This study investigated the implicative meaning of philotimo (or "love of honor"—the highest Greek value, which regulates proper in-group behavior) across milieux within Greece. The antecedent-consequent method of measuring subjective culture was used. The sample interviewed consisted of 740 subjects (47% male and 53% female) 15 to 64 years of age, who were representative of Athens and Thessaloniki (30% of Greece's population). Findings showed that as milieu complexity, education, and social involvement increase, the antecedents and consequents of philotimo change. The direction of change suggests that, when the individual moves from a less to a more highly complex milieu within Greece, his social conduct ceases to be regulated by ingroup norms, and role perceptions become more important. Consequently, philotimo is expressed in terms allowing for more individualized interpretation depending on the social context.

THE IMPLICATIVE MEANING OF THE GREEK CONCEPT OF *PHILOTIMO*

VASSO G. VASSILIOU, Ph.D. and GEORGE VASSILIOU, M.D.
Athenian Institute of Anthropos (Athens, Greece)

One of the variables shaping behavior in a given milieu is the prevailing value system and the operating value orientation. We conceptualize values after Kluckhohn (1959, 1956; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961) and define them as "relationships among abstract categories having a strong affective component." We conceive of values in multilateral transaction with all other variables contributing to the process of social change, social change meaning that a new set of social relationships and social behaviors is most likely to lead to rewards.

Philotimo (love of honor) is the highest Greek value. A number of contemporary investigators (Lee, 1953, Friedl, 1962; Sanders, 1962; Campbell, 1964; Vassiliou and Vassiliou, 1966) found *philotimo* to be a key value within the Greek milieu.

[326]

Lee (1953) finds that it is impossible for one to establish positive relations with a Greek if one is not aware of the meaning of *philotimo*. Friedl (1962) describes *philotimo* as one of the regulatory components of behavior, with a central position in the self of Greeks. Sanders (1962) considers *philotimo* as one of the four guiding lines leading to the understanding of the Greek sense of community, the others being cohabitation, common institutions, and the generally accepted system of social control. Campbell (1964) finds *philotimo* to play a similar central role in the otherwise idiosyncratic subculture of Sarakatsani in Greece.

In an exploratory attempt to investigate the Greeks' conception of *philotimo*, Vassiliou and Vassiliou (1964) asked a representative sample of Athenians to give their associations regarding *philotimo*. Four hundred adult Athenians (18-years and above), representative of the major Athens area, were sampled. They responded to various open-ended questions, sentence completion techniques, and "closed" questions to indicate what connections they see between *philotimo*—this axis of the average Greek's behavior—and other important concepts.

The findings fully support the qualitative observations concerning the central position of *philotimo* in the Greek milieu. The average Athenian considered himself as *philotimos*, believed that *philotimo* is one of the main values of the Greek people, and that *philotimo* characterizes the Greeks significantly more than it does other nationalities. This study also indicated that the concept of *philotimo* is polysemantic—in other words, has many meanings.

Furthermore, when Triandis and Vassiliou (1967) systematically probed into Greek subjective culture, using a variety of methods and instruments, they concluded that *philotimo* is the most important element of the Greek self-concept. Their analysis of the way Greeks perceive their social environment (subjective culture) demonstrates that *philotimo* is a social value which par excellence plays the

regulatory-guiding role in social transactions within the Greek core culture, since it is *the* social value which is associated with "proper in-group behavior." Given that the Greek in-group (as described later) is the key social institution within the Greek core culture, the importance of *philotimo* becomes apparent.

In summary, the analysis of values has been a central theme in the comparative analysis of subjective cultures, and *philotimo* is the central value of the Greek subjective culture. Hence, it is important that it be thoroughly explored. On the other hand, one of the often-criticized characteristics of much current research on values is that it uses a single approach or instrument. In our exploration of *philotimo*, we have attempted several approaches to measure this value, using different samples. Consistencies in results across samples and across methods of gathering data not only provided concurrent validation of the instruments used, but also increased our confidence in the findings.

METHOD

The present investigation of the implicative meaning of *philotimo* followed the procedure of the antecedent-consequent method as outlined in a previous study (Triandis et al., 1972). That study investigated values in four different cultures, and the procedure allowed comparisons of values of different groups and proved highly reliable.[1]

In the present study, the sample interviewed consisted of 740 subjects, 47% males and 53% females, 15 to 64 years of age, representative of Athens and Thessaloniki—more than 30% of Greece's population. The former city is the major urban center of the country; the latter preserves some of the rural traditions to a larger extent than the former. The sampling technique was the one usually employed by the Athenian Institute of Anthropos (Vassiliou et al., 1967). The

representative sample provided the possibility for the analyses within cultures of differences among members of various demographic groups.

THE INSTRUMENT

In a preliminary phase, *philotimo* was placed into two sentences that approximate the following English format:

— "If you have . . . then you have *philotimo.*"
— "If you have *philotimo,* then you have . . . "

One hundred male and female subjects, taken from a representative sample of the Athenian population, were then asked to supply three selections to complete such sentences. Thus, a list of 300 antecedents and 300 consequents was obtained and was tabulated in descending rank order of frequency. The twenty most frequent antecedents and consequents were selected and presented in the final questionnaire, in four sets of five words each. The final questionnaire was presented to 740 Ss—390 Athenians and 350 Thessalonikians—administered individually in door-to-door interviews, in the two main urban centers of Greece. The procedure for this second phase was followed exactly as described in Triandis et al. (1972: 186).

ANALYSIS

The responses of the Ss to the concept *philotimo* were summed. Judgments from 740 Ss were made, and since each S made four responses on the antecedent and four on the consequent side, there were 2,960 responses—1,560 in Athens and 1,400 in Thessaloniki. The frequencies of choice of antecedents and consequents for the total Athenian and total Thessalonikian samples, as well as for each of these subgroups, were counted: (1) males plus females; (2) indi-

TABLE 1
FREQUENCIES OF 20 ANTECEDENTS OF PHILOTIMO AS GIVEN BY ATHENIANS

Concepts	Total Frequencies	Sex M	Sex F	Edu <11 Years M	Edu <11 Years F	Edu 12 M	Edu 12 F	Edu >12 M	Edu >12 F	Age 15-24 M	Age 15-24 F	Age 25-34 M	Age 25-34 F	Age 35-44 M	Age 35-44 F	Age 45-64 M	Age 45-64 F
Character	58	28	30	14	19	14	11	3	7	3	7	5	10	11	11	9	2
Conscientiousness	112	53	59	27	42	26	17	12	8	12	8	5	16	11	24	25	11
Duty	98	44	54	31	39	13	15	7	8	7	8	9	16	12	17	16	13
Egocentrism	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Environment	24	9	15	6	12	3	3	1	1	1	1	0	8	3	4	5	2
Esteem	48	20	28	13	23	7	5	3	5	3	5	5	7	6	8	6	8
Example	26	9	17	6	16	3	1	1	3	1	3	1	5	1	5	6	3
Fear	20	8	12	5	12	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	3	5	4	2
Good upbringing	56	29	27	15	13	14	14	7	6	4	6	4	11	3	8	15	2
Help	47	22	25	18	25	4	0	4	3	7	3	3	8	4	6	11	8
Honesty	254	130	124	81	90	49	34	20	24	20	24	27	29	37	39	46	32
Industriousness	53	31	22	25	17	6	5	4	3	4	3	5	5	9	4	13	10
Love	146	66	80	48	73	18	7	3	13	3	13	12	17	18	27	33	23
Morality	99	42	57	30	51	12	6	5	8	5	8	5	13	12	18	20	18
Politeness	86	38	48	27	44	11	4	5	7	5	7	9	12	12	13	12	16
Progress	21	14	7	10	4	4	3	2	0	2	0	0	2	7	3	5	2
Respect	149	74	75	49	65	25	10	9	13	9	13	18	21	21	24	26	17
Responsibility	42	32	10	18	4	14	6	8	0	8	0	6	3	8	4	10	3
Shame	84	36	48	19	38	17	10	8	11	8	11	5	17	10	13	13	7
Trust	64	29	35	24	34	5	1	2	7	2	7	8	11	6	9	13	8
Mean frequencies	74.5	35.7	38.7	23.3	31.0	12.4	7.6	5.2	6.4	5.2	6.4	6.4	10.8	9.7	12.1	14.4	9.4
Sig. higher than mean	98	52	55	36	46	22	14	11	13	13	19	18	22	25	18		
Sig. lower than mean	51	20	22	10	16	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	1		
Total	1,489	714	775	446	623	248	152	104	128	104	128	128	216	194	243	288	188
Don't know	71	22	49	22	41	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	12	6	13	16	20
Total responses	1,560		1,560		1,560		1,560										

NOTE: In each column, the boldface figures indicate higher or lower (p < .01) frequencies than the mean frequency.

viduals of two educational groups; (3) up to age 11 and above age 12; and (4) individuals of four age brackets as shown in Table 1.

We obtained the mean frequency for antecedents and consequents and then through chi-square analysis we determined the limits of frequencies that were either significantly higher or lower[2] (P < .01) than the corresponding mean frequency.

RESULTS

Table 1 presents the results in detail for the antecedents of *philotimo* as perceived by Athenians.[3] Boldface type indicates the frequencies that were significantly higher or lower than the mean frequencies. Tables 2 and 3 show the antecedents and consequents of *philotimo* presented according to the rank order of their frequencies as given by Athenians and Thessalonikians in general, and by the different subgroups of the general population of the two major urban Greek centers.

Greeks emphatically saw honesty as the first antecedent of *philotimo*. These were followed by respect, love, conscientiousness, duty, and morality. No striking differences were observed between Athenians and Thessalonikians.

In other words, the Greeks will call *philotimos* the person who behaves properly according to in-group norms, the one who is honest, respectful, and loves others, all qualifiers meaning that one will "behave" as expected by in-group members. The above has also been established in another study (reported in Triandis et al., 1972) where the implicative meanings of love and respect were investigated. Therefore, *philotimos* is the person who conscientiously fulfills his duty, always observing the moral code of the in-group.

TABLE 2
THE ANTECEDENTS OF PHILOTIMO GIVEN ACCORDING TO THE RANK-ORDER OF THEIR FREQUENCIES AS GIVEN BY DIFFERENT SUBGROUPS OF THE GENERAL POPULATION

| | Sex | | Education | | | |
| | | | Up to 11 Years | | 12 and Over | |
Total Sample	Total Male Sample	Total Female Sample	Males	Females	Males	Females
Athens						
Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty
Respect	Respect	Love	Respect	Love	Conscientiousness	Conscientiousness
Love	Love	Respect	Love	Respect	Respect	Duty
Conscientiousness	Conscientiousness	Conscientiousness		Morality		Good upbringing
Morality		Morality				
Duty						
Thessaloniki						
Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty
Love	Love	Love	Love	Love	Duty	Conscientiousness
Respect	Conscientiousness	Respect	Respect	Respect	Conscientiousness	Love
Conscientiousness	Duty	Conscientiousness			Good upbringing	
Duty	Respect					

TABLE 2 (Continued)

| | Age | | | | | | | |
| | 15-24 | | 25-34 | | 35-44 | | 45-64 | |
Total Sample	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Athens								
Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty
Respect	Conscientiousness	Respect	Respect	Respect		Love	Love	Love
Love		Love			Love	Respect	Respect	Morality
Conscientiousness						Conscientiousness	Conscientiousness	
Morality								
Duty								
Thessaloniki								
Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Honesty
Love	Respect		Conscientiousness	Love	Duty	Love	Love	Love
Respect	Duty			Shame	Respect			Respect
Conscientiousness								
Duty								

TABLE 3

THE CONSEQUENTS OF PHILOTIMO GIVEN ACCORDING TO THE RANK ORDER OF THEIR FREQUENCIES AS GIVEN BY DIFFERENT SUB-GROUPS OF THE GENERAL POPULATION

	Sex		Education			
			Up to 11 Years		12 and Over	
Total Sample	Total Male Sample	Total Female Sample	Males	Females	Males	Females
Athens						
Success	Respect	Sincerity	Respect	Sincerity	Success	Success
Humanity	Success	Humanity	Success	Obedience	Honesty	Humanity
Honesty	Honesty	Honesty	Obedience	Honesty	Respect	Esteem
Respect	Progress	Success	Progress	Humanity	Humanity	
Sincerity	Humanity	Obedience		Kindness		
Obedience						
Progress						
Thessaloniki						
Honesty	Progress	Obedience	Obedience	Sincerity	Humanity	Humanity
Sincerity	Honesty	Sincerity	Honesty	Obedience	Progress	Honesty
Obedience	Humanity	Honesty	Progress	Honesty	Honesty	
Humanity	Sincerity	Humanity				
Progress	Obedience					

TABLE 3 (Continued)

		Age							
		15-24		23-34		35-44		45-64	
	Total Sample	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Athens									
	Success	Success	Humanity	Progress	Success	Success	Sincerity	Respect	Humanity
	Humanity	Respect	Sincerity		Sincerity	Honesty			Kindness
	Honesty	Humanity			Progress	Respect			Obedience
	Respect								Honesty
	Sincerity								
	Obedience								
	Progress								
Thessaloniki									
	Honesty	Sincerity		Honesty	Sincerity	Humanity	Sincerity	Progress	Obedience
	Sincerity				Obedience	Success			Honesty
	Obedience					Honesty			
	Humanity					Sincerity			
	Progress								

[335]

It may appear puzzling to note that morality is given by Athenians but not by Thessalonikians. However, breakdown into male and female respondents reveals that morality is mentioned by female Athenian Ss, not males. This finding is consistent with changes noticed in the female role under rapid social change in the Greek milieu. Women who are forced to become increasingly involved in social life are concerned with morality because of the lack of clear-cut codes of behavior and the weakening system of social controls.

The consequents of *philotimo* (being successful, humane, honest, respectful, sincere, obedient, and progressive) show that, if one is *philotimos,* one will first be treated as an in-group member—i.e., he will be respected, obeyed, and others will be honest and sincere with him; second, this in-group acceptance will lead to success and progress, and, third, the *philotimos* person will experience humaneness. These results are highly consistent with the findings of several studies, conducted at the Athenian Institute of Anthropos during the last decade, related with the function of the Greek in-group.

Milieu seems to play a role in determining the consequents of *philotimo,* as reflected by the few but very indicative differences appearing in Table 3. Athenians see success as a consequent of *philotimo.* This is characteristic of individual advancement in a context of competition. Thessalonikians first emphasize human qualities, such as honesty, sincerity, humaneness, and obedience, and finally give progress as a consequent of *philotimo*—characteristic of *societal* advancement.

In the less urbanized, less complex milieu of Thessaloniki, the perceived antecedents are honesty, love, respect, conscientiousness, and duty, and the consequents are honesty, sincerity, obedience, humaneness, and progress. Both antecedents and consequents reflect a concept of *philotimo* highly consistent with the findings of other related studies, which show *philotimo* to be the regulatory value of the

culture—a value which secures interdependence through concern for others and utmost cooperativeness.

Furthermore, success is not given with significant frequency as a consequent of *philotimo* by Thessalonikians. Among Thessalonikians, males, irrespective of education and age group, give progress instead. This is the subgroup of the population which is highly active, socially and financially, and thus exposed to new experiences in the midst of development.

On the other hand, obedience, a concept which is of paramount importance for the smooth functioning of the in-group, is given as a consequent of *philotimo* by the subgroup which is closer to the reality of the core-culture. In Thessaloniki, obedience as a consequent of *philotimo* is given with high priority by females, while for males it is the last consequent. When both sexes are considered together, obedience is given by both males and females in the low education subgroups. In other words, it seems that, as people become more exposed to the demands of a higher-complexity milieu, they see no direct association between being *philotimos* and being obedient.

In Athens, with the same consistency as in Thessaloniki, females in general, males and females of low education, and females 45 years of age and older, associate *philotimo* with obedience.

We have repeatedly found that the smooth functioning of the Greek in-group is secured with strict adherence to *philotimo*. As one moves to a more complex milieu such as Athens, one finds that (a) the in-group is not as functional as it is in rural settings, (b) impersonal social institutions are more important, and (c) economic and social development is accelerated relative to rural settings. Under those circumstances, one would anticipate *philotimo* to become more of a value defined by the individual and less of a group-defined value. In other words, *philotimo,* which once meant "if one behaves properly, one is loved, respected and treated prop-

erly by others, and thus everybody survives," comes now to mean "if one is honest and respects oneself, one succeeds."

DISCUSSION

Findings show that, as milieu complexity, education, and social involvement increase, the antecedents and consequents of *philotimo* change. The direction of change suggests that, when the individual moves from a lower to a higher complexity milieu within Greece, his social conduct ceases to be regulated by the in-group norms as strictly as it used to be in the small core-culture community. There, survival, security, and social protection in general were secured by the individual through his in-group relations.

In the Greek core-culture (a traditional milieu of low complexity), the in-group has always been the all-important social institution. It was actually the "Decider System" in social transaction. As shown in a number of studies (Triandis and Vassiliou, 1967; Triandis et al., 1968), the "in-group/ out-group" is a key dimension which predicts role perceptions, in the Greek, but not in the U.S. data.

The Greek in-group is not based on static, fixed criterial attributes of individuals. It is an entity in process, a social system, operationally defined as "people concerned with me, with whom I can establish interdependencies." Being concerned with a Greek's well-being—his health, his education, his financial needs—is what makes one automatically a member of this Greek's in-group. Concern should be shown with actually expressed love, care, active interest in the other person's affairs, readiness to help, and constant availability. From the moment this concern is manifested, an interdependent relationship is established, a relationship characterized by absolute honesty and loyalty, trust, and unlimited giving. At the moment, however, when, in a given situation, one fails to show the expected "concern," he is

abruptly dropped from in-group membership. Relations with out-group people, on the other hand, are openly antagonistic. Outmaneuvering, deceiving, defying, and defeating the other is the expected attitude a non-in-group member; to be *philotimos* in this context does not "make sense." The in-group limits are constantly in flux depending on *who* the out-group people are—*the rivals.* If it is Xerxes of Persia or Benito Mussolini, *all* rivaling Greek in-groups instantly become one to fight the common enemy.

In view, then, of the key role that the in-group has played in the Greek tradition, one would expect *philotimo,* the highest and most important value, to be expressed in terms of behaviors which constitute in-group norms. And this is exactly what is reflected by the analysis of the cognitive structure of *philotimo,* as a concept. The concepts associated with it by the total sample are honesty, respect, love, conscientiousness, morality, and duty. On the other hand, *philotimo* is seen to lead to respect and obedience, honesty and sincerity, success and progress, and, last but not least, humaneness.

With social change, however, the individual is confronted with a more complex environment where norms of behavior, as defined by the individual's in-group, become less and less functional. The reason is that such norms are undiffer-entiated, unrefined rules of behavior which are too general, appropriate for less complex environments characterized by clear-cut dichotomies in social life. Social change imposes change in value orientations (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961). Instead of adapting to the environment, people now attempt to change it to fit their needs. Instead of depending on others for survival, they move into a milieu of relative affluence. Therefore, they can operate as Decider Systems and strive for individual achievement and self-actualization. Under those circumstances, their way of viewing their social environment changes. Actually, as can be seen from the data, the core-culture concept of *philotimo* embodies many

specific in-group norms which are meant to regulate and control the behavior of the individual. However, as the individual moves into the larger, far more complex and organized social milieu, he must always consider "appropriate behavior" within a context. This context, on the other hand, is ever-changing, depending on the level of formality of the social interaction and the degree of affective involvement. Consequently, *role perceptions* become more important than *norms* for the individual. In such a case, one would expect the highest value of the culture to be expressed in terms allowing for more individualized interpretation depending on the social context—which is exactly the case with *philotimo*. The concept is gradually abstracted to where it is associated mainly with honesty.

NOTES

1. A test-retest reliability coefficient of .94 was found by Haried (1969).
2. Indicated as "high" and "low" in Table 1.
3. Tables presenting the results in detail for consequents and for both Athenian and Thessalonikian samples are available upon request.

REFERENCES

CAMPBELL, J. (1964) Honor, Family and Patronage. Oxford: Clarendon.
FRIEDL, E. (1962) Vassilika. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
HARIED, A. A. (1969) "The semantic problem of external accounting com-
    munication." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois.
KLUCKHOHN, C. (1959) "The scientific study of values," in University of
    Toronto Installation Lectures. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.
——— (1956) "Toward a comparison of value-emphases in different cultures," in
    L. D. White (ed.) The State of the Social Sciences. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago
    Press.
KLUCKHOHN, F. R. and F. L. STRODTBECK (1961) Variations in Value
    Orientations. New York: Harper Row.
LEE, D. (1953) "View of the self in Greek culture," in Cultural Patterns and
    Technical Change. New York: UNESCO World Federation of Mental Health.

SANDERS, I. (1962) Rainbow in the Rock. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ Press.

TRIANDIS, H. C. and V. VASSILIOU (1967) A Comparative Analysis of Subjective Culture. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Department of Psychology.

––– and M. NASSIAKOU (1968) "Three cross-cultural studies of subjective culture." J. of Personality and Social Psychology 8, part 2: 1-42.

TRIANDIS, H. C., V. VASSILIOU, G. VASSILIOU, Y. TANAKA, and A. V. SHANMUGAM (1972) The Analysis of Subjective Culture. New York: John Wiley.

VASSILIOU, G. and V. VASSILIOU (1966) "Social values as a psychodynamic variable: preliminary explorations of the semantics of philotimo." Acta Neurologika Psychiatrika Hellenika 5: 121-135.

VASSILIOU, V., J. G. GEORGAS, and G. VASSILIOU (1967) "Variations in manifest anxiety due to sex, age, and education." J. of Personality and Social Psychology 6: 194-197.

Vasso G. Vassiliou was born in Greece and received her Ph.D. from Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois. She is Research Director of the Athenian Institute of Anthropos, and Professor of Psychology in the Division of Social Sciences, Pierce College. The main research interests of both Vassilious, a husband and wife team, are subjective culture, the group process, and family process. With H. C. Triandis, Y. Tanaka, and A. V. Shanmugam, they recently co-authored The Analysis of Subjective Culture *(Wiley, 1972). They have contributed chapters to about 20 volumes and more than 100 papers to journals. They will continue their work at the nonprofit and independent Athenian Institute of Anthropos which they founded in 1963 for research, training, and the development of applications in the sciences of Anthropos.*

George Vassiliou was born in Greece, received his M.D. from the University of Athens and his postgraduate psychiatric training at the Illinois State Psychiatric Institute (1956-1961). He is director of the Athenian Institute of Anthropos and Visiting Professor of Psychiatry and the Behavioral Sciences at the Chicago Medical School.