent of thought, free)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different customs (acceptance of different customs)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curious (enquiry, to know more)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity (reconciliation of divergent views, tolerant)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of position in life (content)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice (equal opportunity for all, fairness)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience (conformity to societal norms, dutiful, yielding)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family security (home, household, economic, social, and political stability)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III:

Please kindly respond to the questions under the following Foundation to Mankind (FTM) activities.

Yearly staff orientation

- I attended?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
  [If yes]
- Did you learned about FTM values?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
- Which values were emphasized? [List the top 3 values, please refer to list in section II]
  1.……………….    2.……………….    3.……………….

Supervisor Orientation

- I attended?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
  [If yes]
- Did you learn about FTM values?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
- Which values were emphasized? [List the top 3 values, please refer to list in section II]
  1.……………….    2.……………….    3.……………….

Farmer Recognition Day Celebration

- I attended?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
  [If yes]
- Did you learn about FTM values?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
- Which values were emphasized? [List the top 3 values, please refer to list in section II]
  1.……………….    2.……………….    3.……………….

Other activities [Name] …………………..
Which values were emphasized? [List the values] …………………………………………………