

Göran HERMEREN

Anatomia zmian wartości

Introduction

The problems of value change have theoretical implications of many kinds, for philosophical theories about change as well as for theories of value. Moreover, the political implications are obvious enough. Value changes are of considerable importance for the development of a society. Yet little is known about the relations between value changes, technological changes and e.g. social changes. This is an area of research that no doubt will prove to be important both for research and policy-making in the future.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING

The practical implications for planning are also worth noting. Let us suppose that value changes take place, at least sometimes. Suppose also that planning ought to satisfy human needs and expectations in a rational and fair manner. (To decide exactly what needs — and whose needs — ought to be satisfied is of course a political problem that I do not intend to discuss here). Suppose finally that the government or the local authorities ask experts to make plans for what kinds of schools, houses, hospitals, and so forth, should be built during the next decade, and that these plans are carried out.

It may then turn out to be the case that people do not want the (kind of) schools, houses and hospitals the experts have planned for them, even if the people concerned were consulted in one way or other during the process of planning. The explanation might simply be that their values have changed in the meantime. Thus value change is a potential source of error in planning. It might even be argued that if people's values change quickly in an unforeseeable and uncontrollable way, planning might do more harm than good; and that an anarchistic society is better than a society with central planning.

I do not believe that an anarchistic society is a good society. From a practical and political point of view it is therefore (especially in a democratic society) necessary to be able to detect, and if possible, to predict value changes. Strategies and channels must be invented which make it possible for value changes to influence planning and policy making. If a society is too rigid in this respect, and no such strategies and channels exist, then value changes can cause tensions which may threaten the survival of that society.

If planning is to be successful, it should be clear that concepts, distinctions, and methods are needed which make it possible to describe, explain, understand, predict (and perhaps influence) value changes. In this way the existence of value changes also represents a challenge to the theory of planning.

SOME PROBLEMS AND AREAS OF RESEARCH

Value changes raise problems of many kinds: political, moral, sociological, historical, economical, philosophical, and so forth. For example, studies can be made of the relations between value changes and various kinds of social, psychological and economical variables. Whose values have changed, and in what direction? What connection, if any, is there between value changes and the social, educational, economic etc. background of the people involved?

An individual or a group whose values change (or who change their values) can have to face serious moral problems; norms of solidarity, integrity, party loyalty, self respect, patriotism, etc., can come into conflict with each other. Also political authorities may have to face moral problems: if, to what extent, and under what circumstances is it right to influence (promote, manipulate, or stop) value changes? The ethics of propaganda and indoctrination are neglected areas of research.

One might also ask what happens to a political, economic, and social system when major and minor value changes take place within a society. This is a problem that can be

studied historically as well as systematically. In the first case a number of historical value changes could be investigated, and in the second a number of examples of value changes could be examined systematically in order to discover general laws or tendencies.

Moreover, attention can be focussed on the causes of value changes and on how value changes are to be explained. For example, do value changes depend on educational changes, economic changes or on social changes? Or do they depend on a combination of these and other factors? Which ones? What role does the press and other mass media play in this context (to promote or stop value changes)? Perhaps there is no single factor, or set of factors, which cause value changes generally?

Important though they are, such empirical questions will not be discussed here. The purpose of the present paper is instead to shed light on another, and theoretically more fundamental, issue: what are value changes, and how are they to be understood and analyzed? If people mean different things when they talk about value changes, this may not only be confusing but lead to pseudo-agreements and pseudo-disagreements. This may be time-consuming and frustrating, and (what is worse) it may prevent people from seeing clearly what the issues are and lead them to use inadequate methods, when they study value changes.

A central idea in this paper is that it is essential to distinguish sharply between changes of preferences and changes of values. Studies of preferences include studies of what people prefer or say they prefer, given that certain alternatives are open to them (or that they believe that certain alternatives are open to them). But studies of value changes include studies of how people's ideas about what is desirable or worthy of being desired have changed over time — in individuals or groups.

The implications of this distinction will be explored in the following sections. But I will begin by discussing an example. Then I intend to propose a few definitions.

AN EXAMPLE

Let us consider the population growth in a country like Japan. Let us first suppose that at one time the country was not very densely populated. Accordingly, there was no urgent need for family planning and similar policies. On the contrary, the government would like to see an increase in the population, since more workers are needed in the factories. Family planning and free abortion are valued negatively; contraceptives are forbidden and abortion is allowed only on medical grounds. The authorities welcome immigration from abroad.

But a few decades later the situation is entirely different. Due to improved medical care the mortality has decreased drastically. As a result the population has grown to such an extent that something has to be done to stop it. Continued increase of population is valued negatively; and different means of controlling the population growth are valued positively: free abortion is allowed, immigration from abroad is stopped, passive euthanasia is permitted in hospitals, and so forth.

This example is, I think, instructive in several ways. In the first place, it illustrates changes which are not imagined or invented; changes of this and similar kind have taken place in many countries. Other examples could easily be given from the political history of Germany during this century, or from the history of social welfare planning in Sweden.

Moreover, the example suggests that certain fundamental values rooted in biological needs may remain constant in spite of the changes in attitude to population growth and free abortion. It may be impossible to maintain a certain standard of living both if there are too many and too few inhabitants in a country. Thus it is perhaps necessary to postulate some kind of hierarchy of values and to make a distinction between basic values and others – on the assumption that the basic ones ought to be given priority, or do not change as easily and as rapidly as the others, or both.

Finally, this example also reminds us of the well-known and much-debated distinction between means and goals (or instrumental and intrinsic values). To legalize free abortion is a means of limiting the population growth, and this in turn is a means to obtain or maintain a certain standard of living in the country.

In the following section I shall try to make explicit some kinds of value changes which are or may be involved in this example.

SOME DEFINITIONS

The first definition to be discussed here will be stated as follows.

Definition 1. A person P or a group G has changed their attitudes to – and evaluation of – a certain alternative (state of affairs, object, action etc.). X from one time t to another time t', if and only if there is an alternative (etc.) Y such that

- (i) *P (respectively G) prefers X to Y at t, and*
- (ii) *P (respectively G) prefers Y to t', and*
- (iii) *t precedes t', and*
- (iv) *$X \neq Y$.*

This, of course, is a definition of what I earlier called a change of preferences. But how is the concept of value change to be defined? I propose that there is more than one concept of value change, and that the following definitions might provide at least the beginning of an answer to the question just asked:

Definition 2. P's or G's values have changed from one time t to another time t', if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) *P (respectively G) was at t disposed to act for certain reasons R, and*
- (ii) *P (G) is at t' disposed to act for certain reasons R', and*
- (iii) *t precedes t', and*
- (iv) *$R \neq R'$*

What has changed according to this definition is what might be called values in the dispositional sense.

Before contrasting this definition with another one, I would like to make the following clarification. No change need of course to be involved, if a person performs an act for one particular reason and then later performs a different act for a different kind of reason. The main idea in the definition is obviously that the agent changes the weight he attaches to reasons of a certain type from one time to another.

The kind of value change that this definition tries to capture could be illustrated as follows. Suppose that the local authorities have to decide about certain proposed reconstruction programs for the city. Suppose also that to begin with they are inclined to let strictly economic reasons be decisive. Accordingly, they hire economic experts to make

cost-benefit analyses of the various alternatives, and they choose the least expensive alternative.

But later the situation is different. The strict application of economic principles has damaged the historically valuable old city. Parking lots have replaced the parks, and air pollution is beginning to become a health problem. Realizing this, the authorities are no longer inclined to let strict economic principles alone be decisive when they have to decide about proposed reconstruction programs. A change of reasons or motives has taken place, and behind this change may be a value change of a different and more fundamental kind – to be defined shortly.

Alternatively, the idea outlined above could also be expressed as follows:

Definition 2'. *P's or G's values have changed from one time t to another t' , if and only if the following three conditions are all satisfied:*

- (i) *P (or G) thinks at t that in situations of type S actions of type A should be performed, if (or only if) certain conditions C are fulfilled,*
- (ii) *P (or G) does not think at t' that in situations of type S actions of type A should be performed, if (or only if) certain conditions C are fulfilled, and*
- (iii) *t precedes t' .*

Thus, at one time the fact that these conditions C are satisfied (e.g. that a particular proposed alternative is the least expensive of the available alternatives, or there are good reasons for believing that this is the case) is (regarded) as a good or even sufficient reason for performing an action of a certain type (e.g. for choosing that alternative). But later the fact that these conditions C are satisfied is not (regarded as) a good or sufficient reason for performing that action. In that sense a change has taken place from t to t' .

Why has such a change taken place? The explanation can very well be that a change of one of the following two types has occurred, or possibly that both of them have taken place:

Definition 3. *P's (or G's) values have changed from one time t to another t' , if and only if there is a state of affairs (alternative, object, action, etc.) X such that*

- (i) *P (or G) thinks at t that X is desirable for its own sake, and*
- (ii) *P (or G) does not think at t' that X is desirable for its own sake, and*
- (iii) *t precedes t' .*

This might be called an intrinsic value change. This kind of change should be contrasted to the one defined below:

Definition 4. *P's (or G's) values have changed from one time t to another time t' , if and only if there are at least two states of affairs (alternatives, etc.) X and Y such that*

- (i) *P (or G) thinks that X desirable as a means to achieve or bring about Y, and*
- (ii) *P (or G) does not think at t' that X is desirable as a means to achieve (etc.) Y and*
- (iii) *t precedes t' , and*
- (iv) *$X \neq Y$.*

But what does it mean to say that something is desirable 'for its own sake' or 'as a means of achieving or bringing about something else'?

There is a vast literature on this topic, and it has even been denied that a distinction between intrinsic and instrumental values can be maintained or serves any useful purpose. One of the reasons for keeping the distinction here, at least for the time being, is of

course that changes of the kind defined in definition 4 need not involve any value changes at all, whereas changes of the kind defined in definition 3 necessarily do. The fact that the distinction can be drawn, and has been drawn, in a number of different ways is in my view no reason for not making any distinction at all between instrumental and intrinsic values.

As is well known, several philosophers have proposed to define the concept of good in terms of the presence of certain attitudes (approval, etc.). I would not be inclined to accept such theories. But this is not a point I can argue in the limited space available here. So the issue must be left open for the time being. Thus without taking a stand as to whether such general theories are tenable, I will simply suggest that what is at stake in certain policy changes is a change of the following kind:

Definition 5. P's (or G's) values have changed from one time t to another t', if and only if there is at least one alternative (state of affairs, object, action, etc.) X such that

- (i) *P (G) had at t a certain (positive, negative or indifferent) attitude A to X,*
- (ii) *P (G) has at t' the attitude A' to X,*
- (iii) *t precedes t', and*
- (iv) *A \neq A'.*

What has changed according to this definition are values in what might be called the attitude-sense of values.

What methods can be used to study value changes? It depends, of course, on how 'value change' is defined and on what assumptions are made about the agents and the alternatives. For example, let us suppose that definition 1 is taken for granted. Let us also suppose that certain assumptions are made about P (or G) to the effect that they are rational, well informed, and so forth. Finally let us suppose that the proposed alternatives are comparable to each other. Then traditional cost-benefit analysis can be used. But the situation is different, if e.g. definition 3 and other assumptions are chosen. This is one of the reasons for distinguishing between the concepts defined in this section.

A CLASSIFICATION

To be able to discuss and analyze the anatomy of value changes more clearly, I propose to use the following diagram as a point of departure:

A person P or a group G thinks that	(A) this holds categorically (unconditionally)	(B) this holds hypothetically (conditionally)
(1) X is good (desirable)		
(2) X is bad (etc.)		
(3) X is indifferent		

With the help of this diagram it is possible to obtain a typology of value changes. The change from combination (1A) to (1B) is clearly a value change of a different type than the change from combination (1A) to e.g. (2A).

The diagram does not represent a complete typology, however. First, 'X is good' is

ambiguous and can be interpreted as 'X is intrinsically good' and 'X is instrumentally good'; thus, we need one diagram for intrinsic values and one diagram for instrumental values. Moreover, we also have to take into account that value changes can consist in changes within a hierarchy of values. But it is easy to take care of this, if the diagram above is supplemented by a new diagram where 'X is good' etc. is replaced with 'X is better than Y', and so forth, in the way outlined below:

A person P or a group G thinks that	(A) this holds categorically (unconditionally)	(B) this holds hypothetically (conditionally)
(1) X is better than Y		
(2) Y is better than X		
(3) X and Y are equal		
(4) X and Y are indifferent		
(5) X and Y are incomparable		

However, 'X is better than Y' is ambiguous in the same way as 'X is good'. Thus it can be replaced both by 'X is intrinsically better than Y' and by 'X is instrumentally better than Y'.

In this way it is possible to obtain four diagrams by means changes do not take place only within these diagrams but also between them. The classification is complex, but I hope this reflects the complexity of the topic.

POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS OF POLICY CHANGES

Let us suppose that the building activities in a country at a particular time are guided by the following goal or principle

(X) *70 000 flats should be built every year*

This is the alternative the government has decided to try to achieve. Let us also assume that it is tacitly taken for granted that attempts to reach goal (X) should be made as long as the situation remains unchanged in certain important respects.

A description of these respects will constitute a series of premises, which might include statements like

(P 1) *The population growth remains constant*

But let us suppose that only a few years later, the government has replaced (X) by the goal

(Y) *100 000 flats should be built every year*

Does this mean that a value change has taken place? Not necessarily. This is, of course, one possible explanation, but there are also others.

For example, the explanation might simply be that the situation now has changed so that (P 1) is no longer true. Instead it might be agreed or taken for granted by the government that (Y) should be followed as long as it is true that

(P 2) *The population growth increases every year*

This simple example (based on Swedish experiences) illustrates the importance of distinguishing between conditional and unconditional values (goals, etc.), and of stating the conditions clearly.

There can also be other explanations of the fact that (X) has been replaced by (Y). It is well known that new information can influence the choice between a number of alternatives decisively. Suppose that in addition to (P 1) the following premise has been taken for granted:

(P 3) *The information about the available alternatives is correct*

But let us assume that it turns out that the information about the alternatives and their consequences is *n o t* correct. As a result it may well be the case that (X) is replaced by (Y). Then what has changed is not (as above) the situation but our knowledge about the situation. Even if this leads to policy changes of various kinds, *n o v a l u e* changes need to be involved.

To sum up: alleged value changes can depend on (among others) the following factors:

- (1) changes in the situation of those who are concerned or involved;
- (2) changes in the understanding of (and reaction to) the situation of those concerned;
- (3) changes in the beliefs of those concerned about what alternatives are open to them;
- (4) changes in the judgments of those concerned about the consequences of various alternatives;
- (5) changes in the judgments of those concerned of the relevance of certain arguments.

The last four of these changes may in turn depend on e.g.

- (a) new information,
- (b) processes of socialization,
- (c) political propaganda,

GENUINE VALUE CHANGES

But what I have said so far should not obscure the fact that genuine value changes *c a n* take place and *d o* take place. A genuine value change takes place if a person or a group first accepts certain categorical (or unconditional) values and then rejects them. This is normally the case in religious and ideological conversions.

Hypothetical values can change, provided that clauses like

- (1) under conditions *C*, it is *i s* good that
- (2) under conditions *C*, one *o u g h t* to do are first accepted and then replaced by
- (3) under conditions *C*, it is *n o t* good that . . . , respectively
- (4) under conditions *C*, one *o u g h t n o t* to do or alternatively by
- (5) it is *n o t* the case that under conditions *C*, it is good that (respectively, one *o u g h t* to do . . .)

The problem to decide in particular cases whether a genuine value change has taken place remains, of course.

To be able to decide whether this has indeed happened, it is necessary to investigate the situation closely. It is particularly important to study the five possible explanations mentioned at the end of the previous section and to try to eliminate as many of them as possible. Of course, the conditions *C* referred to above in (1) – (5), must remain constant

— it is therefore important to check if these conditions implicitly or explicitly have been changed.

Examples from other areas, like architecture and aesthetics, could also be given. The architecture from the end of the nineteenth century has been evaluated differently by different generations. Today there is a lively interest in this architecture, and attempts are made to preserve as much of it as possible in Sweden. The situation has changed considerably during the last fifty years. It may well be the case that here we have an example of a genuine value change in the sense defined above. But again, it does not have to be so.

The explanation can instead be simply that we appreciate and want to preserve what is old and historically interesting. But as time goes by, what is historically interesting changes. To people in the 1920's the houses built during the last decade of the nineteenth century were simply not old enough to be historically interesting. But today we have got the distance in time required to make us feel that these houses are worth preserving. In that case no genuine change of aesthetic values need to have taken place.

PREFERENCES AND VALUE CHANGES

In his important and very influential work *Social Choices and Individual Values* (1951, 2nd ed. 1965), Kenneth Arrow does not distinguish clearly between preferences and values. But it is easy to show that this distinction is important both in theoretical and practical contexts. If a value change is supposed to be genuine, then certain variables have to be controlled; if it is supposed to be spurious (not genuine), then other variables have to be checked.

It is also easy to show that values and preferences are independent of each other in the sense that the preferences of people may change even if their values remain constant. It may also conversely be the case that their values change, but their preferences (overt actions) do not. For example, suppose that in a particular situation a person prefers alternative *X* (to live in DDR) to alternative *Y* (to migrate). Later his values have changed — perhaps as a result of a political conversion. Then he would prefer *Y* to *X*. But now he is not free to choose; the borders are closed. Thus, even if his values have changed, he still lives in DDR.

The importance and practical implications of some of these distinctions could also be illustrated with examples from the field of education. Suppose a comparative investigation is made of what kinds of professions boys and girls choose when they leave school today, and what professions they choose when they left school twenty years ago. Let us also assume that no significant changes can be detected — in spite of all that has been said about equal opportunities and equality between the sexes in the meantime.

Does this mean that no value changes have taken place, and that the views of the pupils of what is a proper profession for a boy and a girl are just as traditional now as twenty years ago? Or does the result show that their school has failed to influence their attitudes and values? Not necessarily. The values may have changed, and their school may have been successful. But if their society has not changed in certain respects (day care centers for children are provided, part time jobs are available, people are employed on the basis of their qualifications only, not on the basis of their sex, all careers are open to both sexes, etc.), then the pupils may continue to choose the traditional jobs — simply because no alternatives are available.

CONCLUSIONS

Value changes have been studied empirically in various social and humanistic disciplines such as anthropology, economics, education, history of literature, psychology, sociology, and so forth. The distinctions outlined in this paper have implications for such studies – and for the theory about these sciences – in several ways. In concluding this paper, I shall briefly call attention to some of these implications.

First these distinctions represent a challenge and a problem to the scholar. The challenge consists in finding indicators by means of which different types of value changes can be studied. The problem is to make sure that these indicators are valid and reliable. Different kinds of value changes will require at least partly different types of indicators. If the kinds of value changes are not distinguished, this is likely to lead to pseudo-agreements and to pseudo-disagreements about what the empirical findings show.

What indicators could be used? For example, to study changes in religious attitudes and values, one might investigate changes in the number of people visiting the church on Sundays, changes in the relative frequency of church weddings, changes in the proportion of death announcements containing religious sentences, and so forth. To study changes in international attitudes (international solidarity, etc.) indicators of the following type could be used: changes in the amount of money spent on programs for developing countries, the number of translations of foreign authors to a language, statistics of the number of people visiting foreign countries and the number of tourists from abroad.

But how are these data to be interpreted? Suppose one has been able to demonstrate that there has been significant changes in the number of more or less lightly dressed women in newspaper ads during the last decades. Does this mean that the attitudes of people towards women have changed? If so, in what way? Or suppose it would be shown that there have been significant changes in the state budget over the last decades so that the social sector has got an increasing amount of the money, and the defense sector a decreasing amount? Does this mean that a value change has taken place, and if so, what kind of value change?

Similar problems arise in the aesthetic disciplines. Taste and aesthetic values may change, and we need indicators by means of which these changes can be studied empirically. There is ample evidence suggesting that the attitudes to the Baroque style or to the Jugend style has changed several times from negative to positive, from positive to negative, and then back again to positive. But suppose that certain fundamental values and need (like the demand for change, novelty, imaginativeness, security, and so forth) have been constant all the time. Is it not possible that certain changes in the situation, or in our perception of the situation, can explain why these demands have been satisfied in different ways at different times and places?

Finally, the distinctions outlined previously in this paper also have implications for certain issues in the theory of science; they call attention to difficulties in a strictly positivistic conception of science. Whatever indicators are used when value changes are studied, empirical data and logical analysis alone are not enough to decide if a value change has taken place, or what kind of value change has taken place. The data

obtained have to be interpreted and to be put in a theoretical context. The construction of this context has to be based on speculations and on value-judgments¹.

STRESZCZENIE

Mówi się często, że zmiany w sposobie działania ludzi są wynikiem zmian w ich systemie wartości. Jest to rozpowszechnione założenie w literaturze socjologicznej, psychologicznej, pedagogicznej i ekonomicznej. Zasadniczym celem niniejszego artykułu jest: 1) rozróżnienie, zdefiniowanie i klasyfikacja różnych typów zmian wartości i ocen i 2) omówienie uzasadnień wnioskowania, że pewne typy zmian wartości wystąpiły.

Przypuśćmy, że agens A znajduje się w pewnej sytuacji – ma on wybrać jeden spośród kilku sposobów działania. Wybór racjonalny zakłada, że formuluje się i wyjaśnia alternatywy postępowania, opisuje się następstwa różnych alternatyw, oblicza prawdopodobieństwo wystąpienia tych następstw, ocenia się te mniej lub bardziej prawdopodobne następstwa i dokonuje się próby całościowej oceny wszystkich następstw każdej alternatywy działania. Jest ważne, aby oddzielić alternatywy oceniane przez agensa od wartości, na których opierają się te oceny, a także od samej oceny tychże alternatyw. zmiany wartości od zmian dotyczących tego co ludzie wybierają wolą, myślą itd., które znaczeniu – brak jest jednolitego lub ogólnie przyjętego języka wyводу. Należy jednak dokonać rozróżnienia pomiędzy procesem wartościowania i oceniania a wynikiem tego procesu, który wyraża się sądem wartościującym. Należy też odróżnić takie pozytywne i negatywne sądy wartościujące od stanów lub jakości, które uważa się za pożądane, np. takie wartości, jak: zdrowie, piękno, sprawiedliwość, solidarność itd. Tak więc zmiany wartości i ocen mogą oznaczać różne rzeczy – dlatego też wspomniane dwa główne problemy (1 i 2) są ważne, jeśli chce się uniknąć nieporozumień.

Autor tego artykułu próbuje więc rozróżnić zmiany wartości jako zmiany preferencji, zmiany usposobienia do działania, zmiany postaw itd. Można połączyć te rozróżnienia z całym szeregiem innych. Następnie próbuję sklasyfikować typy zmian wartości. Uważam, że da się wyróżnić „zmiany absolutne”, „zmiany porównawcze” i „zmiany względne”.

Główną myślą artykułu jest to, że decydującego znaczenia nabiera świadomość wartości, gdy chce się opisywać, wyjaśniać i przewidywać zmiany wartości. Nie należy jednak zakładać, że jest tylko jedna taka hierarchia, że jest ona absolutna i ma raz na zawsze dany szczyt i dół (tym dołem są podstawowe, ogólne i kategoryczne wartości). Hierarchie mogą być częściowo odmienne w różnych miejscach i kulturach.

Świadomi przedstawionych rozróżnień, możemy teraz odróżniać prawdziwe zmiany wartości od zmian dotyczących tego, co ludzie wybierają, wolą, myślą itd, które to zmiany zależą od zmian w sytuacji agensa, zmian w rozumieniu przez ludzi tej sytuacji, zmian w ich przekonaniach co do możliwych alternatyw działania i co do prawdopodobnych następstw tych alternatyw. Agens może zmienić swój wybór, swoje preferencje i postawy, a jednak zmiana wartości nie następuje. W tym przypadku mamy do czynienia tylko z „pozorną zmianą wartości”.

Praktyczny wniosek jest taki, że ci, którzy pragną prowadzić empiryczne badania zmian wartości w dyscyplinach takich jak socjologia, kształcenie, antropologia czy ekonomia, mogą potrzebować jakiegoś rozróżnienia pomiędzy prawdziwymi i pozornymi zmianami wartości. Muszą też sformułować i przebadать różne alternatywne hipotezy. Pod względem badania nad zmianami wartości nie różnią się one od innych typów badań.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Часто говорится, что изменения в способе действия людей являются результатом изменений в их системе достоинства. Этот принцип распространен в социологической, психологической, педагогической и экономической литературе.

¹ The philosophical problems of value changes have so far received little analytical attention. An exception is K. Baier, N. Rescher (eds): *Values and the Future*, New York, 1969. The present paper is a considerably condensed and revised version of an earlier paper of mine in Swedish.

турах. Основной целью данной работы является: 1) различие, определение и классификация разных типов изменений достоинств и оценки; 2) обсуждение обоснований видов, что некоторые типы изменений достоинств выступили.

Допустим, что агент А находится в определенной ситуации — он должен выбрать один из нескольких способов действия. Рациональный выбор заключается в том, что нужно сформулировать и объяснить альтернативы поступков, описать последствия разных альтернатив, подсчитать вероятность выступления этих последствий, оценить эти менее или более вероятные последствия, а также попытаться совокупно оценить все последствия каждой альтернативы действия. Самое важное заключается в том, чтобы отделить альтернативы оцененные агентом от достоинств, опираясь на которых проведено оценку, а также от оценки этой же альтернативы.

Все ключевые термины употреблены здесь в разном значении; нет однородного или общепринятого языка вывода. Нужно однако провести различие между процессом оценки, а результатом этого процесса, который выражается оценочным суждением. Нужно также отличить положительные и отрицательные оценочные суждения от состояния или качества, которые считаются желательными, как нр. такие достоинства как: здоровье, красота, справедливость, солидарность итд. Итак, изменения достоинств и оценки могут быть разнозначны — поэтому упомянутые две главные проблемы (1 и 2) очень важные, если хочется избежать недоразумений.

Автор этой работы пытается различить изменения достоинств как изменения преимуществ изменения расположения к действию, изменения в подходе итд. Автор также пытается классифицировать типы изменений достоинств. Считаю, что возможно выделить „абсолютные изменения“, „сопоставительные изменения“ и „относительные изменения“.

Главная мысль работы заключена в том, что решающее значение имеет сознательность достоинства, когда хочется описать, объяснить и предусмотреть изменения достоинства. Не следует однако заключать, что выступает только одна иерархия, и что она является абсолютной и имеет постоянный пик и низ (этим низом является основание, общие и категорические величины). Иерархии могут быть частично разные в разных местах и культурах.

Осознавая представленные различия, можем теперь отличать правдивые изменения достоинства от изменений, которые относятся к тому, что люди избирают волей, мыслей итд., т.е. те изменения зависят от изменений в ситуации агенса, изменений в пониманию людей этой ситуации, изменений в их убеждениях относительно возможных альтернатив действия и правдоподобных последствий этих альтернатив. Агент может изменить свой выбор, свои предпочтения и свой подход, а изменение достоинства не наступает. В этом случае имеем дело только с „мнимым изменением достоинства“.

Практический вывод заключен в том, что те, которые стремятся вести эмпирические исследования изменений достоинства в таких отраслях науки как социология, просвещение, антропология или экономика, им придется ввести различие между правдивыми а мнимыми изменениями достоинств. Им придется определить и обследовать разные альтернативные гипотезы. Исследование изменений достоинства не отличается от других типов исследований.