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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There are both role differences and cultural differences in the actual rearing of children; nevertheless, the family does appear to perform certain broadly agreed-upon functions. Of these, one in particular deals with the education and training of the offspring to provide for smooth adjustment into his particular culture. More specifically this function deals with the instilling of various values and attitudes necessary to the process of socialization. The way this occurs has always puzzled educators, and at best it is an obscure and complex process; yet these values are received by the student who interprets them and puts them to use in his own way.

A review of the literature indicates a great deal of concern with values and their relationship to the educative process. All groups involved with the education of youth are aware of the many arguments put forth concerning the importance of values. With few exceptions, little has been done to empirically research value positions of both students and their parents.

The general public, as well as educational professionals, have always expressed an interest in the value commitments of university students. It is expressed in the press, motion pictures, and the
professional journals. Much of the writing, however, has been based upon intuition rather than empirical evidence. Terms such as "generation gap" have been used easily and readily by all, but at best with usage that has little to do with fact or careful observation. Contemporary society has given widespread attention to the generation gap. Motion pictures such as "The Graduate," "Goodbye, Columbus," and "Getting Straight" dramatize it. Dustin Hoffman and Elliott Gould have become folk-heroes personifying the generation gap. Former President Lyndon Johnson has suggested that the generation gap is not new at all, what is new is the scope and intensity of the cleavage. He feels that the new cleavage is partly a result of overplay in the mass media, an opinion concurred in by Vice President Spiro Agnew. Former President Johnson further suggests that the gap is partly due to the fact that institutions do not change as rapidly as values. Certainly one institution which must reckon with the generation gap is the university. This thought is stressed also by contemporary commentators who feel that the knowledge explosion is reshaping our environments: intellectual, political, industrial, cultural, and military. Other writers suggest that the university continues to add to knowledge, but does little to prepare students for existing in a society which is not constant but in a state of flux. Thus a paradox emerges. As Deutsch (1962) suggested, the universities quite possibly are not preparing students to exist in a society which the universities are helping to create (p. v). One area in which the university is accused of lagging is that of human values.
Many critics feel that the dynamic condition of the social structure of America only emphasizes the need for each of its members to develop a stable system of personal values. Some go so far as to claim knowledge of which individual value system should be developed and perpetuated. The general concern, however, centers around the necessity for students to develop some system of values. Whether or not universities must consider this responsibility to be one of their functions is a question now being raised both inside and outside the profession.

General observation indicates that some students come to the university with behavior patterns quite set in a value system which often results in conflict with standards of behavior set by professors or peers. A question that is bound to arise is whether or not a student can achieve his potential if the university behavior is in conflict with home-acquired values. This question leads directly to the purpose of this study, which is to ascertain empirically the value patterns of the parents involved and the value patterns of the students involved and then to examine any existing pattern of relationships between the students' values and those of their parents.

Three authors who have written extensively about values and value systems in America are Riesman (1950), Spindler (1955), and Whyte (1956). Pointing out the effects of value changes on various aspects of society, these writers have suggested that a new value system is in fact being formed: Riesman with his "inner" and "other" directed individuals, Spindler with his "traditional" and "emergent" value-oriented persons, and Whyte with his organization man.
The theory of traditional and emergent values has been developed by Spindler (1955), a cultural anthropologist, to explain the value changes occurring in American society. It is a technique used in this study, although modified to a certain extent. Spindler felt that educators must adapt to these shifting values and emphasized that "education can never be freed from the obligation to support, if not produce, the kind of personality, or social character deemed desirable in society" (p. 146). Societal values have been categorized as "traditional" or "emergent" in the following manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Values</th>
<th>Emergent Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Puritan morality</td>
<td>1. Relativistic moral attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individualism</td>
<td>2. Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work-success ethic</td>
<td>3. Conformity for the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Achievement orientation</td>
<td>4. Consideration for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Future-time orientation</td>
<td>5. Present-time orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a reference pertaining to values, Spindler stated, "Values are . . . conditions of existence, personality or characterological features, and states of mind, that are conceived as desirable" (p. 145). Along with this notion, values often carried the connotation of "oughtness" or "shouldness" and were given a different connotation from concepts such as attitudes or interests. Kluckhohn (1951) stated, "Value implies a code or standard, which has some persistence through time . . . and places things, acts, ways of behaving, goals of action on the approval-disapproval continuum" (p. 135). The formation of these value orientations was seen as an outcome of the cultural experiences of the individual.
The cultural factors projected by Spindler as influencing a person's value orientation were primarily sociological: social position, power structure, age, and position in the community. Likewise, the culture of the educational institution itself was another determinant of value, especially the teacher education institutions. Spindler also hypothesized that teachers were typically drawn from the lower-middle and middle classes and, furthermore, within these classes the teaching occupation was selective of a more puritanical element, that is, those emphasizing self-denial, altruism, and a moralistic self-concept, all adding up to a very strong commitment to traditional values. In many teacher education programs, however, teachers had to come to grips with an emphasis on emergent values.

Margaret Mead (1946, 1951) agreed with Spindler that the agent responsible for the teacher's value orientation was the cultural group in which the teacher had been reared. She also suggested that teachers having different subject matter preparations had different value orientations. Teachers of mathematics, science, literature and other classical areas in particular were placed on the traditional end of the continuum.

There appeared to be a lack of empirical research designed to examine the traditional and emergent values of teacher education students and their parents, or to determine whether teacher education students in the various academic disciplines have different value orientations.
Statement of the Problem

The basic problem of this research was to empirically investigate the values held by University of Tennessee students and by the parents of these students. The specific problem was to empirically assess the relationship within student values, the relationship within parent values, the relationship between student-held values and parent-held values, and certain related personal and academic variables for the student and for the parent. The following were variables for the student:

1. Sex
2. Undergraduate college
3. Major
4. Fraternity/sorority membership
5. Regularity of church attendance
6. Academic achievement as expressed by grade point average (GPA)
7. Marital status
8. Geographical location of upbringing

The following were variables for the parent:

1. Sex
2. Father's occupation
3. Mother's occupation
4. Level of education
5. Regularity of church attendance
In keeping with these goals, questions significant to the study were:

A. Is there a high degree of similarity of values within the student group?

B. Is there a high degree of similarity of values within the parent group?

C. What relationship exists between student-held values and parent-held values?

**Hypotheses**

Hypotheses directly related to the above questions were tested in this study at the junior level at the University of Tennessee. There were separate hypotheses (H) for each of the three significant questions. Hypotheses under question A were labeled HA, with hypotheses under significant questions B and C likewise labeled HB and HC. In this way the hypotheses were kept in relationship with their major topic.

The hypotheses were the following:

\( H_{A1} \) There is no significant difference between male students and female students.

\( H_{A2} \) There is no significant difference between education majors and liberal arts majors.

\( H_{A3} \) There is no significant difference between education majors and non-education majors (excluding liberal arts).

\( H_{A4} \) Within the College of Education, there is no significant difference among students who are elementary education
majors and students who are secondary education majors
(science, English, special education, social studies).

H_A5 There is no significant difference between students who are
fraternity/sorority members and students who are independent.

H_A6 There is no significant difference between students who
are married and students who are single.

H_A7 There is no significant difference between students with
a grade point average (GPA) greater than 3.0 and students
with a GPA between 2.2 and 2.9.

H_A8 There is no significant difference between instate (rural
and urban) students and out-of-state (rural and urban)
students.

H_A9 There is no significant difference between instate rural
students and instate urban students.

H_A10 There is no significant difference between instate rural
students and out-of-state rural students.

H_A11 There is no significant difference between instate urban
students and out-of-state urban students.

H_A12 There is no significant difference between regular church-
attending students and nonregular church-attending students.

H_B1 There is no significant difference between male parents
and female parents.

H_B2 There is no significant difference between regular church-
attending parents and nonregular church-attending parents.
There is no significant difference between parents with less than a high school diploma and parents that completed high school.

There is no significant difference between parents with less than a high school diploma and parents with college or graduate credits.

There is no significant difference between fathers with occupations labeled "blue collar" (farmer, fireman, transportation worker, painter, federal government employee, self-employed worker, mechanic, watchmaker) and fathers with occupations labeled "white collar" (teacher, attorney, physician, engineer, minister, businessman, manager).

There is no significant difference between mothers who are housewives and mothers who are employed (teacher, nurse, secretarial/clerical worker, attorney, other).

There is no significant difference between male students and parents.

There is no significant difference between female students and parents.

There is no significant difference between education majors and parents.

There is no significant difference between liberal arts majors and parents.

There is no significant difference between other majors (business, home economics, communications, agriculture) and parents.
HC6 There is no significant difference between fraternity/sorority students and parents.

HC7 There is no significant difference between independent students and parents.

HC8 There is no significant difference between married students and parents.

HC9 There is no significant difference between single students and parents.

HC10 There is no significant difference between instate, rural students and parents.

HC11 There is no significant difference between instate, urban students and parents.

HC12 There is no significant difference between out-of-state, rural students and parents.

HC13 There is no significant difference between out-of-state, urban students and parents.

HC14 There is no significant difference between regular church-attending students and parents.

HC15 There is no significant difference between nonregular church-attending students and parents.

HC16 There is no significant difference between elementary education students and parents.

HC17 There is no significant difference between secondary education (science, English, special education, social studies) students and parents.
There is no significant difference between students with high grade point averages (greater than 3.0) and parents.

There is no significant difference between students with grade point averages between 2.2 and 2.9 and parents.

There is no significant difference between students and regular church-attending parents.

There is no significant difference between students and nonregular church-attending parents.

There is no significant difference between students and parents who have completed high school.

There is no significant difference between students and parents who have college or graduate credits.

There is no significant difference between students and fathers with occupations labeled "blue collar" (farmer, fireman, transportation worker, painter, federal government employee, self-employed worker, mechanic, watchmaker).

There is no significant difference between students and fathers with occupations labeled "white collar" (teacher, attorney, physician, engineer, minister, businessman, manager).

There is no significant difference between students and mothers who are housewives.

There is no significant difference between students and mothers who are employed (teacher, nurse, secretarial/clerical worker, other).
Significance of the Study

This study will be a contributing piece of research to the total nationwide survey of current values among college students. Its significance is expected to be a better understanding of the University of Tennessee student and his beliefs in comparison with his parents and their beliefs. Information of this sort is of great interest to the educator and to the student himself. In addition, the study of relationships between values and other relevant variables is expected to lead to a richer understanding of the structure of personal values and the nature of value conflict. From a practical standpoint, a comprehensive empirical study of college student values should be of great worth to the high school and college counselor, who devotes much of his time and energy to student value problems. Also, since contemporary educators are concerned with changing values, this study is structured in such a fashion as to encourage its replication and the study of value shift through time, providing a point of reference for comparative analysis.

With the coming of the vote to youth, the study has additional importance. Some political experts assert that young voters will have little effect because they will divide in much the same way as their parents. If it is true, instead, that young people do depart from the cultural outlook of their families, this would mean a strong possibility for party realignment, having particular significance in the South.
In a pluralistic society such as we enjoy, many value systems are found in varying degrees in various people. Many factors have contributed to this value dilemma. Some of the more obvious factors are the region of the country in which a person lives, whether or not he has a rural or urban background, his religion, his occupation, and so on. The normative study is especially important because of its pertinence in comparative studies. For example, one could compare black students and parents to the normative group. Similarly, one might determine the extent to which northern students differ from University of Tennessee (southern) students in value areas.

Previous studies of familial similarities have more often focused upon sons and daughters in childhood or adolescence, rather than in young adulthood. A review of the literature revealed, however, widely divergent theories and contradictory sets of empirical findings, whatever the age of the children involved.

If this study shows fairly substantial evidence for resemblance between family members in the domain of values, this would be a finding of particular significance because these young adults have presumably been influenced by many persons outside the family.

The concept of traditional and emergent value systems has significant implications for an important part of school administration—the curriculum. A curriculum is based upon a philosophy of education and the curriculum-maker must decide which values are to be perpetuated as he outlines what should be taught. Although the present study has made no attempt to attach value judgments to types of value patterns,
there are obviously some areas where this must be done either consciously or unconsciously.

Further study and investigation of values and value conflicts can provide administrators with important insights into some of the basic causes of conflicts in education. A better understanding of these conflicts and of the cultural change taking place in America will enable them to more effectively meet the present challenge to the schools.

Limitations of the Study

1. That the values expressed on these inventories will always be reflected in a respondent's daily behavior is, of course, subject to empirical test. It was assumed in this study that an investigation of expressed statements of value had considerable importance in its own right.

2. Although attempts were made to standardize administration of the instruments to the parents, variations may have occurred because of the impossibility of supervision.

3. The sample was restricted to University of Tennessee students (juniors and seniors enrolled in Philosophy of Education classes during Fall quarter 1970) and their parents.

4. The sample could have been expanded beyond the University of Tennessee, but it would have lost its regional significance.
Definitions of Terms

"Values" are defined by Roscoe (1964) as personal and social ideals, attitudes, beliefs or standards which may be used to evaluate and regulate the actions of the individual and society. These involve the element of choice based on belief or opinion (as opposed to fact upon which all individuals might be expected to agree) about what is good, right, desirable, or true. Values are recognized as bases for action, but the possibility of inconsistency between the values and the behavior of a given individual is also recognized. It is presumed that values may indicate an aspiration somewhat higher than life as it is lived.

"Philosophies of human nature" are defined by Wrightsman (1964) as beliefs about people in general, with emphasis on their interpersonal aspects (pp. 743-751).

A "student" is defined as a young man or woman duly enrolled and pursuing a course of academic studies leading to an undergraduate degree at the University of Tennessee.

"Parents" are defined as parents of students involved in this study.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I of this study has consisted of an introductory statement, a statement of the problem, the presentation of the hypotheses to be tested, a brief discussion of the study's importance, an indication
of its limitations, the definition of important terms used throughout, and this outline of the total organization of the study.

Chapter II presents a selected review of the literature in the areas considered by the investigator to be pertinent to the study.

Chapter III provides a description of the implementational procedures of the study and a description of the instruments employed.

Chapter IV presents the results of the investigation.

Chapter V includes the summary, discussion, conclusions, and implications of the investigation.
A search of the literature revealed much concern for the part values play in the education of youth. The greatest part of the literature is general and reflects the concern of educators, sociologists, and anthropologists. The general tone of this portion of the literature reflects the point of view that values are important as they relate to the educational enterprise.

The research literature pertaining to the questions being investigated by this study is limited. Little has been done to research youth value positions or the various groups involved in educating youth, and none was found that specifically investigated student-held values as they related to the value positions of their parents and other students.

Many issues are involved in this study of values. In a search of the literature, attention was given to the identification of a "youth culture" and studies concerned with students' values and parents' values and their relationship.

**Youth Culture**

Talcott Parsons (1942) introduced, described, and formally baptized a descriptive concept that today appears in most serious
discussions of American youth. The concept was that of the American "youth culture." Briefly stated, youth culture refers to a social phenomenon peculiar to the United States which is characterized by the development of a distinctive subculture among youths of middle and upper-class urban backgrounds. This subculture, or youth culture, consists of highly complex role elements and values which clearly distinguish it from the larger adult society in which it is surrounded. Further, the youth culture is seen as a product of industrialization and, at the time of the writing (1941), it was described as "unique and highly distinctive in American society" (p. 606). A host of publications followed which drew reference to the youth culture phenomenon. The 43rd Yearbook edited by Tryon (1944) of the National Society for the Study of Education had the distinction of introducing the concept to educators and into educational literature.

Stimulated by Parson's early description and amplified by a host of journal articles in a variety of fields, there has come into existence a widespread and stereotyped conception of the youth culture. James Coleman, professor of social relations at Johns Hopkins University, seems to have emerged as the leading spokesman and guardian of this conception. That which is implied by this conception, which will henceforth be referred to as the traditional conception of youth culture, will be discussed in the next section.

It should be made clear that the traditional conception of youth culture denotes more than just the existence of youth groups with somewhat different attitudes, jargons, and behaviors. Ralph Linton
(1942) suggests such groups are not new. On the contrary, youth groups of this character have emerged in almost all societies (p. 593). Rather, youth culture connotes a subculture, a set of values and norms deeply rooted, which influences the behavior of its members in most of their interactions with the environment. Moreover, unlike many societal subcultures, the youth culture is not afforded formal recognition (p. 595). That is to say, Americans do not recognize the period of adolescence as a distinct period of life.

Freidenberg (1959) has called our attention to the fact that we do not even possess a "neutral term" or label for young people falling between the approximate ages of 14-20. "Adolescence" connotes the erratic and unsettled aspects of this period while "teenager" implies joviality and superficiality. One is forced therefore to employ such emotionally laden concepts in even a scientific exploration of the subject (p. 20). True, there are societies. Margaret Mead's Samoa and the societies of the industrial sweatshop laborers, for example, where adolescence as a period of life is not recognized and where behaviors which we associate with the young are rarely seen (p. 32). Usually, this is a result of a societal effort to extend adult status, role, and obligations downward into the adolescent years. The fact that adolescence and "adolescent behavior" cannot be shown to be universal is evidence leading to the conclusion that the youth culture is a social rather than a maturational product. On the other hand, societies exist that afford formal recognition to a period of adolescence and, in these societies, specific adolescent functions materialize.
Linton (1942) suggests that Polynesia is an example of such a society. In this culture, adolescents are sharply differentiated from children and adults. They are relieved of most social and economic responsibilities and left free to amuse themselves. When marriage is contemplated, the Polynesian youth begins his transition into adulthood (p. 295). By definition, the concept of youth culture suggests the *de facto* existence of an adolescent period in our society, but this period is not afforded *de jure* recognition.

Essentially, the purpose of this literature review is to bring together significant commentary and research on the phenomenon of youth culture in an attempt to determine if in fact a distinctive society has emerged in our midst (despite our willingness to give it formal recognition) for the purpose of examining the validity of the youth culture concept and its relationship to adult society.

The first depiction of the youth culture was provided by Parsons' writing (1942) during the period of the last World War. The distinguishing feature of the youth culture as then described can be summarized as follows:

1. **Its orientation is basically one of irresponsibility.** The posture of the youth culture is antagonistic toward adult expectations and standards.
2. **The major preoccupation of its members is the hedonistic pursuit of the "good time."**
3. **In male circles especially, a glorification of things athletic is prominent.**
4. **There is a strong tendency to repudiate adult interests and values and to substitute "peripheral values" in their place. Specifically, great emphasis is placed upon the quality of physical attractiveness especially that which is appealing to members of the opposite sex. This is
clearly evident among adolescent females who desire to achieve "glamour girl" status.

5. The youth culture is not common to all geographic regions but rather is seen among urban youths emanating from middle and upper socio-economic class backgrounds.

6. The youth culture is crystallized about the system of formal education. (However, the reader should not interpret this statement as meaning that youths hold a commitment to the obligations of study and work. Often, the values of the school and the culture are in direct conflict. Rather, the school serves as the meeting place and offers youths a significant common experience about which they coalesce (p. 607).

A careful review of the literature since the publication of the foregoing description, for example Coleman (1965), Easton and Hess (1961), Fichter (1957), Green (1952), Kerber (1965), Mueller (1961), Riley, Riley and Moore (1961), Simpson and Simpson (1958), Smith (1962), Tryon (1944), and Turner (1964), revealed little serious disagreement among writers concerning the actual content of the youth culture. To that which Parsons set forth, bits and pieces of descriptive fabric have been woven to give the traditional conception of the youth culture a three-dimensional effect. For example, many subsequent authors have pointed out the compulsive conformity of the culture or the other-directiveness of its constituents, particularly Parsons (1965), Riley, Riley and Moore (1961), Simpson and Simpson (1958), and Tryon (1944). Attention is called by Smith (1962) to the obvious fact that adolescents possess their own specialized language, dating patterns, fads, and fashions. Of great import is the characteristic of mediocrity which is said to pervade the culture with the result that even the aspirations of the most able are adversely affected. Riley and Flowerman (1951) and Riley, Riley, and Moore (1961) have gone so far as to conclude that
mediocrity is the central feature of youth culture, while in the works of Coleman (1960, 1961, 1965) mediocrity is seen as one of the crucial features. Also, characteristics often associated with adolescents as individuals (such as rebellion, romanticism, idealism, and so on) are generalized and used to describe adolescent cultures.

The intent of such descriptions is to articulate the fundamental feature implied by the term "youth culture" itself, namely, that youths operate in a culture that is significantly distinct from that occupied by adults. Ample documentation can be provided to demonstrate that the youth culture concept is used to denote the estrangement of a significant segment of American youth from the dominant society. Included among these are Coleman (1961), Easton and Hess (1961), Green (1952), Mueller (1961), and Smith (1962). James Coleman (1961) presents this view as forcefully as any author in the first chapter of The Adolescent Society:

He is cut off from the rest of society, forced inward toward his own age group, made to carry out his whole social life with others his own age. With his fellows, he comes to constitute a small society, one that has most of its important interactions within itself, and maintains only a few threads of connection with the outside adult society . . . . It is hard to realize that separate subcultures with languages all their own, with very special symbols and most importantly, with value systems that may differ from adults (p. 3).

One senses from a reading of the literature that some aspects of the youth culture are more important than others. Most authors who are pointing an accusing finger at the nature of the youth culture view certain features (such as the specialized jargon, clothing fads, and taste in popular music) as being relatively innocuous. Other aspects, however, such as conformity, "regression toward mediocrity,"
and values which are at variance with adult society are perceived as threatening and potentially harmful. Among those who clearly regard conformity, mediocrity, and peculiar value systems as detrimental are Coleman (1960, 1961, 1965), Riley (1961), Easton (1961), and Riesman (1961). This group should not be confused with authors who see the phenomenon of youth culture as pernicious because it tends to retard the psychological development of its members. Friezenberg (1965, 1959) and Eisenstadt (1963) are proponents of this latter position. It would seem that a greater exposition of the significant and potentially threatening aspects of peer culture is in order and this shall be accomplished by briefly reviewing some findings based upon research.

Coleman (1961) is one of the few who has attempted an empirical exploration of the values of the adolescent culture. Almost seven thousand students in 10 selected high schools in the Midwest were administered questionnaires designed to tap student values and the status systems operating within the participating schools. Coleman believed that responses to some of the questions provided particularly good insight into the value systems of adolescents. For example, students were asked how they wanted to be remembered at school and were given the alternatives of (1) brilliant student, (2) athletic star, and (3) most popular. "Athletic star" was chosen by 44 percent of the males and 38 percent of the females. Contrast this to 31 percent of boys and 29 percent of girls who selected "brilliant student." When parents of the participating students were asked essentially the same question, their desires for their children were quite different.
Among parents of boys, 77 percent preferred the brilliant student alternative; 9 percent, the star athlete; and 15 percent indicated the desire to have their children remembered as being most popular (pp. 30ff.).

Coleman's work (1960) is replete with questions and student responses which in total depict members of the adolescent society as valuing physical attractiveness over academic competence, popularity over conviction, glamorous occupational goals (athletes, test pilots, and so on) in preference to more substantial and "worthy" pursuits, and the pleasure of peer approval over parental approval. In the majority of instances, these values are held most strongly by the "elite" or leading crowd which establishes the atmosphere within a school and strongly influences the rest of the student body. Further, to Coleman, it is the Zeitgeist existing within the school that controls the reinforcing stimuli for the most able and alert students. This means that in most schools the youth culture does not reward academic achievement, thus potentially the brightest and most sensitive students yield to pressures arising from the culture and pursue non-academic goals (especially in the area of athletics if they are able), while a "more mediocre few" pursue the meager rewards of scholarship mediated by adults (p. 342).

Since Coleman (1965) is especially concerned with the repression of the academic motive by the youth culture, it is interesting to note where in his study this pattern was most pronounced. Surprisingly, the school in his sample in which one would suspect to observe the
greatest tolerance for the acquisition of good grades, a plush suburban school which sent most of its products to college, was next to last in the list of 10 schools in this respect. The importance of good grades, although never a dominant response, was mentioned most often in a comprehensive city school. The next highest mention was observed in a boy's parochial school populated by youths from lower-class immigrant families (p. 20). Coleman's findings seem to be borne out by a recent CBS television special devoted to an analysis of youths with backgrounds similar to those in Coleman's plush suburban school. The program, entitled "The Sixteen-Year-Olds of Webster Groves," was presented over the CBS network on February 25, 1966. Webster Groves is a suburb of St. Louis, with a population of approximately 30,000, where over half of all its families have annual incomes in excess of $10,000. This community was described by the commentator Charles Kuralt as being "the best of America" and its youth were not generally found to be rebellious and dissatisfied with the world as they perceived it. Instead, "the attitudes and ideals of the youngsters were found to be those of their parents." Therefore, the disparagement of things intellectual tended to support the traditional position on youth culture although the emerging theme of the program seemed to be in opposition to this position. A questionnaire analysis of the television's sample revealed that 83 percent of the student body did not consider good grades to be important credentials for membership into the leading crowd. Rather, such things as "good personality," "leadership," "good looks," "a car," and the right family background constituted
the real qualifications for membership. Further, only 20 percent felt that "intelligence" was an important ingredient for success in contemporary society.

Additional research efforts to substantiate that values and goals of the adolescent culture are becoming worlds apart from those of adults have been conducted by Riley, Riley, and Moore (1961). In 1952, 2500 ninth and tenth grade middle class students in New Jersey schools were questioned in an effort to test Riesman's hypothesis that peer acceptance is the overriding factor underlying the desires, values, and behaviors of adolescents. From their investigations, the authors concluded:

First, the particular form of other-direction that we were able to isolate here seems to be a particularly adolescent phenomenon. The desire for peer approval in itself by no means restricted to youth; but the other-directed tendency to stress peer approval to the detriment of crucial internationalized goals appears in our data primarily in the adolescent stereotype of peer-group values, and in the aspirations of some—but not all—adolescents themselves (p. 385).

The empirical findings of Turner (1964) also lend moderate support to the traditional conception of youth culture. Turner calculated correlations between a scale designed to measure "ambition" and a scale constructed to measure involvement on the part of an individual in the youth culture. The resulting small, negative coefficients suggested that youth culture involvement has a depressing effect on ambition. However, because this particular set of correlations was in turn correlated with social class background, Turner did not want to conclude in favor of the ambition-youth culture involvement relationship since this would tend to negate the first (p. 164).
If one desired to support the traditional view (1) that the values of youth culture are not compatible to those of the great majority of adults, (2) that youths are literally pressured into conforming to the established values and norms of the youth culture, and (3) that the overall effect of conformity to youth culture values results in a tendency toward mediocrity, he could point to the studies previously noted. However, proponents of the traditional view do not see the youth culture as being completely segregated from adult society on the significant dimensions discussed to recognize and label it as such. Perhaps this point is best expressed in Coleman's (1961) words: "It is as if the adolescent culture is a Coney Island mirror, which throws back a reflecting adult society in a distorted but recognizable image" (p. 42).

The meaningful questions to bear in mind are to what degree the youth culture distorts significant aspects of the adult culture and how much of the contents of youth culture can be explained by factors not obviously present in adult society?

The traditional view of youth culture also permits variations between schools, communities, and regions. Similarities between youth groups, however, far outweigh local differences, and the similarities center about these aspects of the youth culture which have just been described. It is for this reason that proponents of the youth culture phenomenon speak not of many youth cultures but of the youth culture.

Youth culture as previously described is not a universal phenomenon. It does not appear in cultures characterized by youth-adult continuity, that is, cultures that readily integrate youths
into the responsibilities and privileges of adulthood. Also, a youth culture does not appear in societies that formally recognize adolescence as a discrete stage of development, for in such societies explicit adult-sponsored norms of behavior are provided. Youth culture is unique and highly distinctive for American society. However, in the established meaning of the term, it does not appear among youth emanating from less favorable social and economic circumstances. The differences between the middle and upper class youth culture and the pattern of youth groups of the working class have been enumerated by S. N. Eisenstadt (1956). Eisenstadt first calls attention to the fact that the life span of working class youth groups is shorter because of earlier marriage and the necessity of early entry into the world of work. Less crystallization about the school, less involvement in extracurricular activities, a greater tendency to organize along ethnic lines constitute additional features of lower class youth groups. Of particular interest is Eisenstadt's contention that the conflict between youth and the adult world is much different in working class groups. There are tensions and conflicts in lower class groups to be sure, but they are over specific and concrete matters rather than a result of the incompatibility of value systems. Actually, the values and behavior patterns of the lower class youth groups, that is, drinking, aggressiveness, and the like, are best thought of as downward extensions of the adult society. Thus, the traditional conception of the youth culture which demands well-defined differences clearly does not apply to these groups (p. 96ff).
What contingencies can be offered to explain the emergence of youth culture in the modern American world?

In the current literature, etiological explanations tend to fall into one of two categories, although these categories are by no means mutually exclusive. The first and most common point of emphasis is one where reliance is placed upon cultural change (especially in economics, technology, and the family) as causal factors. For lack of a more appropriate title, this form of explanation shall be called the "sociological approach." Other writers tend to credit the emergence of youth culture to functions that it serves in contemporary society. Since most of the functions alluded to are of a psychological nature, this second point of emphasis will be called the "psychological approach." Occasionally, writers appear whose novel explanations defy ready classification. Both Turner (1964) and Friedenberg (1965, 1959) fit this description. In this section, an attempt will be made to survey the two major schools of thought relative to the etiology of youth culture. Highlights of the offerings of Friedenberg and Turner will also be reviewed.

To those relying upon sociological phenomenon, the etiology of youth culture is traced ultimately to dislocations resulting from social change. Rapid social change is said to have left the middle class adolescent with little of a "meaningful" nature to do. His existence during this period is preparatory, similar to preparatory cleansing which supposedly occurs in limbo before final acceptance. His participation in gainful adult work is discouraged because, in
this age of specialization, long periods of training are demanded. Little effort is made by the parent to transmit his occupational speciality to his offspring because industrial specialists are by nature specialties only for a brief period of time. In short, the modern middle and upper class youth knows little of what his parent does in the world of work, thus blocking a channel of significant involvement and communication between generations. In times past (and even still in certain limited sectors of contemporary society), these barriers to adult occupational involvement were nonexistent. Youths undoubtedly behaved in ways which annoyed the older generation but their roles and responsibilities in an adult world were communicated to them through the medium of occupational identification.

There exists in the sociological discipline, as indicated by Bierstedt (1957), a "principle" which holds that the greater the complexity of a society the longer the period of preparation for youth (p. 359). Ours is probably the most complex of societies, therefore it logically follows that our society will maintain youth in a dependent position, out of adult society, for an unprecedented duration to learn. Friedenberg (1959) indicated, "When years of special preparation for adult life are required, these years become a distinguishable period with its own rules, customs and relationships" (p. 22).

Some sociologists, particularly Young (1959) and Coleman (1965), have skillfully pointed out that parents actively attempt to postpone their children's involvement in the crucial matters of life. Postponement assumes the guise of protection, however. An excellent illustration of this was seen in a recent CBS special on teenagers. The
television correspondent asked a group of parents of high school students if they approved of student participation in the Civil Rights struggle. Collectively, their reaction was negative. One father actually replied, "I don't think a child of 16 should be burdened by the troubles of the world."

A sociologically oriented approach maintains that the phenomenon of youth culture is a function of the vast complexities of rapid social and technological change. As a result of this change, several social spokesmen tell the adolescent that he is not ready to enter adult society. "Go to school. Do well so that you will be accepted into a good college and by doing so you'll be prepared for that good job in the future. Have fun." The following quotation from Richter (1957) captures much of the adolescent spirit of ambiguity and restlessness:

Youth in America is largely functionless, except in a preparatory fashion. We have said that the utility of the function performed is an important criterion of social status. American youth has no specific function except to "grow up." It is in a waiting period, between dependent childhood and independent adulthood. In most societies, the great majority of boys and girls are gainfully employed, at the age of 14 or 15. They are "doing everything" that is considered important and is taken seriously by their contemporaries and by themselves (p. 53).

These, then, are the conditions that prompt adolescents to form their own society. Also, the adult-operated entertainment industry reinforces their departure by directing much of their programming (beach party movies, popular music, and so on) specifically toward them.

Those adopting a more psychologically oriented point of view place less emphasis on the rapidity of social change and stress instead
the "natural" emergence of youth culture as a mechanism satisfying the peculiar psycho-social needs of adolescents. Tryon (1944) indicated that youth culture is needed in a society in which youths are not permitted ready access into the adult world because "many of the major 'development tasks' can only be met in peer groups" (p. 217). Havighurst's concept of "developmental tasks" is highly appropriate in classifying the needs satisfied by the youth culture as reported by Miller (1961). The essential elements of the concept are that certain critical times in the lives of individuals, specific tasks or types of learning, must be achieved in a prepotent order. Successful achievement of a particular task permits the individual to move on to the next; failure to learn implies difficulty in his attempts to master the next task. Success promotes well-being and psychological development, whereas failure leaves the adolescent to prove too many anomalies. The nature of the tasks are not exclusively psychological or social in origin but rather are seen as a combination of both. Havighurst has identified 10 such tasks which occur during adolescence:

1. Achieve new or more mature relations with peers of both sexes;
2. Achieve a masculine or feminine role;
3. Accept one's physique;
4. Achieve emotional independence from parents and other adults;
5. Achieve assurance of economic independence;
6. Prepare for marriage and family life;
7. Prepare for an occupation;
8. Develop skills necessary for civil competency;
9. Desire and achieve socially responsible behavior;
10. Acquire a set of values as a guide to behavior (p. 9).
The functions of the adolescent group are far more complex. Quite obvious is the function of assisting the adolescent in his efforts to gain independence from the family. Group membership constitutes a compromise solution between the extremes of complete independence for which he is not as yet prepared and the dependent security of the family which must be severed. In short, the peer group tends to balance the dual needs of dependency and independence.

It is argued that the emergence of peer groups and even the youth culture is not difficult to understand if the adolescent's needs for belonging is fully appreciated. Kohlen (1952) states, "Perhaps no psychological need is so pervasive as the desire for social approval and social acceptance" (p. 246). Since youths are not permitted the approval and acceptance earned by individual accomplishment in the adult world, it is necessary for them to achieve some among their own. Further, as a careful examination of the "developmental tasks" of adolescence reveal, many of the critical learnings cannot be realized in a culture other than that consisting of peers. Much has been said relative to youth groups replacing family ties at this stage of development resulting in the displacement of dependency upon peers. Bios (1941) succinctly reports this view:

The group of contemporaries is uncompromising in its demands that the adolescent conform to its standards of behavior and belief. It offers him in return a security in group belongingness and in collective responsibility at a time when he is abandoning childhood relationships and reorientating himself in terms of mature goals. In response to the pressures of peer culture, his family patterns of relationship, identification, and feeling life are gradually modified in the direction of group norms . . . . The great dependence on group support
and belongingness is naturally at its height at a time when the adolescent leaves the family, its protection and support, and has not yet the capacity to function independently on a mature level (p. 250).

The unfolding of culturally tempered needs combined with the notion that these needs are best satisfied by peer groups constitute in large part the psychological contributions explaining the emergence of youth culture. This approach, however, does not speak directly to the crucial hallmarks of youth culture. They acknowledge differences in attitudes and behaviors between adolescents and adults but hesitate to address themselves to the issue of a discrete adolescent subculture. The contributions afforded by a psychological perspective are nevertheless worthy if only for the fact that some of the responsibility for the emergence of youth culture is directed away from societal forces and an unsympathetic adult generation and placed instead within the adolescent himself.

Somewhat outside the orbits of these two schools of thought is found Edgar Friedenberg. Although rarely addressing himself specifically to the construct of youth culture, he holds views that pertain to many of its essential features. Like many psychologists, Friedenberg (1959) emphasizes the importance of the group on personality development.

Living among other adolescents in the peer-group decisively influences the developing fabric of personality. Strength, vividness, riches of pattern, warmth and crush-resistance are all necessary to a good life with others . . . . In the adolescent peer-group that relationship may be developed toward the end of personal autonomy (p. 52).
Friedenberg's original contributions, however, rest with his explanations accounting for adult estrangement. To a significant degree, adults prevent adolescents, especially adolescent males, from becoming intimately involved in their lives and work. Friedenberg (1965) portrays the male adolescent as a second class citizen devoid of rights and responsibilities. Because of his natural sexual vigor, aggressiveness, and compulsiveness, he comes a "phobic object" or adverse stimulus reminding adults of pleasures lost, of potency declining, of adventures consummated. If adults are not repelled by the adolescent on the basis of simple jealousy, they are repelled because youths disturb the well-maintained defenses of adults constructed against sexually perverse impulses (p. 68).

Greater attention to the formal concept of youth culture is seen in the recent writing of R. H. Turner (1964). Turner merits special attention for two reasons: (1) he is one of the few who have attempted empirical investigations into the nature of youth culture, and (2) his comments regarding the etiology of youth culture are strikingly original. Turner perceives the youth culture as an extended primary group. When the child left the family, the neighborhood, and elementary school, he leaves behind much of the security of familiar faces and an identity that may have served him well during childhood. In addition, the eyes of watchful and protective adults are no longer continually trained upon him. The faces he encounters in junior and senior high school are new, and being replaced more rapidly. He is forced to continually establish his identity (a more difficult task during adolescence) in their eyes as well as his own.
It is at this point, Turner suggests, that youth culture emerges. It emerges out of children's efforts to reinstate a primary-group system of identities and relations and controls in the context of constantly shifting peer associations (p. 140ff).

Further, the centripetal forces bringing youths together in the subculture are not those of presenting a front of irresponsibility and opposition to the adult world as is implied by the traditional conception. Rather, the youth culture is a mechanism pressed into service to protect youths from themselves. In order to re-erect the secure barriers of the primary group, loyalty and strict enforcement of group norms are demanded. Unusual or superior behavior are threats to the group and are discouraged. For example, there are forms of excellence known to be acceptable to the "adult out-group" and efforts to achieve such excellence is a manifestation of disloyalty to the group. The pursuit of academic excellence is a manifestation of group disloyalty. Such a person is going to have to go to great lengths to convince his peers that he is really one of them. Athletic prowess, on the other hand, is less highly valued by the adult world and therefore provides an avenue of achievement that earns peer respect rather than rejection.

Turner's emphasis is placed upon strains in relationships among peers resulting in the characteristic blind conformity and tendency toward mediocrity so often described. Tensions and conflicts between the culture and adults are only byproducts of these more crucial peer dynamics. Or in Turner's words, "The youth culture is more of
a device to protect youth from one another than an organized opposition to the adult world" (p. 164). The "generation gap" between youth and adults is magnified primarily in adult eyes because they view the adolescent's united front as a defiant thrust against their authority when in reality it is a means of self-defense against each other.

The immediate objection to the extended primary group explanation is similar to that which applies to psychological explanations; namely, the backdrop of culture forces operating in this, the age of technology, is not given adequate consideration. Youths in many times and in many places have been forced to re-establish their identities during adolescence, yet it is relatively recently, and only in the United States, that supposed youth cultures have emerged. A more comprehensive cultural perspective is needed. Nevertheless, Turner's explanations possess the advantage of being readily researchable. For in the philosophy of experimental science, one of the most potent criteria by which a theory is evaluated is the amount of research interest that it generates.

To this point, few normative judgments have been expressed concerning the phenomenon of youth culture. Assuming for the moment that the traditional conception of youth culture accurately describes an existing phenomenon, let us ask what the consequences may be. One need not probe extensively in order to acquaint himself with the significant opinions relative to this question because most writers who talk seriously to this point raise one of two concerns. The first is simply that the existence of youth culture has or, more properly,
will have a pernicious effect upon society when the reins of responsibility are ultimately invested in the presently irresponsible. James S. Coleman is perhaps the leading proponent of this view. The second concern relates to youth culture and its implications for personality development. Youths may not hold the accepted values of the parent society and they may appear to be irresponsible at times, but these are not the problematic issues. If, on the other hand, youth is immersed in youth culture to the extent that he is unable to identify himself as a separate being, this is problematic. In connection with the latter view Friedenberg (1959), Eisenstadt (1956), and Erickson (1963) should be mentioned. Outside of these two viewpoints, little else is heard. Most psychologically oriented writers such as Coleman (1965), Mueller (1961), and Stone (1957), who place emphasis on "youth" rather than "culture," accept the phenomenon as a fait accompli and seem to feel the increased mutual understanding between both youth and adults will assist in pacifying most conflicts.

Coleman (1965), as spokesman for the critics of youth culture content, operates on the assumption that the majority of attitudes and values present in the culture of the older generation are beneficial to the society. Although this assumption is never directly stated, it is implicit throughout his works. Therefore, that which clashes with the contents of adult society is potentially detrimental. Mentioned previously is Coleman's concern over mediocrity which pervades the culture of youth. He contends that able students are discouraged from developing their academic abilities. Youth culture's effect is comparable to that of labor unions. Unionized work groups develop
norms which are minimal and encourage only enough activity to give the appearance of "looking busy." The "rate buster" (the curve breaker) is subjected to ridicule and ostracism. In the student's union, that is, the youth culture, most students give in to this collective pressure and adopt the goal of maximum return for minimum effort. "In a high school, the norms act to hold down the achievements of those who are above average so that the school's demands will be at a level easily maintained by the majority" (p. 77). Further, where youth culture pervades, the innately talented throw in their lot with the youth culture leaving the academic rewards to the less talented. Coleman (1960) suggests that "Because high schools allow the adolescent subcultures to divert energies into athletics, social activities, and the like, they recruit into adult intellectual circles people with a rather mediocre level of ability" (p. 117). Coleman naturally assumes that his adult readers will concur that such developments are pernicious.

The idealization of the athlete and the preoccupation with a "good time" are further illustrations of unwholesome features of youth culture. They are unwholesome because they are superficial. Good looks, nice clothes, and enticing manners may be worthy pursuits for the minority of female adolescents who will earn their living as "objects of male attention," but they are not the important values that will be needed by good wives, mothers, and professional women. Coleman does not credit the emergence of these features to the creativeness of youth. Their genesis is found in adult society, but they have been borrowed, expanded, and distorted by youth culture.
The school is seen as a party fostering youth culture. This is accomplished largely through acts of omission; that is, the school permits many of these "unwholesome" values and features to exist by not counteracting them. In some instances, the school is even guilty of acts of commission. For example, the athletic cult is actively promoted by school officials with the consequences that athletes become the visible models leading gullible underclassmen away from studies and toward athletic fields and parties. Also, school resources are diverted away from teacher salaries, libraries, and soon to be invested in gymnasiums (p. 37).

Coleman's (1961) remedy for the salvaging of youth culture leaves little doubt as to his stand relative to the value of youth culture. He recommends "channeling of the adolescent societies so that the influence they exert on a child is in the directions adults desire" (p. 9). This will have to be done by schools and other agencies in a collective effort, for parents working with their children on an individual basis do not have sufficient influence to compete with adolescent groups in the struggle for the minds of youth.

The study which serves as the basis for Coleman's current published contributions was undertaken in 1958. This was before the "Sputnik crisis" in education. Although difficult to substantiate, many people close to higher public education maintain that the Zeitgeist existing in most high schools today is considerably different from that of the mid-fifties. It is said that in some schools the scholars are beginning to rival the star athlete as objects of esteem.
There is probably just enough truth to such statements to question the applicability of Coleman's findings and interpretations in the seventies.

While Coleman's concern is over the socialization process, the innermost workings of personality development are the concern of others. More specifically, the latter are concerned with the process of "identity" which is viewed as one of the crucial developments, if not the most crucial, in adolescence. Its source is found in Neo-Freudian thought and its spokesmen are Erickson (1963), Friedenberg (1959), and, to somewhat lesser extent, Eisenstadt (1956). These scholars insist that adolescence is the time in which a person seeks to find himself. During childhood and the latency period, the child identifies with the parent of the same sex. Adolescence brings with it a fresh and disturbing look at the world and the child finds that his father or mother is no longer an adequate figure upon which to model his emerging potentialities. He, therefore, begins a search for new models. If his search is to be successful, that is, if the youth is to develop an integrated and stable conception of self, he must find and use at least one competent, dedicated, and congruent adult of the same sex. Other youths can't serve in this final identification process because they also are "selfless;" they are searching. Therefore, anything that prevents adolescents from coming into contact with the kinds of adults needed for identification is pernicious. Since the youth culture, as stated, stands for apartheid, its influence is pernicious. The behaviors, values, or general content of youth
culture are not being condemned as Coleman would have it. But those aspects of youth culture that keep youths and adults apart are subjects of concern. Eisenstadt (1963) expresses these points vividly in the following quotation:

The linkage between the culture occupied by adults and that occupied by soon to be adults is instrumental in the personality development of the young. Definite adult role models are needed by adolescents for the maximum personality and maturational development and to the extent that youths become estranged and deprived of the adult world, the development of the young becomes problematic. Moreover, the stresses and strains associated with adolescence in modern societies is largely a result of their uncertain standing in relation to the greater world at large (p. 41).

An examination of the position held by Friedenberg (1959) is appropriate. He not only fails to criticize the contents of youth culture, but frequently idealizes it. Through his eyes, adolescents are viewed in the Rousseauian romantic tradition. They are "knights in shining chino pants." They are courageous, loyal, honest, authentic. Unlike their juvenile brothers and sisters and many adults, they possess a profound capacity for tenderness towards other people. Their passion is a search for competence, especially in adults. Clearly, Friedenberg's adolescents are the untarnished and noble breed rising above the pettiness and phoniness of adult society. That which is cheap and phoney in the adolescent culture is not of their making but rather the result of adult manipulation and profit-seeking.

Few members of any community can survive saturation bombing and the communications industry subjects the teenager to little else. The fads, the Elvisses, do not reflect the free choice of adolescents but are the only choices presented by the adult-controlled adolescent industries (p. 30).
Those who support the traditional view believe the culture phenomenon does in fact correspond to what most regard as being objective reality. There are, however, those who openly challenge the viability of the youth culture concept. Moreover, there are scattered bits and pieces of evidence that support this claim.

At the very core of the traditional conception of youth culture is the notion of distinctiveness. That is to say, youth and adult live in cultures that are discrete, or nearly so, over a number of significant dimensions. Within the last 10 years, this fundamental assumption has been subjected to challenge. The study of Elkin and Westley (1955) serves to illustrate just such a challenge. Their findings are based upon an investigation of a sample of 20 adolescents and their parents through interview and of 20 others through life history materials. The 40 adolescent subjects were all between the ages of 14 and 15 and were members of a well-to-do suburb (upper-middle class) in Montreal. Elkin and Westley's analysis indicated that family ties were close and the degree of basic family consensus was high. Adolescents frankly discussed their behavior and problems with their parents in all areas except that of sexual relations. In the authors' own words, "for this given sample of adolescents, the continuity of socialization is far more striking than the discontinuity." And, "the adolescents themselves demonstrate a high level of sophistication about their own activities, in many respects having internalized 'responsible' and 'adult' perspectives." At the conclusion of their article, Elkin and Westley flatly stated that among the middle class group studied "the
current model of adolescent culture represents an erroneous conception" and "the theories which employ such a culture to analyze the social structure are without adequate foundation" (pp. 680-684).

While there are some obvious weaknesses in the study (for example, the location and size of sample), these findings cannot be easily dismissed. It is the only "in depth" study of youth culture. All others have utilized the questionnaire, which researchers know measures overt behavior only indirectly. Assuming similar results, two or three replications would relegate the traditional concept of youth culture to a position servicing only historical curiosity.

Additional challenges to youth culture lack somewhat the firm empirical basis demonstrated in the just cited work, but nevertheless deserve attention. Turner (1964), who has previously been mentioned in connection with the etiology of youth culture, makes it clear that when reference is made to the adolescent subculture, the use of the term "subculture" is somewhat inappropriate. "Subculture" implies vast areas of uniqueness or discreteness relative to others or a larger culture. Further, a true subculture prescribes an almost total way of life for its members. Turner is not willing to concede such a disparity between contemporary youth and adults. He argues that in two important respects the youth culture does not satisfy the conditions of the traditional conception. First, the youth culture is a segmental pattern rather than a comprehensive way of life. Its mores and norms do not govern an adolescent's behavior in many family situations and have even less efficacy when a youth is interacting with nonfamilial
adult groups. In short, youth culture behavior can be turned on and off, depending on circumstances, almost at will (p. 144ff).

Second, much of the content of youth culture is ritualistic and not of the substance which is rooted in deeper conviction. (This makes possible the flexibility in attitude and behavior alluded to above). Most of what is demanded by youth culture can be executed without recondite involvement of inner convictions because, by nature, the content of youth culture is recreational and not that of the serious "stuff" of life. In his research, Turner found that the peer culture's influence was not strong enough to persuade most youngsters to renounce long-range goals (compatible with adult standards) and the "sacred beliefs" and values of their parents. To use Turner's words, "many researchers have wondered to what extent that which passes as youth culture is the 'line' used by mass media hucksters to address youthful audiences rather than the spontaneous pattern of behavior involved in the society itself" (p. 140).

Ruth Strang (1955), in a study in which she asked 277 youths from grades seven through twelve to write on "How It Feels To Be Growing Up," concluded after an analysis of the compositions that the notion of adolescent irresponsibility was not tenable. "They (the compositions) accent adolescents' desires to be independent and to take responsibility. Many of these young people thought of growing up as involving increased independence, self direction and responsibility" (p. 32).
Elkin, Turner, and Strong do not exhaust the list of contributors whose research efforts cast doubt upon some of the fundamental assumptions underlying the traditional youth culture concept. Gordon (1957) and Hess (1957) also project this feeling of doubt.

Let us turn to a recent theoretical challenge to the youth culture concept. In an ironic twist of events Talcott Parsons, the originator of the traditional concept of youth culture, is now placed somewhat in opposition to that which developed from his earlier work. In *Social Structure and Personality* (1965), Parsons rebuilds a bridge across the crevice which has separated youth and adolescent cultures for 20 years. Parsons now maintains that the youth culture is an integral component of our American society.

Parsons' position must be examined systematically. First, he maintains that there exists a relatively stable general system of values in our society. In addition, this system has undergone relatively little change in this century. (This contention is partially documented in Chapter 3 of the work under discussion. The general value system, however, must be viewed at the highest level of generality, in other words, at a distant social perspective. In contrast, at lower levels of generality, our contemporary society is undergoing rapid "differentiation of structure." The following illustration may help here. Looking from the top of a skyscraper at cars parked in a lot below, it is impossible to distinguish between the various makes and models of automobiles. This is comparable to observing a uniformity in values if the society is viewed from afar. If, however, these same cars are
observed at ground level, there is much distinctiveness between various makes and models. This is illustrative of a society in which groups and institutions are becoming more specialized or less integrated when seen at close perspective. This means that major societal institutions such as the family, religion, and so on are becoming less integrated. A greater differentiation between generations is a part of the pattern of increased structural differentiation. Structural differentiation, however, is not equivalent to value differentiation; in fact, "whereas the paramount value system has remained stable, the structure of the society has been undergoing a major process of differentiation" (p. 199).

Parsons (1965) provides many institutional examples to illustrate this thesis and perhaps the following one will be helpful. Consider the family. Despite social changes which have altered and limited its functions, a dislocation of the hard core values associated with the family has not resulted. The need for such an institution and the valuable contributions it affords are well recognized. The institution is not in danger. In fact, there are indexes suggesting that the cohesiveness of the family is becoming stronger, for example, (1) an increased proportion of the population living in the married state, (2) a decline in the divorce rate since its peak in 1946, (3) an increase in ownership of single family dwellings, and (4) a persistently high birth rate. What has changed is the family's role, which has been reduced to two major functions: (1) the care, maintenance, and primary socialization of the young and (2) the satisfaction of the psychological
and physical needs of adults. Other traditional functions including the vocational, sexual, and social training of progeny are slipping out of the hands of parents to other institutions and groups—such as the youth culture. Parsons' point is missed, however, if it is not realized that in this age of greater social specialization all agencies, groups, and institutions operate under a common umbrella of an increasingly integrated value system or American ethic.

It is in this social context that Parsons now views the youth culture as part of the overall process of differentiation under the relatively stable general system of values. In this context, the youth culture has emerged as a specialized social group complementing—but not antagonistic to—the school and the family in the socialization process. In short, the youth culture does exist as an identifiable entity but not as an isolated culture performing a useless or waiting function. Despite the fact the youth culture is identifiable, it does not have the influence over its members attributed to it by other writers (p. 221).

Parsons' (1965) views have indeed been modified. The quotation presented below serves to document this change and further illustrates that Parsons no longer perceives youth culture as being an example of divergence from adult society but rather as "in tune" with a more specialized society.

Clearly American youth is in ferment. On the whole, this ferment seems to accord relatively well with the sociologists' expectations. It expresses many dissatisfactions with the current state of society, some of which are fully justified; others are of a more dubious validity. Yet the general
orientation appears to be not a basic alienation but an eagerness to learn, to accept higher orders of responsibility, and to "fit" not in the sense of passive conformity, but in the sense of their readiness to work within the system rather than in basic opposition to it. The future of American society and the future place of that society in the larger world appear to be present in the main, a challenge to American youth (p. 182).

Spindler's Theory and Elaborations

This section of the literature review presents modifications and elaborations on Spindler's original theory and reviews research referring to his traditional-emergent values orientations.

Spindler's value constructs were further developed by Getzel (1957), who combined the work-success ethic and achievement orientation into one category because of similarities in definition. He also combined consideration for others and conformity to the group. Then he clarified their intentional meanings and used the following eight categories for his analysis:

**Traditional Values**

**Puritan morality**—Respectability, thrift, self-denial, sexual constraint, respect for elders, feelings of guilt.

**Individualism**—The individual is sacred and always more important than the group. In one extreme form this value sanctions egocentricity, expediency, and disregard for the other people's rights. In its healthier form the value sanctions independence and originality.

**Work-success ethic**—Successful people work hard to become so, anyone can get to the top if he tries hard enough. Success is a constant goal. There is no resting on past glories. People must work desperately and continuously to convince themselves of their worth.
Future-time orientation—The future, not the past, or even the present, is most important. Time is valuable and cannot be wasted. Present needs must be denied for satisfactions to be gained in the future.

**Emergent Values**

Relativistic moral attitudes—Absolutes in right and wrong are questionable. Morality is what the group thinks is right.

Conformity—Everything is relative to the group. Group harmony is the ultimate goal. Everything one does should be done with regard for others and their feelings.

Sociability—One should like people and get along well with them. Solitary activities are looked upon with suspicion.

Hedonism, present-time orientation—No one can tell what the future will hold; therefore, one should enjoy the present—within the limits of the well-rounded, balanced personality and group. Emphasis on spending money and having fun (pp. 42-102).

Out of Spindler's theory and Getzel's modification of Spindler's constructs, Prince developed the **Differential Values Inventory** (1957). After extensive effort in validating the instrument, Prince administered his value orientation scale to principals, teachers, and students in 22 high schools to distinguish for each group its position on the traditional-emergent continuum. He found older principals more traditional than younger principals and older teachers significantly more traditional than younger teachers. The more similar the teacher-pupil values, the more effective was the teacher as perceived by the students. The more similar the teacher-administrator values, the more effective was the administrator as perceived by the teacher.

McPhee (1959) used Prince's scale to study the relationship between the type of values which an individual holds and the education viewpoint to which he subscribes. He studied 600 respondents (superintendents, school board members, and local organization members)
in eight midwestern communities. No significant differences were found between teachers and laymen, but the older respondents were more traditional than the younger. He reported no differences in value orientations associated with occupation, income, educational attainment, home ownership, school attended by the children, or participation in school elections.

Stone (1960) added to the inquiry about values by investigating the value orientations of 72 adolescents as they related to career choice, scholastic achievement, and their parents' values. Inventory responses were obtained from all of the mothers and 64 of the fathers. The parents as a group were more traditional than the children. The value orientations of the adolescents were significantly related to those of the fathers but not of the mothers. However, a significant positive correlation was found between high traditional and high emergent adolescents and their parents' value orientations. There was no relationship between the adolescents with scores in the middle of the traditional-emergent values continuum and scores of their parents. Stone also reported that students with more traditional scores had higher scholastic achievement. Those with high traditional scores tended to choose professional careers, while those with high emergent scores tended to select nonprofessional careers.

Stone further confirmed the findings of Prince (1957) and McPhee of the high relationship of age to value orientations. The differences in this study may be partially accounted for in two ways: (1) the parents of children who scored high on traditional values were considerably older than the parents of the children who scored high on
emergent values and (2) those older parents had a higher frequency of
church attendance (which may be related to cultural background rather
than differences in age).

Bentley (1963) investigated the value differences between adoles­
cent boys and their fathers and the relationships of these differences
to level of occupational choice. Three Minneapolis high schools were
used to obtain the sample. The high schools were selected to control
for socioeconomic levels: one to represent high, a second to represent
middle, and a third to represent low. Out of the original 321 senior
boys tested, the final sample consisted of 231 boys and their fathers.
There was a significant difference between the value orientations of
the fathers and sons. The fathers were more traditional value oriented.
After dividing the total group of boys into thirds on the basis of
most traditional, middle, and most emergent, a significant difference
was found at the .01 level between the means of the traditional and
emergent groups. The traditional group made occupational choices
toward the professional end of an occupational rating scale. No rela­
tionship was found between similarities or differences of father and
son value orientation scores and a measure of vocational maturity or
level of occupational choice. Finally, no differences were found on
a measure of vocational maturity between boys with the highest tradi­
tional values and those with the highest emergent values.

The literature indicated that the results obtained by the
researchers were for the most part congruent with Spindler's theory.
The most consistent finding was that females were more emergent in
their value orientations than males. Although inconclusive, differences in age appeared to be a factor. Future research should control for this variable.

The research findings were inconclusive in relating traditional or emergent value orientations to different occupation groups, the parent and his child, the teacher and his pupils, and an individual's occupational choice.

Spindler reasoned that one of the agents responsible for a person's value orientation was the cultural group in which he had been reared. Perhaps this was not adequately taken into account in the research.

This section of the review of literature has found the summary statement of Vreeland and Bidwell (1966) to be well substantiated: "Evidence is accumulating that colleges socialize students to characteristic values and attitudes" (p. 237). Nearly every study reviewed supports their position.

Huntley (1965) conducted a comprehensive study of the value changes of students. He grouped the subjects into nine entities according to their academic majors. He was interested in showing that the values of students changed in direct relation to the changes noted for the group to which the student belonged. By comparing value scores of 1,027 students recorded at the time they entered college with those they attained as college seniors, he was able to support the original premise of the study. His conclusion was that the individuals in each group changed their personal values to the same degree and in the same direction as other members of their group. However,
"... when each group was compared with the population studied, the differences among the groups tended to be accentuated or sharpened over the four years" (p. 381). The implication of the study is that changes in personal values may well be a function of the student's choice of academic major.

Sanford has found that the student's values change in a certain manner during the four years. "There is change in the direction of greater liberalism and sophistication in political, social, and religious outlook" (p. 806). These changes parallel those described by Freedman (1960), who feels that seniors tend to be less stable, less authoritarian, but more liberal in a religious sense than they were as freshmen. His general conclusion is that seniors developed greater internal conflict while demonstrating a greater acceptance of intellectual values.

Four studies have indicated that the most basic change in the values and attitudes of students is an emphasis on central or predominant values. Huntley (1965) found that all but one of his nine groups tended to raise the score of the value previously emphasized most. Obst (1966), after administering the Study of Values instrument to 494 education students at UCLA, found that male education majors recorded increasingly higher aesthetic and political value scores as they progressed through college. A similar conclusion was presented by Bender (1958), who found that the political value scores of men remained the highest overall. He also discovered a tendency for the religious scores of college men to become larger as they progressed through school. Bender's findings may be more reliable than those of
Obst due to the fact that he tested persons who had majored in a variety of areas. Also, he was able to retest a group of 84 men that had taken the Study of Values test 15 years earlier. Through the use of a t-test, the two sets of scores for each individual were compared.

Specific changes in student values were studied by Kelsey (1963). It was found that after 32 years education students were still dominated by religious and social values. Further changes were noted, however; while preference for theoretical and political values increased, there was a decreased preference for the aesthetic value.

Other authors have studied the personality makeup and value profiles of teacher candidates by grouping subjects according to sex or expected teaching level. One study compared data gathered from prospective elementary teachers, prospective elementary teachers, prospective secondary social studies teachers, and prospective secondary science teachers (Munson, 1959). The results indicated that the interests and attitudes of the three groups were distinct and different. Yet, the author pointed out that the selection of the teaching area appeared to be consistent with dominant interests and values. Hamachek and Mori (1964) grouped education majors according to sex and then studied their need structure and adjustment profile on the basis of this division. While few significant differences between the groups were apparent, the female education majors did score high on the personal worth scale. The male education majors scored high in the area of self-reliance. Both groups, however, possessed a rather realistic view of themselves.
Interesting conclusions were reached by Philippus and Fleiger (1962), who studied the personality, values, and interest patterns of individuals entering the teaching profession as elementary, secondary, or special education teachers. Their study pointed out that the values of student teachers do not parallel those of the American middle class. Analysis of the data collected also indicated that prospective secondary teachers are not necessarily more interested in subject matter.

Finally, two studies reviewed dealt specifically with the differences between undergraduate education majors and those majoring in other areas. Riccio (1959) found students with high social-religious value patterns to be the best prospects for the teaching profession. Employing a sample of 408 students, he studied the relationship between the characteristics of education students and their attitudes toward teaching. Using scores from the Study of Values test and transmuted Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory scores, a t-test for unmatched groups was completed. On the basis of this statistical analysis, Riccio presented his conclusion about the relationship between a high social religious score and probable success in teaching.

The second study compared education majors with other students in the five areas of social drive, social maturity, intraception, flexibility, and emotional maturity (Cook et al., 1963). In this study the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were administered to 196 students enrolled in an educational psychology course at Purdue University. The same tests were also given to 252 students who were entering the engineering
curriculum. After employing a form of factor analysis to analyze the data, Cook concluded that there was no difference between the groups in the stated areas. There was a difference, however, in that the education majors revealed a greater tendency toward authoritarian personalities.

**Values and the Measurement of Values**

This section of the review of literature will present related ideas on the topic of values and the necessity for measuring values.

Robert Redfield (1962), the anthropologist, asserted that the study of values had relevance when he stated:

> As each fresh effect is made to understand humanity "as it really is," the thing turns out to be made of states of mind. And of these states of mind, the scheme of values of people are central and of most importance. It is this scheme of values which we must come to understand if we are to understand a man or a tribe or a nation (p. 49).

It appears to be very difficult to study youth values during this period, since they seem to be changing so rapidly. Angell's (1958) comment about the lack of knowledge in the area of human values bears examination.

Sociologists have not paid as much attention to moral data as they deserve, and this for a curious reason. For a generation, social scientists have proudly kept judgments of fact separate from judgments of value. They have eschewed anything that smacks of moral criticism for fear that such a stance might harm their scientific objectivity. Although this "value-free" position does not imply that moral standards and moral conduct should not be studied, there has often been a disinclination to study them. . . . From this standpoint, the present study will be thoroughly out of fashion. It takes a diametrically opposed position. It assumes that moral
phenomena lie at the very heart of society, and that it is above all moral facts that we need to understand today (p. 6).

A frequent criticism in a study of values is that the response given to a value question does not really describe the person's attitude. For example, a value question pertaining to an explosive area concerning marijuana or Black Panthers might evoke a response not truly describing the person's attitude. When the height of a desk is measured, not everything is known about the desk but only that attribute which was measured. The same is true in the measurement of values: only one characteristic of the values is described by the measurement of it. The measurement of an object essentially affixes the object to a point on a continuum. By the relation of the points on the continuum we may refer to the strength of a value extending from a strong positive feeling all the way to a strong negative feeling toward a person, group of people, or object. As Thurstone (1931) indicates, it is just as legitimate to say that one is measuring attitudes as it is to say that one is measuring desks or men (p. 260). In defense of this idea Jacobs (1957) wrote of "values" or "value matters" as criteria of individual conduct. Thus, a value is a standard for making decisions and normally to be identified when it is articulated in (a) an expressed verbal statement or (b) overt conduct.

Lorge (1951) has made a pertinent observation about measurement which pertains to the motivation behind this study:

Measurement is the assignment of numerals to objects, events, or persons, according to rules. If one correctly defines his rules, he may use numerals to represent relations among the objects, and to compare these objects with other sets of objects similarly measured (pp. 533-559).
Ruch (1963) wrote that "everyone is motivated by a system of values, shaped largely through his experience in his home environment" (p. 167). Taylor (1960) stated:

The study of human values is of primary importance in the understanding of human motivation. Among the questions to which better answers are needed are the following: What are the important human values? How are such values structured, organized, or interrelated? How do such values vary from one individual to another, and from one group to another? In what way do an individual's values determine the choice he makes? (p. 66).

Woodruff and DiVesta (1948) defined "value" as a generalized condition of living which the individual feels has an important effect on his well-being. In general, a person will try to advance all of his higher positive values as opportunity permits but, when a conflict between values develops, each value will take precedence over those below it in this pattern (p. 645).

Value attachments may vary according to the amount of contribution or rejection the individual has experienced in connection with the objects or conditions. This results in a pattern of values running from high positive through neutral to high negative strength. In a behavior situation, a person acts in a manner which will get him more of his positive values and less of his negative values. Values can be attached at different levels of specificity or generality, such as a type of food, a particular pet, a generalized condition of living, a general characteristic of people, or a type of social event. In the words of Krech and Crutchfield, "Attitudes are a result of emotional, perceptual, and cognitive processes with respect to some aspect of the individual's world" (1948, pp. 66-67).
It is a fact that most value change will be brought about by making changes in the concept of the object toward which the values are expressed. This emphasizes the role of education in producing behavior change. Eric Allen contended "that the formation of attitudes is one of the principle aims of education, though it is rarely given the attention it deserves" (1960, p. 66).

Summary

A review of the literature was conducted in three areas considered relevant to the study. The first area focusing on youth culture presented strong support for the notion of a high degree of similarity in the student group. The term youth culture was used to describe youths that operate in a culture that is distinctly separate from that occupied by adults.

There was also evidence to show that youth culture was probably, to some extent, an adult projection, although a distorted projection because it was filtered through adult feelings of inadequacy. This concern has become more predominant and can be witnessed in the attention given to adolescents in the press and on television specials. It was out of this concern that youth culture has materialized. Without adult concern, deviations in adolescent behavior would go unnoticed and unlabeled.

The second section of the review of literature emphasized Spindler's theory and elaborations upon this theory. This study utilized this theory of traditional and emergent values in attempting to explain
value differences between students and parents. The evidence indicated that the results obtained by the researchers were for the most part in agreement with Spindler's theory.

The third section of the review of literature was related to values and the measurement of values. Evidence indicated support of the idea that values could be measured, and the appropriateness of measuring values objectively in spite of the difficulties of measuring such highly personal dimensions.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

The general approach to this investigation will be discussed in this chapter. Instruments used in the study will be described and procedures for developing the semantic differential explained. Methods of selecting the sample, administration of the Wrightsman Philosophies of Human Nature Scale and the semantic differential, and treatment of the data will also be presented.

Approach to the Study

The normative analytical research approach was used because it appeared best to examine present reactions of the groups under study. This investigation was undertaken to collect data on the distribution of certain values among University of Tennessee students and their parents. The study also examined the relationship between values and certain personal and academic variables.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used in this study. The semantic differential was chosen to measure student and parent attitudes toward selected contemporary concepts. The Wrightsman Philosophies of Human Nature
Scale (PHN), which facilitates the study of expressed opinions and attitudes about people, was used to measure subject beliefs about six characteristics of human nature and, specifically, beliefs about the interpersonal aspects of human nature. Accompanying the PHN Scale was a personal information form which supplied data concerning certain variables which will be discussed in a subsequent section of this chapter.

**Semantic Differential**

A semantic differential is essentially a combination of controlled association and scaling procedures. Osgood (1957) claimed, "It is a highly generalizable technique of measurement which must be adapted to the requirement of each research problem to which it is applied" (p. 76). The subject is provided with a concept to be differentiated and a set of bipolar adjectival scales against which to do it, his only task being to indicate for each item the direction of his association and its intensity on a seven-step scale. The crux of the method lies in selecting the sample of descriptive polar terms. Ideally, the sample should be as representative as possible of all the ways in which meaningful judgments can vary, yet small enough in size to be efficient in practice.

Using Osgood's technique, a scale was developed to measure the student and parent attitudes toward 16 concepts reflecting traditional-conservative, neutral, and emergent-liberal values. The concepts felt to be representative of traditional attitudes were: Spiro Agnew,
compulsory draft, Billy Graham, John Birch Society, Johnny Cash, George Wallace, and hard work and responsibility. Related to emergent values were these concepts: hippies, premarital sex, marijuana, college riots, Black Panthers, and acid rock music. Neutral concepts were: alcoholic beverages, suburbia, and college football. For each concept, the subjects were requested to respond on a series of descriptive scales. Each scale had left and right side adjectives which were separated by seven degrees of agreement. Four dimensions were measured by this instrument: evaluative, activity, potency, and novelty. Each dimension was measured by two different adjective scales. Bipolar adjective descriptives on the form included in the evaluative dimension were bad-good, sick-healthy; included in the activity dimension were: excitable-calm, passive-active; included in the potency dimension were: constrained-free, feminine-masculine; and included in the novelty dimension were: new-old, youthful-mature. The descriptive scales were selected because they were felt to be representative of the major dimensions and to have the proper factor loadings as concluded from several structural studies.

The validity of the semantic differential was reported by Osgood (1957) in relation to the Thurstone Scales and a Guttman Scale. The correlation between the semantic differential scores and the corresponding Thurstone scores being significantly greater than chance (p < .01) in each case, "it is apparent . . . that whatever the Thurstone Scale measures the evaluative factor of the semantic differential measures just about as well" (p. 194). In comparison with a Guttman
Scale, "the rank order correlation between the two instruments was highly significant (rho=.78, p < .01). Again we may say that the Guttman Scale and the evaluative scale of the differential are measuring the same thing" (p. 194). The findings of both these studies support the notion that the evaluative factor of the semantic differential is an index of attitude.

The reliabilities given by the authors of the semantic differential were: (meaning in general) test-retest r = 0.85, and (attitudes) test-retest r = 0.91. The validity cited by Miller (1964) was: Thurston Scale—r = 0.74 to 0.82; Guttman Scale—4 = 0.78; and Bogardus Social Distance Scale (three factors)—r = 0.72 to 0.80 (p. 192).

Philosophies of Human Nature Scale

Wrightsman (1964) has assumed that each person possesses a set of beliefs about the nature of human nature and that his expectations about the behavior of others reflect, in part, these assumptions. The PHN Scale, measuring these assumptions, consists of six subscales:

1. Trustworthiness (T), the extent to which people are seen as moral, honest, and reliable.

2. Altruism (A), the extent of unselfishness, sincere sympathy, and concern for others present in people.

3. Independence (I), the ability to maintain one's convictions in the face of pressure to change.

4. Strength of Will and Rationality (S), the ability to understand one's motives and have control over the outcomes.
5. Complexity (C), a dimension which cuts across the above continua and deals with the extent to which people are complex and hard to understand or simple and easy to understand.

6. Variability (V), which also cuts across the first four dimensions and relates to the extent of individual differences in basic changeability in human nature (p. 744).

A factor analysis of the six scales by Wrightsman (1964) revealed two factors. Factor I included the first four subscales (T, A, I, and S) and was named Positive vs. Negative (P), which is a general measure of one's beliefs about good or evil in human nature. Factor II included the last two subscales (C and V) and was named Multiplexity (M), which measures one's beliefs about the individual differences in human nature. Thus PHN provided eight measures, six substantive subscales, and two factors. The low intercorrelations of the six subscales justified their use separately as measures of the philosophy of human nature.

The reliability coefficients for male and female undergraduate samples are generally of an acceptable magnitude: all above .60 and nine of the twelve above .70. The reliability coefficients for the graduate students range from .40 to .78; they are lower because of the homogeneity of attitudes of the graduate students (p. 746).

The test-retest coefficients, with a three-month interval between testings, were the following: T, .74; A, .83; I, .75; S, .75; C, .52; and V, .84. The scores on the first four subscales were summed
to find a general Favorability score; this score had a reliability of .90. Thus, the subscales appear to be quite stable over time, and these reliability coefficients are higher than those measuring the internal consistency of the subscales. The use of a summary score for these four scales thus seems defensible as a measure of general evaluative orientation toward human nature, which may see man as good, as evil, or as neither (p. 746).

It appears that one's opinions about the general favorableness or unfavorableness of human nature have little relation to his opinions about whether people are simple or complex, and whether they are similar or different.

One indication of the validity of the PHN Scale is its correlation with other attitude scales in the same conceptual area. Political Cynicism Scale: As expected, there are significant negative correlations ranging from -.42 to -.55 between the substantive dimensions of the PHN Scale and political cynicism. This indicates that those subjects who are cynical about politicians tend to see human nature as untrustworthy, selfish, conforming, and lacking in will power. Machiavellianism Scale: Likewise, there are negative correlations between these subscales and Machiavellianism, ranging from -.38 to -.67. The person scoring high on the Machiavellianism Scale (Christie and Merton, 1958) has needs to manipulate people; he believes that flattery, threat, and deceit are the most successful ways of getting people to conform to his thinking. The correlation between PHN Scales and Machiavellianism Scale indicate that the Machiavellian type does
possess a cynical negative view of human nature, as revealed by the PHN Scale.

"Faith-in-People" Scale: Correlations between the "Faith-in-People" Scale and the substantive element of human nature are positive, ranging from .39 to .75. This is to be expected, as both scales attempt to measure the goodness, worthiness, and improvability of human nature. The nonsubstantive dimensions of the PHN Scale (Complexity and Variability) are not significantly related to political cynicism, Machiavel-lianism, or faith in people (p. 750).

The PHN Scale appears to have reliability, validity, and differentiation adequate for research purposes. The coefficients of stability are strong, considering the three-month interval between testings.

Selection of the Subjects

Students enrolled in Education 3010 classes at the University of Tennessee during Fall Quarter 1970 and one of their parents were designated as the sample group. A total of 222 (132 students and 90 parents) completed the scales.

Administration of the Instrument

During one class period in October 1970, 132 students completed both instruments, the Wrightsman PHN Scale and the Semantic Differential. Each respondent was also given copies of both instruments enclosed in a self-addressed, stamped envelope along with a letter of explanation for his parents. Since only one form of each instrument was
enclosed, the student was asked to choose the parent most influential in value choice in the home. This information was explained in the letter to the parent. The only difference in the student-parent instruments was in the personal data portion, where separate sections were labeled "For Parents Only" or "For Students Only." The common factors on both parent and student information sections were sex, regularity of church attendance, and residence. The student section additionally included classification (junior or senior), age, college of enrollment, major, fraternity/sorority member or independent, marital status, and grade point average (GPA). The parent information section asked for father's occupation, mother's occupation, and highest level of education.

The students were told that they were being asked to take part in a research project in which their names were not required; an identifying code would allow comparison of each student with his parent, but anonymity would still be maintained. They were assured that anyone not wishing to take part in this research project would be excused. They were told that they could have all the time necessary to complete both scales and that it was important to complete all items. The time required to finish both scales averaged 50 minutes.

**Treatment of the Data**

The semantic differential was scored by assigning values of −3 to +3 for the seven alternative choices, the value of −3 assigned to the adjective descriptive on the left-hand side of the scale and
the value of +3 assigned to the adjective descriptive on the right-hand side of the scale. Several adjective pairs were reversed in order to obtain more meaningful results. No response or two or more responses were assigned no value (0).

Scoring each of the six subscales on the PHN scale required the same procedure, although the actual test items were different for each subscale. As previously stated, the subscales were: T, Trustworthiness; S, Strength of Will and Rationality; A, Altruism; I, Independence from Group Pressure; C, Complexity; and V, Variability. Fourteen items on each of the six subscales yielded a total of 84 items and a possible range of scores from +42 to -42. On each subscale, half of the items were scored in the opposite direction and these scores had to be reversed. The P score (a positive-negative score) was obtained by summing the scores for T, S, A, and I (range from +168 to -168). The M score (a measure of multiplexity) was the sum of the C and V scores (range from +84 to -84). Data from both scales were then transferred to IBM cards and processed by the University of Tennessee Computing Center. See Table 1 for tabulation of frequency counts on five variables of the parent population and Table 2 for tabulation of frequency counts on nine variables of the student population.

The problem was to determine if any significant differences occurred within the student group, within the parent group, and between the student and parent groups. Forty-five hypotheses had been formulated
# TABLE 1

**FREQUENCY COUNT SUMMARY FOR PARENT POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents (N = 90)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonregular</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school diploma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have undergraduate credits</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have graduate credits</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation of Fathers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;White collar&quot; occupations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Blue collar&quot; occupations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchmaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/Deceased</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation of Mothers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary/Clerical</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired/Deceased</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 2

FREQUENCY COUNT SUMMARY FOR STUDENT POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students (N = 132)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19, 20, 21</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>64.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 23, 24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25, 27, 28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35, 40, 42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Enrolled In</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education (N = 80 comprised of the following)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Music</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education (listed separately)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternity/Sorority Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>72.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Point Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1.0 and 2.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2.2 and 2.9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3.0 and 3.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State, urban</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-State, rural</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State, urban</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State, rural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonregular</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by the investigator: twelve to determine homogeneity within the student group, six to determine homogeneity within the parent group, and 27 based on variables considered necessary to determine significant differences between the parent and student groups. The method chosen to determine significant differences was to compute t-tests for all hypotheses. The differences were computed utilizing the mean scores on 14 variables including positive-negative score (P score) and multiplicity score (M score) from the Wrightsman Philosophies of Human Nature Scale (PHN); evaluative, activity, potency, and novelty dimensions for traditional, emergent, and neutral concepts from the semantic differential. The decision to accept or reject each hypothesis was based on the number of significant differences on 10 of the variables considered critical. The evaluative, activity, potency, and novelty dimensions of the neutral concepts were omitted as critical variables as these concepts were not intended to evoke a strong positive or negative responses by either group. The levels of confidence considered significant were .05, .01, and .001. Presentation of the data relevant to each hypothesis will be presented in Chapter IV and a discussion of the findings in Chapter V.

Summary

Information presented in Chapter III described the procedures utilized in the study. The principle instruments for gathering data were the Wrightsman Philosophies of Human Nature Scale, the
investigator's semantic differential, and a personal information questionnaire included with the semantic differential.

The study population consisted of 132 students enrolled in Philosophy of Education 3010 at the University of Tennessee during Fall Quarter 1970 and 90 of their parents. The students completed the instruments during class and were each given a packet to be completed and returned by one of his parents. The forms for both students and parents were identical, with the only identification being a code number to match parent with student.

Treatment of the data included scoring the semantic differential and the Philosophies of Human Nature Scale, computing the mean scores for the semantic differential and PHN Scale for each group (parents and students) by sex, tabulating frequencies on the personal data variables (education level, church attendance, marital status, and so on) for parents and students by sex, and analyzing the data by means of t-tests on each of the 45 hypotheses on 14 variables (although 10 variables were considered critical in accepting or rejecting the hypotheses).
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

Significant questions to be answered by the study were the following:

A. Is there a high degree of similarity of values within the student group?

B. Is there a high degree of similarity of values within the parent group?

C. What relationship exists between student-held values and parent-held values?

An extensive list of hypotheses directly related to these questions was derived by the investigator and tested by means of the procedures described in Chapter III. Chapter IV contains a presentation of significant data and the results of the investigation as these pertain to the specific hypotheses.

Presentation of the Data

Evidence representing sex differences of parents as obtained from the PHN Scale was presented in Table 3. For each group (male and female), the mean scores tended to be around the neutral point for each of the four substantive subscales (T, S, A, I). That is, human nature was seen, generally, as neither trustworthy nor untrustworthy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Males (N=40)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females (N=42)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>3.881</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Will</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>8.441</td>
<td>7.796</td>
<td>11.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>-0.325</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>-1.619</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>9.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>9.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive-negative</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>36.74</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplexity</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>13.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
neither possessing nor not possessing willpower (female = +7.8; male = +11.7), neither altruistic nor unselfish (female = -1.6; male = -.33), and neither independent nor conforming (females = +1.5; males = +3.3). Contrary to expectations, male parents possessed a more positive view of human nature than did female parents. The male parents viewed human nature as more trustworthy, possessing more willpower, less unselfish, and more independent. Of the four subscales, a greater degree of willpower was seen as present, but it was probably unwise to make comparisons across dimensions, as it was doubtful that a zero score on the subscale was exactly equivalent to a point of absolute neutrality in the attitude. For these substantive dimensions, S. D.'s ranged from 8.441 to 15.63. Inspection indicated actual subjects using almost all the possible range (+42 to -42); a good spread of scores occurred on each of these four subscales.

On one of the two individual difference dimensions, complexity, the means of +5.8 for males and +7.7 for females tended to be around the neutral point and indicated that both groups believed human nature to be neither complex nor simple. The scores of +11.3 for males and +14.1 for females for the other individual difference dimension, variability, tended to be farther from neutrality. This indicated a view that different people tend to vary rather than to be alike.

The two summed scores gave the following results: general favorability of human nature (F), male mean = +21.0, S. D. = 36.7 and female mean = +11.7, S. D. = 40.7; multiplexity, male mean = +17.0, S. D. = 21.04 and female mean = 21.8, S. D. = 13.02. Thus, the average
male (parent) respondent tended to view human nature more favorably than the average female parent, although both positions were only slightly on the positive side of neutral when compared to a possible range of +168 to -168. In regard to multiplexity, the evidence also indicated that the female parents tended to see more individual differences in human nature than did the male parents.

Evidence representing sex differences of students obtained from the PHN Scale has been presented in Table 4. The mean scores for each of the four substantive subscales (T, S, A, I) approached neutrality for both the male and female groups. The results were as follows: Trustworthiness, male = -5.0 and female = -1.8; strength of will and rationality, male = +4.5 and female = +5.4; altruism, male = -10.7 and female = -6.1; and independence, male = -3.9 and female = -3.5. It was interesting to note that both student groups had negative feelings on three or four substantive subscales with the males having the more negative outlook. (This was in opposition to the parent groups). The students, generally, viewed human nature as more untrustworthy, more selfish, and more conforming (that is, less able to maintain convictions when there was pressure to change) than did the parents. In agreement with the adult groups, both student groups (male and female) saw human nature as having strength of will and rationality (in other words, as having the ability to understand one's motives and have control over the outcomes) rather than viewing human nature as irrational and lacking in willpower. The student groups tended to see others as having less strength of will than did the parents and again it was the
TABLE 4
STUDENT MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OBTAINED FROM PHN SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Males (N=43) M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Females (N=82) M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>-4.953</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>-1.793</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Will</td>
<td>4.535</td>
<td>9.905</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>11.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>-6.146</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>-3.907</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>-3.549</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>6.837</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>9.012</td>
<td>10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>9.672</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>10.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive-negative</td>
<td>-15.02</td>
<td>32.41</td>
<td>-6.098</td>
<td>33.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplexity</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>16.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
female students that saw less strength of will and rationality than did their male counterparts. For these four substantive subscales, the S. D.'s ranged from 9.905 to 12.69.

Examination of the means for complexity (male = +6.8, female = +9.0), one of the individual difference dimensions, revealed that both student groups also tended to be around the neutral point (although several points higher than parents), and the scores indicated that the student groups saw human nature as neither complex nor simple. The scores of +12.56 for males and +14.43 for females for variability, the other individual difference dimension, tended to be farther from neutrality and more positive than the parent scores. This indicated that the student groups agreed with the parent groups in feeling that people were different and variable, rather than similar and consistent.

The two summed scores gave the following results: general favorability of human nature (P), male mean = -15.0, S. D. = 32.41 and female mean = -6.1, S. D. = 33.92; multiplexity, male mean = +19.4, S. D. = 15.24 and female mean = +23.4, S. D. = 16.4. According to the evidence presented, both student groups viewed human nature negatively, with male students having the more negative outlook, although the scores did not depart far from the neutral point. This presented an interesting contrast to the more positive view of human nature held by both parent groups. The student scores for multiplexity ranged near those of the parent groups although the student scores were slightly higher. This indicated that both parents and students tended to recognize individual differences in human nature.
Presentation of Data and Results Relevant to Individual Hypotheses of the Study

Forty-five hypotheses directly related to the three significant questions central to the study were derived by the investigator. Following is a presentation of data and results relevant to each hypothesis.

Hypothesis A1. There is no significant difference between male students and female students.

Because of the impending draft, the war in Vietnam, and the instability of potential family life, one might assume that the values of male students would differ from those of female students. The data showed no significant difference between male students and female students. This lent support to the validity of a youth culture. The sample of 43 males and 82 females showed that in only one of the 14 variables was there any difference. This variable, emergent concepts-evaluative dimension, was found to be significantly different at the .05 level. The female students responded to the emergent concepts, such as Black Panthers, as slightly bad or slightly sick, whereas the male students saw the concepts as neither good nor bad, neither sick nor healthy. The evidence indicated an acceptance of the Hypothesis HA1.

Table 5 indicates the values obtained from t-tests in reference to Hypothesis HA1 through HA12.
### TABLE 5

**T-VALUES COMPARING TWELVE VARIABLES WITHIN THE STUDENT POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>T-Values</th>
<th>Traditional Concepts</th>
<th>Nontraditional Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.419 1.541 1.049 0.8693 1.2666 1.549 2.513&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 1.332 0.5170 0.3572 1.940 0.7467 0.0327 0.3497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.3229 -0.7584 -1.946 -1.4897 -2.023 -2.748 2.465&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; -1.837 1.615 0.7648 -1.348 0.7401 -1.303 1.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noneducation</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>0.9700 -0.2199 -1.326 -1.946 -1.644 1.909 1.950 0.6006 0.6026 -1.906 1.947 -0.041 0.1234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Affiliation</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant/Secular</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point average</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-1.505 -1.696 0.0497 0.5107 1.062 0.6125 -1.146 -1.302 1.243 0.146 -1.502 1.243 0.146 -1.502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instate</td>
<td>1.070 -2.273 -3.306 -2.387 3.2090 -2.299 1.506 1.303 0.1917 -0.9939 -4.992 -0.2568 -0.1177 -0.6088 0.5794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instate, rural</td>
<td>0.5792 -0.0614 1.128 1.100 0.3251 -0.0473 0.7856 1.155 1.755 -0.7242 -0.2932 1.109 1.259 1.655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instate, urban</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstate, rural</td>
<td>0.246 0.0670 -1.905 1.609 0.9802 0.5800 1.2441 -0.2342 -0.0210 -0.4000 0.2109 0.3243 -0.3335 1.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstate, urban</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Attendance</td>
<td>0.0625 0.9620 -0.182&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 0.087 -1.652 -4.415 1.506 -1.340 1.639 1.634 -1.777 1.364 -1.283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonregular</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .05 level.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .01 level.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at the .001 level.
Hypothesis HA2. There is no significant difference between education majors and liberal arts majors.

Hypothesis HA3. There is no significant difference between education majors and non-education majors.

It might seem logical that there would be differences between education majors and liberal arts majors. To verify this assumption, one can point to the differing requirements of the various colleges within the university. However, this research indicated that in only one of 14 variables was there any significant difference between education and liberal arts majors. There was a difference at the .05 level of significance in regard to emergent concepts-evaluative dimension. The education majors viewed the emergent concepts, such as marijuana, as slightly sad or slightly sick, whereas liberal arts majors saw these concepts as neither good nor bad, neither healthy nor sick. Thus, hypothesis HA2 was accepted as stated.

Related closely to the preceding hypothesis was hypothesis HA3. Again, one might assume that because of differing requirements in the different colleges that there would be differences in value orientation. The non-education majors in this study included business, home economics, communications, and agriculture. The differences between education and non-education majors occurred within traditional concepts-potency, emergent concepts-novelty, and neutral concepts-activity and novelty dimensions. The non-education majors reacted to traditional concepts, such as hard work and responsibility, as slightly free or slightly masculine, while the education majors viewed these concepts as less so.
With respect to emergent concepts—novelty dimension, the non-education majors saw the concepts, such as marijuana, as more youthful and newer than did the education majors. The neutral concepts—activity and novelty dimensions revealed that the non-education majors viewed these concepts, such as college football, as more excitable and active, also more old and mature than did the education majors. Examination of the evidence found it supportive of the hypothesis, and hypothesis HA3 was therefore accepted.

**Hypothesis HA4.** Within the College of Education, there is no significant difference among students who are elementary education majors and students who are secondary education majors.

Because of the sharp distinction in subject matter areas, the preponderance of female students in elementary education, and the difference in vocational goals, a diversity of value orientation among the students might be expected. The evidence, however, clearly indicated no significant difference at any of the 14 points of measurement. Therefore, Hypothesis HA4 was accepted as stated.

**Hypothesis HA5.** There is no significant difference between students who are fraternity/sorority members and students who are independent.

Traditionally, one could safely contend that on a university campus there was considerable difference in value orientation between fraternity or sorority members and their independent counterparts. This investigation revealed a more recent interpretation in that no significant
difference was found between fraternity/sorority members and independent students. Hypothesis HA5 was accepted as stated.

**Hypothesis HA6.** There is no significant difference between students who are married and students who are single.

It would appear that because of the difference in domestic and social relationships there would be variations in value emphasis. This was in part indicated by this investigation. Of the 14 variables, five revealed some difference, three of the five involving neutral concepts which attempted to be value free. In regard to traditional concepts-evaluative dimensions, married students saw these concepts, such as Billy Graham, as sicker and more bad than did the single students; but in the potency dimension there was a difference as the single students viewed traditional concepts, such as Billy Graham, as more free and more masculine than the married students.

Although there was some evidence to indicate a diversity between married and single students, nine of the 14 variables indicated no significant differences. Hypothesis HA6 was therefore accepted.

**Hypothesis HA7.** There will be no significant differences between students with a grade point average (GPA) greater than or equal to 3.0 and students with a GPA between 2.0 and 2.9.

One would assume that there would be differences in value orientation between those students who have achieved scholastic success as measured by GPA and those who have achieved moderate success. The only variable
of 14 possible variables that revealed any significant difference was
the neutral concepts-novelty dimension, and this was not considered to
be a critical variable. Therefore, Hypothesis HA7 was accepted as
stated.

Hypothesis HA8. There is no significant difference between
instate (rural and urban) students and out-of-
state (rural and urban) students.

Hypothesis HA9. There is no significant difference between instate
rural students and instate urban students.

Hypothesis HA10. There is no significant differences between
instate rural students and out-of-state rural
students.

Hypothesis HA11. There is no significant difference between instate
urban students and out-of-state urban students.

These hypotheses were projected because there was strong feeling
about possible differences between instate students as compared with
out-of-state students. The possibilities of out-of-state "instigators"
and "troublemakers" have been raised by university officials and state
legislators. These data indicated that a more appropriate assumption
would be that all the students, instate and out-of-state, have similar
value orientations and belong to what has previously been defined as the
youth culture. In the four hypotheses there was no significant differ-
ences at any level for any variable. Therefore, these hypotheses, HA8,
HA9, HA10, HA11 were accepted as stated.
Hypothesis HA12. There is no significant difference between regular church attending students and non-regular church attending students.

Church attendance has long been considered a strong influence on the formation of values. However, the only points of significant difference occurred at traditional concepts—evaluative dimension and emergent concepts—evaluative dimension. There was an .001 difference at traditional concepts, such as Billy Graham, where the nonregular attenders viewed the concepts as slightly bad and slightly sick. There also was a difference of .001 at emergent concepts, such as acid rock music, where the regular church attenders viewed the concepts as slightly sick, slightly bad. Examination of all the other variables indicated no significant difference; therefore, Hypothesis HA12 was accepted as stated.

Hypotheses relating to the second major question were prefixed HB. Table 6 indicates t-values in reference to Hypothesis HB1 to HB6.

Hypothesis HB1. There is no significant difference between male parents and female parents.

This hypothesis was included in an effort to determine whether there was a difference in value orientation between mothers and fathers of students. One might expect that sex differences would lead to value differences, but this investigation lent no support to this contention. The data indicated no significant difference for any variable and thus Hypothesis HB1 was accepted.
TABLE 6

T-VALUES COMPARING SIX VARIABLES WITHIN THE PARENT POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>0.6132</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonregular</td>
<td>-1.354</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>-1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>-0.4281</td>
<td>0.0473</td>
<td>-0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have college or graduate credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers' Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue collar</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White collar</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nontenure Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

*Significant at the .01 level.

*Significant at the .001 level.
Hypothesis HB2. There is no significant difference between regular church-attending parents and nonregular church-attending parents.

One might anticipate a significant difference between regular church-attending parents and nonregular attenders. As with the students, one would logically assume that those parents who attend church regularly would have been influenced markedly in value orientation and view of human nature. The data from this investigation revealed no support for this assumption. Hypothesis HB2 was accepted as stated.

Hypothesis HB3. There is no significant difference between parents with less than a high school diploma and parents that completed high school.

Hypothesis HB4. There is no significant difference between parents with less than a high school diploma and parents with college or graduate credits.

These hypotheses were projected in an effort to determine if there were any significant differences between the extremes of educational exposure. One would suspect that the various levels of education examined would reveal a broad range in value orientation. Once again, however, evidence did not support this theory. There was no significant difference pertaining to any of the variables under consideration. Hypotheses HB3 and HB4 were accepted without revision.

Hypothesis HB5. There is no significant difference between fathers with an occupation labeled "blue collar" (farmer, fireman, transportation worker, painter,
federal government employee, self-employed worker, mechanic, watchmaker) and fathers with an occupation labeled "white collar" (teacher, attorney, doctor, engineer, minister, businessman, manager).

**Hypothesis HB6.** There is no significant difference between mothers who are housewives and mothers who are employed (teacher, nurse, secretarial, clerical worker, attorney, other).

Much has been written in recent years of the "hard hat" mentality and the "silent majority," as if there existed some basic value differences between them and other Americans. This research in examining parental occupations showed no distinguishable differences in value patterns. Hypotheses HB5 and HB6 were accepted.

Hypotheses relating to the third major question were prefixed HC. See Table 7 for t-values in regard to Hypothesis HC1 through HC9.

**Hypothesis HC1.** There is no significant differences between male students and parents.

This hypothesis was tested in an effort to determine if there was a significant difference between students (in this case, male) and their parents. If there was a "generation gap" it should be revealed in this and following hypotheses. Some quite significant differences were revealed in Hypothesis HC1. The positive-negative (P) score which measured a positive or a negative view of human nature indicated a difference at the .001 level, with the parents having a more positive view of human nature and the male students having a more negative view.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PHE Scores</th>
<th>Traditional Concepts</th>
<th>Emergent Concepts</th>
<th>Neutral Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Students (N=43)</strong></td>
<td>-4.514a</td>
<td>-4.185b</td>
<td>-2.599c</td>
<td>-1.297a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Students (N=82)</td>
<td>-3.922a</td>
<td>-4.606c</td>
<td>-3.411b</td>
<td>-2.515b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>-4.581a</td>
<td>-6.097c</td>
<td>-3.455c</td>
<td>.709b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (N=63)</td>
<td>-4.581a</td>
<td>-6.097c</td>
<td>-3.455c</td>
<td>.709b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Students (N=23)</td>
<td>-2.651a</td>
<td>-4.956c</td>
<td>-2.859c</td>
<td>1.219b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other College Students (N=19)</td>
<td>-2.565a</td>
<td>-3.404c</td>
<td>-1.609c</td>
<td>1.754c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/ Sorority</td>
<td>-2.865a</td>
<td>-4.098c</td>
<td>-2.671b</td>
<td>2.129c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (N=60)</td>
<td>-4.972a</td>
<td>-7.113c</td>
<td>-3.455c</td>
<td>2.021c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Students (N=49)</td>
<td>-4.475c</td>
<td>-6.466c</td>
<td>-3.326c</td>
<td>2.459c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Students (N=81)</td>
<td>-4.138c</td>
<td>-6.313c</td>
<td>-3.737c</td>
<td>1.746c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aSignificant at the .05 level.

bSignificant at the .01 level.

^Significant at the .001 level.
Of the four dimensions of the traditional concepts, three showed significant differences. The evaluative dimension found that parents felt slightly good, slightly healthy about traditional concepts, whereas students felt the concepts were neither good nor healthy. The potency dimension of traditional concepts was significantly different at the .01 level. Parents felt the concepts to be slightly free, slightly masculine, but the students not as much so. The novelty dimension indicated a difference significant at .05 level. Students felt the concepts were slightly old, slightly mature, while the parents found them less so. As these were traditional concepts being measured, the data were not surprising.

The emergent concepts indicated significant difference at two points, the evaluative dimension and the activity dimension. Parents viewed emergent concepts as quite bad, quite sick, whereas the students viewed the same concepts as neither sick nor healthy, neither bad nor good. Students saw the activity dimension of the emergent concepts as more excitable, more active than did the parents. Emergent concepts, such as acid rock music and marijuana, would seem likely to draw these differing reactions from students and parents.

All the other variables indicated no significant differences. Based on the assumption that four of the variables measured neutral concepts, which were not intended to wake strong differing responses, the remaining 10 variables are the basis for rejection or acceptance of the hypothesis. Inasmuch as six of the variables showed a significant difference, Hypothesis HC1 was rejected.
Hypothesis HC2. There is no significant difference between female students and parents.

Since there were no significant differences between male students and female students for the variables under consideration, it might be expected that the relationship of female students to parents would be similar. This was the case. While it did not seem necessarily logical, the female students had even more areas of significant difference than the male students. The two additional variables were the emergent concepts—novelty dimension and the neutral concepts—potency dimension. The students felt the emergent concepts to be less new and less youthful than did their parents. The evidence contrary to the stated hypothesis outweighs supportive evidence; therefore, Hypothesis HC2 was rejected.

Hypothesis HC3. There is no significant difference between education majors and parents.

The following three hypotheses were projected in order to determine if there was a variation between students enrolled in different colleges and their parents. HC3 indicated that College of Education enrollees had significant differences from their parents. The students had a negative P score. The traditional concepts—evaluative dimension was seen by the students as less good and less healthy than the way the parents viewed the concepts. The traditional concepts—potency dimension was viewed as less free and less masculine by the students than by the parents. The traditional concepts—novelty dimension
was viewed by the students as older and more mature than the way the parents viewed the concepts.

Emergent concepts—evaluative, activity, and novelty dimensions showed significant differences. The students saw the concepts as less sick, less bad (evaluative), less excitable, less active (activity), and less new, less youthful (novelty) than did the parents. The collected data clearly indicated that Hypothesis HC3 must be rejected.

Hypothesis HC4. There is no significant difference between liberal arts majors and parents.

Liberal arts students felt more negative according to the P score than did their parents. There were significant differences in the traditional concepts—evaluative, potency, and novelty dimensions. The students viewed the traditional concepts as less good, less healthy, less free, less masculine (potency), and older and more mature than the parents viewed the same concepts. Emergent concepts—evaluative, activity, and potency dimensions—showed significant differences also. The students viewed these concepts as less bad, less sick (evaluative), more excitable, more active (activity), and more free, more masculine (potency) than did their parents. The evidence indicates difference on seven of the 10 variables judged as critical; therefore, HC4 was rejected.

Hypothesis HC5. There is no significant difference between other majors (business, home economics, agriculture, communications) and parents.

The students from other colleges had a more negative view of human nature than did their parents. The traditional concepts—evaluative
dimension was viewed by the students as less good, less healthy than the way the parents viewed the concepts. Emergent concepts—evaluative and activity dimensions—revealed significant differences. The students viewed these concepts as slightly sick, slightly bad, but less so than their parents (evaluative), and more excitable, more active (activity) than their parents. In view of the evidence presented, a decision was difficult as to whether to reject or accept this hypothesis. Since only four of the 10 critical variables were significantly different, this investigation accepted Hypothesis HC5.

Hypothesis HC6. There is no significant difference between fraternity/sorority students and parents.

Hypothesis HC7. There is no significant difference between independent students and parents.

Both fraternity/sorority members and independents had a more negative view of human nature than did their parents. The traditional concepts—evaluative, potency, and novelty dimensions as viewed by both groups showed significant differences. The students saw the concepts as less good, less healthy (evaluative), less fair, less masculine (potency), and older and more mature (novelty) than did their parents. Emergent concepts—evaluative and activity dimensions—indicated that the students viewed those concepts as less bad, less sick (evaluative), and more active, more excitable (activity) than did their parents. Both hypotheses revealed significant differences in six of the 10 critical variables; therefore, Hypotheses HC6 and HC7 were rejected.
Hypothesis HC8. There is no significant difference between married students and parents.

Hypothesis HC9. There is no significant difference between single students and parents.

In both groups, the students viewed human nature more negatively than did the parents (P score). The traditional concepts—evaluative, potency, and novelty dimensions—all showed significant differences. The students, both married and single, saw these concepts as less good, less healthy (evaluative), less free, less masculine (potency), older and more mature (novelty), than did their parents.

The emergent concepts—evaluative and activity dimensions—likewise showed significant differences for both the married students and the single students with their parents. The students rated the concepts as less sick and less bad (evaluative), and more active and more excitable (activity), than did their parents.

In light of the evidence, Hypotheses HC8 and HC9 were rejected as stated.

Hypothesis HC10. There is no significant difference between instate rural students and parents.

Hypothesis HC11. There is no significant difference between instate urban students and parents.

As previously stated, the rural and urban students showed no significant differences among themselves. Likewise, their differences with parents were similar enough for the two hypotheses to be projected together.
Again, the students, instate rural and instate urban, viewed human nature as significantly more negative (P score) than did their parents. In viewing the traditional concepts, differences were found for both groups of students concerning the evaluative, potency, and novelty dimensions. The students, both rural and urban, viewed the concepts as less good, less healthy (evaluative), less free, less masculine (potency), older and more mature (novelty), than did their parents.

The emergent concepts—evaluative dimension—revealed significant differences between both student groups and their parents. Both student groups viewed the concepts as less sick and less bad than did their parents. The instate urban students viewed the activity and potency dimensions of the emergent concepts as significantly different, whereas the instate rural did not. The urban students viewed the concepts as more excitable, more active (activity) and more free, more masculine (potency) than did their parents. The instate rural students showed no significant difference for these dimensions of the emergent concepts.

On the basis of the evidence and the fact that instate rural showed significant difference on five of the 10 critical variables, and instate urban showed significant difference on seven of the 10 critical variables, Hypotheses HC10 and HC11 were rejected as stated. Table 8 indicates t-values in reference to Hypotheses HC10 through HC19.

**Hypothesis HC12.** There is no significant difference between out-of-state rural students and parents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional Controls</th>
<th></th>
<th>Emerging Controls</th>
<th></th>
<th>Neutral Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instate, Metro. Students</td>
<td>-4.260&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.5496</td>
<td>-4.194&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.240</td>
<td>-3.226&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instate, Rural Students</td>
<td>-3.912&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.4909</td>
<td>-5.059&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.9295</td>
<td>-2.990&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state, Metro.</td>
<td>-1.565</td>
<td>.2642</td>
<td>-4.297&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.0496</td>
<td>-1.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (N=16)</td>
<td>-1.300</td>
<td>.2080</td>
<td>-3.807&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.764</td>
<td>-5.253&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state, Rural</td>
<td>-4.237&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.4404</td>
<td>-4.446&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.633</td>
<td>-2.415&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (N=15)</td>
<td>-5.946&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>-3.393&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.223</td>
<td>-4.172&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>-1.771</td>
<td>.1985</td>
<td>-3.061&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>-1.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majors (N=39)</td>
<td>-4.223&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.229</td>
<td>-4.428&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td>-3.348&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>-5.557&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>-5.636&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.9496</td>
<td>-3.081&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Grade Point Average</td>
<td>-5.608&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-7.106&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.0039</td>
<td>-3.707&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .05 level.<br><sup>b</sup>Significant at the .01 level.<br><sup>c</sup>Significant at the .001 level.
Hypothesis HC13. There is no significant difference between out-of-state urban students and parents.

There was no significant difference in a positive-negative view of human nature (P score) as there had been in all previous HC hypothesis. Both out-of-state student groups showed significant difference with their parents in viewing the traditional concepts—evaluative dimension. The out-of-state rural students also revealed a difference at the novelty dimension of the traditional concepts in viewing these concepts as older and more mature than did their parents.

Both groups of students, out-of-state rural and out-of-state urban, revealed significant difference in viewing emergent concepts—evaluative dimension. They say the concepts as less sick and less bad than the way the parents viewed the same concepts. In none of the other critical variables was there any significant difference; therefore, since hypothesis HC12 showed significant difference on only three of 10 variables and Hypothesis HC13 showed significant difference on only two of 10 variables, both Hypotheses HC12 and HC13 were accepted as stated.

Hypothesis HC14. There is no significant difference between regular church-attending students and parents.

Hypothesis HC15. There is no significant difference between nonregular church-attending students and parents.

Both groups of students had a less positive view of human nature (P score) than did their parents. The students, both regular and nonregular church-attenders, showed significant differences with their parents in the way they viewed the traditional concepts as less good,
less healthy (evaluative), less free, less masculine (potency), and as older and more mature (potency) than did their parents.

The students of both groups viewed the emergent concepts—evaluative and activity dimensions—differently from their parents. The students viewed the emergent concepts as less sick, less bad (evaluative), more excitable, more active (activity) than did their parents. The nonregular church-attending students also revealed a significant difference with their parents at the potency dimension of the emergent concepts. They viewed the concepts as freer and more masculine than did their parents.

The regular church-attending students showed significant difference on six of the 10 critical variables and the nonregular church-attending students showed significant difference on seven of the 10 critical variables. Therefore, Hypotheses HC14 and HC15 were rejected.

Hypothesis HC16. There is no significant difference between elementary education students and parents.

There was no significant difference in a positive-negative view of human nature (P score), nor was there any difference with parents in a view of the multiplexity of human nature (M score).

There were only two variables at which significant differences were found: the traditional concepts—evaluative dimension—and the emergent concepts—evaluative dimension. The elementary education students viewed both the traditional and the emergent concepts as less good, less healthy (traditional-evaluative), and not as sick, not as bad (emergent-evaluative) than did their parents.
On the basis of the evidence revealing only two variables with significant differences, Hypothesis HC16 was accepted as stated.

Hypothesis HC17. There is no significant difference between secondary education (science, English, special education, social studies) students and parents.

The secondary education students viewed human nature in a negative manner (P score) as compared with their parents.

There was significant difference revealed in their view of the traditional concepts—evaluative, potency, and novelty dimensions. The secondary education students viewed these concepts as less good, less healthy (evaluative), less free, less masculine (potency), older, more mature (potency). In the emergent concepts—evaluative and activity dimensions—the secondary education students viewed these concepts as less sick, less bad (evaluative), more excitable, more active (activity) than did their parents.

Since significant difference was attained on six of the 10 critical variables, Hypothesis HC17 was rejected as stated.

Hypothesis HC18. There is no significant difference between students with high grade point average (greater than 3.0) and parents.

Hypothesis HC19. There is no significant difference between students with grade point average between 2.0 and 2.9 and parents.

Both groups of students had a more negative view of human nature (P score) than did their parents. Both the high grade point average
(GPA) students and the lower GPA students showed significant difference with the parents in viewing traditional concepts—evaluative, potency, and novelty dimensions. The students saw the concepts as less good, less healthy (evaluative), less free, less masculine (potency), and older and more masculine (novelty) than did their parents.

Both groups of students as represented by these two hypotheses also differed significantly with their parents in viewing the emergent concepts—evaluative and activity dimensions. The students indicated that the concepts were less sick, less bad (evaluative), and more excitable and more active (activity) than did their parents. The students with a high GPA also revealed a significant difference at the potency dimension of the emergent concepts, indicating that they saw the concepts as freer and more masculine than did their parents. The students with the lower GPA revealed a significant difference with their parents at the novelty dimension of the emergent concepts, indicating that they saw the concepts as less new and less youthful than did their parents.

The students of both groups showed a significant difference for seven of the 10 critical variables; therefore, Hypotheses HC18 and HC19 were rejected.

The previous HC hypotheses all dealt with the students as the variable and the parents as the constant. In Hypotheses HC19 through HC27, the parents will be the variable and the students will be the constant. See Table 9 for t-values in reference to Hypothesis HC20 through HC27.
TABLE 9

T-VALUES COMPARING EIGHT VARIABLES OF THE PARENT POPULATION WITH THE STUDENT POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Traditional Concepts</th>
<th>Neutral Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Church Attending Parents (N=54)</td>
<td>-4.390</td>
<td>1.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have College or Graduate Credit (N=54)</td>
<td>-3.982</td>
<td>2.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers—White Coller (N=21)</td>
<td>-4.166</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers—Republican (N=81)</td>
<td>-4.390</td>
<td>1.234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

bSignificant at the .01 level.

cSignificant at the .001 level.
Hypothesis HC20. There is no significant difference between students and regular church-attending parents.

The parents attending church regularly had a more positive view of human nature (P score) than did the students.

In viewing traditional concepts—evaluative, potency, and novelty dimensions, significant differences were revealed. The parents viewed these concepts as better, healthier (evaluative), freer, more masculine (potency), and less old, less mature (novelty) than did the students.

Regular church-attending parents saw emergent concepts—evaluative, activity, and novelty dimensions—significantly differently from the students. They saw the concepts as sicker, worse (evaluative), less excitable, less active (activity), and newer and more youthful than did the students.

As there were significant differences in seven of the 10 critical variables, Hypothesis HC20 was rejected.

Hypothesis HC21. There is no significant difference between students and nonregular church-attending parents.

The parents attending church nonregularly had a very positive view of human nature (P score) in comparison with the students.

The parents viewed the traditional concepts—evaluative and novelty dimensions significantly differently from the students. They viewed these concepts as better and healthier (evaluative) and not as old, not as mature (novelty) than did the students.

These nonregular church-attending parents also revealed a significant difference with the students in viewing the emergent
concepts—evaluative dimension. The parents saw these concepts as sicker and worse than did the students.

The data indicated significant differences in only four of the 10 critical variables, therefore Hypothesis HC21 was accepted.

**Hypothesis HC22.** There is no significant difference between students and parents who completed high school education.

Examination of the data again revealed a significantly different positive-negative score, with the parents viewing human nature in a more positive manner than the students. It was interesting to note the significantly different multiplexity score. The parents who had completed a high school education viewed human nature as less complex and variable than did the college students.

In regard to traditional concepts, the points of significant difference occurred at the evaluative and novelty dimensions. The parents felt these concepts to be better, healthier (evaluative), and less old, less mature (novelty) than did the students. For emergent concepts, the significant differences occurred at the evaluative, activity, and potency dimensions. The parents saw these concepts as sicker, worse (evaluative), less excitable, less active (activity), and less free, less masculine (potency) than did the students. Inasmuch as seven of the 10 critical variables were significantly different, Hypothesis HC22 was rejected.

**Hypothesis HC23.** There is no significant difference between students and parents who have had college or graduate credits.
There was a significant difference in the positive-negative view (P score) between this group of parents and the students in that the parents had a significantly positive view of human nature.

These parents viewed the traditional concepts—evaluative, potency, novelty dimensions—with a degree of difference that was significant. The parents saw the concepts as better and healthier (evaluative), more free and more masculine (potency), and less old and less mature (novelty) than did the students.

Viewing the emergent concepts—evaluative and novelty dimensions—the parents who had college credits differed significantly from the students. These parents saw the concepts as sicker and worse (evaluative) and newer and more youthful (novelty) than did the students.

Of the 10 critical variables, a significant difference was shown in six of them. Hypothesis HC23 was therefore rejected.

Hypothesis HC24. There is no significant difference between students and fathers with an occupation labeled "blue collar" (farmer, fireman, transportation worker, painter, federal government employee, self-employed worker, mechanic, watchmaker).

Once again the parents had a more positive view of human nature (P score) than the students did. There were significant differences in the traditional concepts—evaluative and potency dimensions. The "blue collar" workers viewed the concepts as better and healthier (evaluative) and more free and more masculine (potency) than did the students.
In the emergent concepts—evaluative, activity, and potency dimensions—there were significant dimensions between these parents and the students. The "blue collar" fathers saw these concepts as more sick, worse (evaluative), less excitable, less active (activity), less free, less masculine (potency), than did the students.

With a significant difference in six of the 10 critical variables, Hypothesis HC24 was rejected.

Hypothesis HC25. There is no significant difference between students and fathers with an occupation labeled "white collar" (teacher, attorney, doctor, engineer, minister, businessman, manager).

Once again the parents had a more positive view of human nature (P score) than did the students.

In viewing the traditional concepts—evaluative, potency, and novelty dimensions, all showed significant differences. These "white collar" fathers saw the concepts as better, healthier (evaluative), more free, more masculine (potency), and less old, less mature (novelty) than did the students.

In viewing the emergent concepts—evaluative dimension—the "white collar" fathers also differed significantly from the students. These fathers viewed the concepts as more sick and more bad than did the students. In light of the evidence presented, the decision as to accept or reject was difficult. Since five of the 10 critical variables differed significantly, however, Hypothesis HC25 was rejected.
Hypothesis HC26. There is no significant difference between students and mothers who are housewives.

Examination of the data revealed a significant difference in the P score with the parents again having a more favorable attitude toward human nature than the students. In regard to traditional concepts, the points of significant differences occurred at the evaluative, potency, and novelty dimensions. The parents viewed these concepts as better, healthier (evaluative), more free, more masculine (potency), and more youthful, newer (novelty) than did the students. The emergent concepts differed at three dimensions: evaluative, activity, and potency. The parents saw the concepts as worse, sicker (evaluative), less excitable, less active (activity), and less free, less masculine (potency) than did the students. Inasmuch as seven of the 10 critical variables were found to be significantly different, Hypothesis HC26 was rejected.

Hypothesis HC27. There is no significant difference between students and mothers who are employed (teacher, nurse, secretarial/clerical worker, other).

There was a significantly different positive-negative (P score), with the parents again having the more favorable feeling about human nature. In regard to traditional concepts, there were three points of significant difference: evaluative, potency, and novelty. The parents felt these concepts were better, healthier (evaluative), more free, more masculine (potency), and newer, more youthful than did the students. The emergent concepts were viewed as significantly different at only one point (evaluative), with the parents viewing these concepts as worse
and sicker than did the students. In light of the evidence presented, the decision as to accept or reject was difficult; but inasmuch as five of the 10 critical variables differed significantly, Hypothesis HC27 was rejected.

It is necessary to note that the use of repeated t-tests may lead to the inflation of the alpha error.

Summary

Chapter IV has presented relevant data and findings of the investigation as they related to specific hypotheses.

An important consideration in the study was selection of the 14 variables to be used as the basis for acceptance or rejection of each hypothesis. It was determined by the investigation that 10 of the 14 variables (omitting evaluative, activity, potency, and novelty dimensions of neutral concepts) should be considered as critical variables in judging each hypothesis.

Analysis of the data obtained from the PHN Scale revealed that, in general, the parent population viewed human nature positively. The P (positive-negative) score for both male and female parents was positive, and three of the four substantive subscales (T, S, I) were positive with only altruism being slightly negative. In regard to multiplicity, both male and female parents tended to see individual differences in human nature. The data also revealed that, in general, the student population had a negative view of human nature. The positive-negative score for both male and female students was negative, and
three of the four substantive subscales (T, A, I) were negative with only strength of will and rationality being positive. In regard to multiplicity, both student groups tended to recognize individual differences in human nature as did both parent groups.

Analysis of the data relevant to the hypotheses regarding the similarity of the student group indicated acceptance of each hypothesis. In general, no significant differences were found in regard to sex, college enrolled in, major, social affiliation, marital status, grade point average, residence, or regularity of church attendance. Analysis of the data relevant to the hypotheses regarding the similarity of the parent group likewise revealed, in general, no significant differences among parents according to sex, regularity of church attendance, educational level, or occupation. Therefore, each of these hypotheses was accepted.

In regard to the hypotheses comparing variables of the student population with the parent population, 15 comparisons were found to be significantly different and were rejected. These hypotheses compared parents with male students, female students, education majors, liberal arts majors, independent students, fraternity/sorority members, married students, single students, instate rural and urban students, regular and nonregular church-attending students, secondary education majors, and high and low GPA students. The hypotheses not found to be significantly different and thus accepted were those comparing parents with students enrolled in other colleges (business, home economics, agriculture, and communications), out-of-state, rural and urban students, and
elementary education majors. In regard to hypotheses comparing variables of the parent population with the student population, seven comparisons were found to be significantly different: comparing students with regular church-attending parents, parents who had completed high school, parents who had college or graduate credits, fathers with "blue collar" occupations, fathers with "white collar" occupations, mothers who were housewives, and mothers who were employed. One comparison was not found to be significantly different and was accepted. This hypothesis compared students with nonregular church attending parents.

Chapter V will present discussion and inferences of these findings as well as recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF THE STUDY

The final chapter of the study is divided into three sections. The first contains a brief review of the entire study. The second section is devoted to a discussion of the findings and inferences of the study, and the chapter concludes with some implications and recommendations for further research.

Summary of the Study

The present study addressed itself not to the ways in which various values and attitudes are instilled, but to an empirical assessment of the differences in value orientation between parents and university students. Values have always been a point of argumentation among educators, and at this particular time the general public is equally concerned and argumentative about the value commitments of university students. This study assessed whether a "generation gap" existed at the University of Tennessee and allowed for a more precise usage of that term.

It was clear to the investigator that some students came to the University of Tennessee with behavior patterns set in a value system that often resulted in a clash or value conflict with standards of
behavior set by professors or peers. A question that naturally arose was whether or not a student could achieve his full potential if the university behavior was in conflict with home-acquired values. In an attempt to come to grips with that question the purpose of this study was formulated, which was to ascertain empirically the value patterns of the students involved and the value patterns of the parents involved, and then to examine any existing pattern of relationships between the students' values and those of their parents. In keeping with the nature of the investigation of values, three major questions significant to the study arose:

A. Is there a high degree of similarity of values within the student group?

B. Is there a high degree of similarity of values within the parent group?

C. What relationship exists between student-held values and parent-held values?

Forty-five hypotheses directly related to these questions were derived and tested.

A review of the literature was conducted in three areas considered pertinent to the study. Examination of the literature focusing on youth culture indicated strong support for the idea of a similar student group. To describe youth culture is to articulate the fundamental feature of the term, that is, that youths operate in a culture that is significantly distinct from that occupied by adults. Much evidence was provided to reveal that the youth culture concept has been used to denote the
estrangement of a significant group of American youth from the dominant society. Evidence has also shown that youth culture is probably to a great extent an adult projection. It is a distorted projection because it is filtered through adult feelings of inadequacy. This concern is becoming more predominant. Witness the attention given to adolescents in the popular press and on television network specials. It is out of this concern that youth culture has materialized. In the absence of adult concern, deviations in adolescent behavior would go unnoticed and unlabeled.

The next section of the review of literature emphasized Spindler's theory and elaborations upon this theory. The theory of traditional and emergent values was very useful in this study in attempting to explain value differences between students and parents. The literature indicated that the results obtained by the researchers were for the most part in agreement with Spindler's theory.

The third section of the review of literature was related to values and the measurement of values. Evidence was presented in support of the idea that values can be measured and the appropriateness of measuring values objectively in spite of the difficulties of measuring values objectively in spite of the difficulties of measuring such highly personal dimensions.

Since the proposed study appeared to utilize the potentials of investigation in the three areas surveyed and to surmount some of the problems of previous research endeavors, the investigator felt justified in continuing his endeavors.
There is significance at all levels for this investigation. Students could understandably become aware of what other students are doing and thinking. Generalization of the evidence would reveal significance for the high school student as he anticipates moving into university life. At this point, the high school counselor would find this study appropriate. Parents, in an effort to come to grips with communication failure, would find appropriateness in this study, as well as ministers and community leaders dealing with youth. Obviously, teachers and professors would benefit from the evidence involved in this study. Administrators, too, might better understand the motivations of youth if they became aware of the differences that exist in value orientation between them and the students. Likewise, in giving the vote to the youth, political leaders have shown an awareness of the youth culture concept in a somewhat positive manner.

Data for the study were collected by means of the Wrightsman Philosophies of Human Nature Scale, the investigator's semantic differential, and a personal data questionnaire. Data obtained were analyzed by means of a computer program processed by the University of Tennessee Computing Center. All data were examined to determine their support of the stated hypotheses by means of t-tests considering 14 variables. The population of the study was limited to 132 students enrolled in Philosophy of Education 3010 at the University of Tennessee during Fall Quarter 1970 and 90 of their parents. The students completed the instruments during class time and were given packets to be completed and returned by one of their parents.
Discussion of the Findings

The results of the study should be examined in relation to several factors. First, it is essential to recall that the population represented in the study consisted of juniors and seniors enrolled in educational philosophy classes at the University of Tennessee. Results either supporting or disproving specific hypotheses cannot be considered applicable to all students at all levels in all places. Since subjects in this study agreed to participate and since data were collected by means of written responses, some concern could be voiced as to whether the values expressed on these inventories would consistently be reflected in the respondents' daily behavior. While these factors may certainly have influenced the findings of this study, the investigator is convinced that expressed statements of value had considerable importance in their own right.

Based upon the results of the investigation and the factors to be considered in weighing those results, the investigator has arrived at the following conclusions:

A. There is a high degree of similarity of values within the student group.

B. There is a high degree of similarity of values within the parent group.

C. Significant relationships do exist between student-held values and parent-held values.
Relative to the first conclusion, the investigator suggests that the University of Tennessee students are more alike than dissimilar in value orientation. The findings of the study provided information which did not exist previously, and the conclusion has been strongly supported. Of interest to the investigator was the fact that there was no significant difference between male and female students. Because of the impending draft, the war in Vietnam, and the instability of potential family life, one might assume that the values of male students would differ from those of female students. The data showed that there was no significant difference between male and female students. Further, while some of the literature indicated that females would be more emergent in their value orientation than males, this phenomenon did not occur in this investigation. The evidence concerning students seemed to follow this trend. Through all the variables, little or no significant difference occurred. The findings indicated that University of Tennessee students, with minute exceptions, could be viewed as a whole. The idea that fraternity/sorority members had different value orientations than independents was disputed. A continuing argument within the College of Education as to whether secondary education majors and elementary education majors viewed the world differently was also stilled. It was assumed also that some differences would be found between liberal arts majors and education majors, but this was not borne out by the evidence. Of interest was the finding that rural and urban instate students showed no significant differences. This could be attributed to the rural or agrarian influence even in urban schools and in the
State legislature. The limited sample of out-of-state rural population reduced the validity of statistics derived from those hypotheses dealing with that group of students. Tennessee normally is considered a "Bible belt" state with a strong religious influence; therefore, it seemed unusual to find that those students attending church regularly differed only insignificantly from nonregular church-attending students.

In spite of all the variables investigated, it appeared that students could best be identified as a whole group rather than as a segmented or cross-sectioned population. This conclusion lead to the positive assumption that there was a high degree of similarity of values within the student group.

In regard to the second significant question, "Is there a high degree of similarity of values within the parent group?", a positive answer was derived. There were six hypotheses formulated to examine the variables of parents' attitudes. The investigator assumed that male and female parents would respond differently to the instruments, but this was not verified by the evidence. Nor did educational level or occupation indicate any significant differences among parents. As with the students, the investigator assumed that because of the supposed influence of religious feeling in the State the parents who attended church regularly would respond differently from those who did not. This assumption was shown to be false. The reason the two apparently disparate groups responded similarly could be the pervading attitude of religion in all walks of life and in institutions other than the church.
Upon the basis of this investigation, it was determined that parents can best be identified as an entire group, rather than as a fragmented population. This conclusion lead to the positive assumption that there was a high degree of similarity of values within the present population. Parents viewed traditional concepts, such as Spiro Agnew, as younger than the students viewed the same concept. Likewise students viewed emergent concepts, such as acid rock music, less youthful than did their parents. In other words, traditional concepts were not as young to the student group as to the older population.

Analysis of the data derived from the PHN Scale presented some interesting differences between parents and students. Investigation of Wrightsman's research revealed that females tend to view human nature more favorably than do males. This study indicated contrary evidence as the male parents tended to view human nature more positively than did female parents or female students.

In comparing the relationships between students and parents, several interesting factors emerged. The examination of the students alone revealed few significant differences and the examination of the parents alone revealed few significant differences, but comparison of the one group with the other led to rejection of most of the hypotheses. Both male students and female students differed significantly from the parent group. This was the first empirical evidence to indicate a differing value orientation, or a "value gap," between parents and students. When broken down as to type of student, it was found that education majors and liberal arts majors differed rather sharply from
parents, but those enrolled in other colleges (business, home economics, agriculture, communications) revealed no significant differences with their parents. A popular conception has prevailed that the student enrolled in a vocational training college tends to be more conservative in orientation than does the liberal arts and fine arts enrollee. This investigation indicated that education majors were more closely aligned with liberal arts majors in an assessment of value differences. They have generally been lumped with the vocationally oriented colleges, but this evidence revealed otherwise.

Within the area of the education college, some surprising results were indicated. Those students majoring in secondary education had significant value differences with the parents, whereas those in elementary education did not. This might be attributable to a number of factors including the preponderance of females and career choice, that is, number of years willing to be employed. Since this data, however, indicated there was no difference between male and female students, the burden of explanation probably falls on the course content of the elementary curriculum or the long-term occupational goals of those choosing the elementary curriculum.

Much has been said about the differences between fraternity/sorority members and the independent student. This study, however, indicated that they were more alike than dissimilar, and both revealed significant differences with the parent group. This information could indicate that fraternities have become less isolated or that the facilities of the university have offered the independent student
the same opportunities as the fraternities, thereby reducing the
differences between them.

Both married and single students differed significantly from
the parent group. This investigator anticipated married students
being more reserved and more conservative in orientation than their
single counterparts. The evidence, however, did not reveal this to
be the case. The age of married students did not differ significantly
from the age of single students and this might be the reason for their
similarity.

Instate rural and instate urban students both differed signifi­
cantly from their parents, but out-of-state rural and out-of-state urban
students did not. This was difficult to account for and the limited
sampling of out-of-state students may have skewed the statistics out
of proportion. The investigator had anticipated a wider divergence
in value orientation from out-of-state students, but this was not
borne out by the statistics.

Both the regular and nonregular churchgoing students differed
significantly from their parents. If the church is intended to be a
value equalizer among people, it has not accomplished these goals with
University of Tennessee students.

One might assume that students with high grade point averages
would be more career-oriented and more in line with the value orienta­
tion of the parents, but this was not shown by the evidence of this
investigation. In fact, the students with higher averages had the
same value orientation as students with lower averages, and both
differed significantly from the parent group.
Regular church-attending parents revealed significant differences with the students, but nonregular church-attending parents did not. Perhaps the church's attempts to instill values are more effective on older people than on younger. It was interesting to note that nonregular church-attending parents were closer to the students in value orientation and indicated no significant differences.

Occupations and educational levels of the parents all revealed significant differences with the students. Both blue-collar and white-collar male parents and both housewives and employed female parents differed significantly from the students. The investigator had assumed at the outset that those in white-collar professions would be more in line with student thinking, but this was not the case. Likewise, those who had more than a high school diploma and those who had less than a high school diploma did not hold sharply differing value orientations as might have been expected. Instead, both groups indicated significant differences with the students.

This research indicated several possible areas for investigation. Expanding the research beyond the University of Tennessee population would place the results on a relative basis with students and parents throughout the United States. Broader generalizations could then be made. Likewise, designating this research on the basis of size of school might be revealing. This could be done with a careful expansion of this investigation.

The research should be repeated periodically to ascertain shifts in value orientation with students or parents. Also, administering
the instruments to Freshmen and later administering the instruments to the same group when they are seniors would be a beneficial investigation. This would help determine the influence of the particular institution on individual value formation.
APPENDIX
Dear Parent,

In an effort to come to grips with some of the pressing problems found on campuses and with youth today, we are engaged in this research project. With your help in completing this questionnaire, we hope to measure some of the differences in values and attitudes between parents and youth. Your personal replies will be held in strict confidence. If there are any further questions, please feel free to contact me by phone or letter. It is essential for the completion of the project that these questionnaires be returned by November 6, 1970. After completion of the project, I will be glad to discuss the conclusions with any of you who are interested.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Kermit J. Blank
Assistant Professor
College of Education
Room 3, Claxton Education Building
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Phone: 974-3103
This questionnaire is a series of attitude statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with matters of opinion.

Read each statement carefully. Then, on the separate answer sheet, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling a number by the number for each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

- If you agree strongly: circle +3
- If you agree somewhat: circle +2
- If you agree slightly: circle +1
- If you disagree slightly: circle -1
- If you disagree somewhat: circle -2
- If you disagree strongly: circle -3

First impressions are usually best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and then circle the appropriate number on the answer sheet. Be sure to answer every statement.

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion, use the one which is closest to the way you feel.

All responses should be made on the answer sheet. Do not mark on the questionnaire.
1. Great successes in life, like great artists and inventors, are usually motivated by forces they are unaware of.

2. Most students will tell the instructor when he has made a mistake in adding up their score, even if he had given them more points than they deserved.

3. Most people will change the opinion they express as a result of an onslaught of criticism, even though they really don't change the way they feel.

4. Most people try to apply the Golden Rule even in today's complex society.

5. A person's reaction to things differs from one situation to another.

6. I find that my first impression of a person is usually correct.

7. Our success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our own control.

8. If you give the average person a job to do and leave him to do it, he will finish it successfully.

9. Nowadays many people won't make a move until they find out what other people think.

10. Most people do not hesitate to go out of their way to help someone in trouble.

11. Different people react to the same situation in different ways.

12. People can be described accurately by one term, such as "introverted," or "moral," or "sociable."

13. Attempts to understand ourselves are usually futile.

14. People usually tell the truth, even when they know they would be better off by lying.

15. The important thing in being successful nowadays is not how hard you work, but how well you fit in with the crowd.

16. Most people will act as "Good Samaritans" if given the opportunity.

17. Each person's personality is different from the personality of every other person.
18. It's not hard to understand what really is important to a person.
19. There's little one can do to alter his fate in life.
20. Most students do not cheat when taking an exam.
21. The typical student will cheat on a test when everybody else does, even though he has a set of ethical standards.
22. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" is a motto most people follow.
23. People are quite different in their basic interests.
24. I think I get a good idea of a person's basic nature after a brief conversation with him.
25. Most people have little influence over the things that happen to them.
26. Most people are basically honest.
27. It's a rare person who will go against the crowd.
28. The typical person is sincerely concerned about the problems of others.
29. People are pretty different from one another in what "makes them tick."
30. If I could ask a person three questions about himself (and assuming he would answer them honestly), I would know a great deal about him.
31. Most people have an unrealistically favorable view of their own capabilities.
32. If you act in good faith with people, almost all of them will reciprocate with fairness toward you.
33. Most people have to rely on someone else to make their important decisions for them.
34. Most people with a fallout shelter would let their neighbors stay in it during a nuclear attack.
35. Often a person's basic personality is altered by such things as a religious conversation, psychotherapy, or a charm course.
36. When I meet a person, I look for one basic characteristic through which I try to understand him.

37. Most people vote for a political candidate on the basis of unimportant characteristics such as his appearance or name, rather than because of his stand on the issues.

38. Most people lead clean, decent lives.

39. The average person will rarely express his opinion in a group when he sees the others disagree with him.

40. Most people would stop and help a person whose car is disabled.

41. People are unpredictable in how they'll act from one situation to another.

42. Give me a few facts about a person and I'll have a good idea of whether I'll like him or not.

43. If a person tries hard enough, he will usually reach his goals in life.

44. People claim they have ethical standards regarding honesty and morality, but few people stick to them when the chips are down.

45. Most people have the courage of their convictions.

46. The average person is conceited.

47. People are pretty much alike in their basic interests.

48. I find that my first impressions of people are frequently wrong.

49. The average person has an accurate understanding of the reasons for his behavior.

50. If you want people to do a job right, you should explain things to them in great detail and supervise them closely.

51. Most people can make their own decisions, uninfluenced by public opinion.

52. It's only a rare person who would risk his own life and limb to help someone else.

53. People are basically similar in their personalities.
54. Some people are too complicated for me to figure out.
55. If people try hard enough, wars can be prevented in the future.
56. If most people could get into a movie without paying and be sure they were not seen, they would do it.
57. It is achievement, rather than popularity with others, that gets you ahead nowadays.
58. It's pathetic to see an unselfish person in today's world because so many people take advantage of him.
59. If you have a good idea about how several people will react to a certain situation, you can expect most people to react the same way.
60. I think you can never really understand the feelings of other people.
61. The average person is largely the master of his own fate.
62. Most people are not really honest for a desirable reason; they're afraid of getting caught.
63. The average person will stick to his opinion if he thinks he's right, even if others disagree.
64. People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.
65. Most people are consistent from situation to situation in the way they react to things.
66. You can't accurately describe a person in just a few words.
67. In a local or national election, most people select a candidate rationally and logically.
68. Most people would tell a lie if they could gain by it.
69. If a student does not believe in cheating, he will avoid it even if he sees many others doing it.
70. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.
71. A child who is popular will be popular as an adult, too.
72. You can't classify everyone as good or bad.
73. "Most persons have a lot of control over what happens to them in life.
74. Most people would cheat on their income tax if they had a chance.
75. The person with novel ideas is respected in our society.
76. Most people exaggerate their troubles in order to get sympathy.
77. If I can see how a person reacts to one situation, I have a good idea of how he will react to other situations.
78. People are too complex to ever be understood fully.
79. Most people have a good idea of what their strengths and weaknesses are.
80. Nowadays people commit a lot of crimes and sins that no one else ever hears about.
81. Most people will speak out for what they believe in.
82. People are usually out for their own good.
83. When you get right down to it, people are quite alike in their emotional makeup.
84. People are so complex, it is hard to know what "makes them tick."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>22. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>43. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>64. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>23. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>44. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>65. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>24. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>45. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>66. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>25. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>46. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>67. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>26. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>47. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>68. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>27. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>48. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>69. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>28. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>49. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>70. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>29. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>50. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>71. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>30. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>51. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>72. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>31. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>52. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>73. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>32. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>53. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>74. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>33. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>54. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>75. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>34. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>55. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>76. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>35. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>56. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>77. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>36. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>57. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>78. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>37. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>58. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>79. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>38. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>59. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>80. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>39. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>60. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>81. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>40. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>61. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>82. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>41. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>62. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>83. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>42. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>63. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
<td>84. -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL DATA

It is not necessary to put your name on the questionnaire. We do, however, request the following identifying information.

FOR STUDENTS ONLY:
Classification: Junior___ Senior___ Graduate___ Sex_________ Age_____

College Enrolled In: ______________ Major____________

Fraternity/Sorority Number____ Independent____ (Please Check)

Do you attend church regularly? Yes___ No___

FOR PARENTS ONLY:

Sex________ Father's Occupation________________________

Mother's Occupation________________________

Highest Level Of Education: Elementary___ College (years) 1___ 2___ 3___ 4___
(Please Check) Junior High___ Graduate Work Yes___ No___
Senior High___

Do you attend church regularly? Yes___ No___

DIRECTIONS

The questionnaire you are about to take is designed to assess your feelings about some ideas and people. For each concept you are requested to respond on a series of descriptive scales. Each scale has left and right side adjectives which are separated by seven degrees of agreement. For example:
The questionnaire you are about to take is designed to assess your feelings about some ideas and people. For each concept you are requested to respond on a series of descriptive scales. Each scale has left and right side adjectives which are separated by seven degrees of agreement. For example:

**COLOR TELEVISION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>extremely excitible</th>
<th>quite excitible</th>
<th>slightly excitible</th>
<th>neither exciting nor calm</th>
<th>slightly calm</th>
<th>quite calm</th>
<th>extremely calm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| extremely bad | quite bad | slightly bad | neither bad nor good | slightly good | quite good | extremely good |

On the first scale (excitable-calm) if you feel that Color Television is "quite" excitible, you would place an X in the second degree position from the left (see above). For the second scale (bad-good) if you feel that Color Television is "extremely" good, you would place an X in the first degree position on the right.

Be sure to check each scale only once and do not omit any. Work at a moderately rapid pace for it is your first impression, or immediate feeling about a concept, that is most important.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLACK PARTNERS</th>
<th>MAN WORE AND RESPONSIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, extremely calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quite calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slightly calm</td>
<td>quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm, quite calm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please double check to see if you have responded to all of the concepts and adjective pairs in this questionnaire. Please return this questionnaire in the provided self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please do it now! Thank you again for your cooperation.
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