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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The effort to integrate two vocations often considered incompatible (psychologist and religious minister), if not mutually exclusive, has very naturally led the writer to that area of psychological study most closely related to ethical-moral choices, the study of values. Previous publications (Garsee, 1963; Garsee and Glixman, 1967) have been in areas concerned with values—religious and interpersonal. The latter publication grew out of a combined Master's Degree program at Oklahoma University and interest in cultural differences in interpersonal values, during an extended stay in Samoa as head of a religious mission.

Since 1968, the writer has been active as teacher, counselor, and chaplain at Mount Vernon Nazarene College, as well as itinerant minister and lecturer in many places on the entire educational zone. The "apparent generation gap" verbalized to the writer by members of both generations (students and their parents) has increased interest in endeavoring to ascertain whether such "perceived differences" are "real" or "apparent."
It is not difficult for the writer to agree with the statement made by Phenix (1960): "Values are the soul of civilization." The problem, of course, arises out of the effort to examine a "soul" in empirical terms. This research represents a scientific effort to describe the real stance of college students in relation to some of the prescribed and prescribed items of behavior, within an atypical subculture. It is based upon the preconception that "perceived value choices" are the point of interaction where science and "soul" (as the source of moral-ethical choice) can be observed.

Statement of the Problem

Since many of the early psychologists had ambivalent prior leanings toward philosophy, it is not unusual that the purview of psychology has always included the study of values. The previous bent may also provide a partial reason for the great difficulty that psychologists have had of defining values operationally, thus limiting the opening of doors to empirical studies in the area. Another problem is occasioned by the fact that the general discussion of values nearly always gets clouded by the emotion-packed effort to distinguish between freedom (choice) and determinism. Any effort to operationalize the variables involved must put aside this artificial distinction, with the knowledge that even if all behavior is determined, it is nevertheless meaningful to endeavor to discover the antecedents which
determine the behavior, since they are certainly not all clearly distinguishable, especially in the arena of values.

The most meaningful empirical studies in values have seemed to result from a group of voluntarily-imposed limitations on the scope and direction of the research. Some of the most pertinent of these limitations would seem to be:

1. homogeneity
2. specific developmental level
3. specific values

It seems that vital value differences are more likely to be isolated through this process of voluntary specification. It is, further, the position of the writer that correlates and antecedents of values are most likely to be found in the perceptions of the dynamic but subtle interactions between parents and child.

Before further defining these specifics and endeavoring to implement them in empirical application with a given sample, it is necessary to see the elaboration of some of these basic ideas in previous work in the field.

The search of the literature is rendered extremely difficult by the interaction of a number of situations inherent to this particular research:

1. The broadness of the field of values;
2. The specificity of most of the research in the field;
3. The large number of variables the writer is interested in, directly or indirectly, as having pertinence in the study;
4. The rhetorical and philosophical nature of much of what has been written about pertinent variables, e.g., the generation gap, the nature of values, and the scope of child-rearing dynamics.

Survey of the Literature

Summary of Major Highlights of the Literature

The modern era of concern with moral-ethical values was ushered in by Hartshorne and May (1929) just before the days of the great Depression. Their ambitious study dealt primarily with deceit and honesty, and they found that honesty is situation-specific and does not generalize well, especially to situations not covered by previous learning.

There are not a great number of sources that emphasize the study of moral-ethical values. As the writer pointed out in the oral examination, psychology has provided a moratorium for study on most behavior which can be suspected of possible relationship to religion, or religious convictions, or even religious prejudice. Gesell and Ilg (1949) do not include values in the ten major fields of consideration with regard to the development of the child. A thorough study of all of the issues of the recently published Journal of Developmental Psychology reveals that most of the articles dealing with any kind of values relate primarily to honesty
(Johnson and Gormly, 1972) in grade school settings, honesty and altruism (Mussen, Harris, Rutherford, and Keasey, 1970) among preadolescents, or moral judgment (see later section in literature review for details).

A study of the Psychological Review for two years reveals no major section dealing with values. Kagan (1964), in a review of all the longitudinal research pertinent to developmental variables, places no emphasis on moral-ethical values. In an editorial appraisal and analysis of research topics reported in one important journal (Child Development) in one year's time, Siegel (1967) puts the study of values in perspective:

Personality and social development was the topic of 37 other studies, or about 25% of the total. Included are studies of child-rearing practices and their outcomes, of moral judgment, and of motivation, interests, values, beliefs, preferences, and emotions.

School-age children are most commonly the subjects of the studies. There is a tendency for younger children to be studied more frequently in research on cognitive development than in research on personality and social development.

This reveals a dual lack of emphasis and of research with adolescents and young adults.

There are a few bright spots, however, that point to a renewed concern about scientific understanding of this area, too, of human behavior. The concern by Piaget (1948) for the moral development of the child, has brought respectability, and even some prestige, to this area of study, although Piaget was primarily concerned with changes over time in the child's
attitudes toward rules, justice, and ethical behavior. Many more recent textbooks on development (Thompson, 1962; Horrocks, 1969; Mussen, Conger, and Kagan, 1969; Singer and Singer, 1969) have included meaningful discussions of values, even moral-ethical values in some very specific kinds of situations reported in the literature.

At the graduate level, even Baldwin (1968) mentions the "ought forces" of Heider's theoretical formulations, though his terminology and his analysis seem to "put down" this emphasis as unscientific.

The study of moral-ethical values was actually recently legitimated by three scholarly works. Aronfreed (1968) showed the power of emotional learning to provide a basis for attitudes and values. He went a step further, even, and included a previously "religious" concept in the title of his book, Conduct and Conscience. Hoffman (1970), in a powerful accumulation of earlier research and application to dynamics of the home, has tied moral development into the very center of the socialization process. Horrocks and Jackson (1972) provide a keen insight into the place of values in the developmental process, from the individual and the cultural viewpoint.

It can certainly be expected that future research will begin to open up the area of moral development to greater understanding.
Definition of Type of Values Considered

As noted previously, the study of values tends to cover a very broad area. Thompson (1962) has shown that there are two different kinds of personal values that children need to develop in order to live harmoniously in a given society: values that are related to the relative desirability of different goal-objects (books, drama, churches, schools, art, and the like), and values that pertain to the relative desirability, or undesirability, of fairly stable patterns of behavior (going to church, being honest, supporting charities, contributing to the arts, supporting the government, and the like). The research herein reported deals with the second kind of values.

The base for this kind of values is set (Horrocks and Jackson, 1972) in both the individual and the culture:

...an individual value system is not wholly idiosyncratic. It grows out of learning and experience occurring within a given culture, and to that extent is based to a large degree upon society's definitions of morality. In the last analysis, morals and morality are simply a given culture's criteria for judging behavior styles or modes of conduct of others. An individual's moral-type judgment at any point in time represents a culture-based, as well as a personality-based, interpretation.

Values and the Generation Gap

Since 1968, it has become almost a necessity to write a book, or at least an article, about the "generation gap," to prove that you are "with it" in relation to the rapid
change in values. Such an onus has produced a plethora of books (Reich, 1970; Mead, 1970; Roszak, 1969; Slater, 1970; and Klein, 1969) on the subject—good, bad, but seldom indifferent.

Goethals and Klos (1970) show indirectly, using first-person accounts, that many of the conflicts of youth grow out of reactions to parents. Coleman (1961) has shown that more adolescents find it harder to risk parental disapproval than to break with their best friend over the issue of joining a club, indicating that adolescents are members of both the adolescent subculture, and are also tied to the adult one. Slater (1970) proposes that the basic conflict here grows out of three human desires that are frustrated by American culture's emphasis upon opposing needs:

1. The desire for community—the need to compete;
2. The desire for engagement—the need to be uninvolved;
3. The desire for dependence—the need to be independent.

Margaret Mead (1970) has proposed that there are three kinds of culture, and that the kind of culture we are living in precipitates conflict:

The distinctions I am making among three different kinds of culture—postfigurative, in which children learn primarily from their forebears, configurative, in which both children and adults learn from their peers, and prefigurative, in which adults learn also from their children—are a reflection of the period in which we live. Primitive societies and small religious and ideological enclaves are primarily postfigurative, deriving authority from the
past. Great civilizations, which necessarily have developed techniques for incorporating change, characteristically make use of some form of configurative learning from peers, playmates, fellow students, and fellow apprentices. We are now entering a period, new in history, in which the young are taking on new authority in their configurative apprehension of the still unknown future.

Although her elaboration of this concept is very lengthy, it is included here for its poignancy and effect in context of this concept.

When the first atom bomb was exploded at the end of World War II, only a few individuals realized that all humanity was entering a new age. And to this day the majority of those over twenty-five have failed to grasp emotionally, however well they may grasp intellectually, the difference between any war in which, no matter how terrible the casualties, mankind will survive, and one in which there will be no survivors. They continue to think that a war, fought with more lethal weapons, would just be a worse war; they still do not grasp the implications of scientific weapons of extinction. Even scientists, when they form committees, are apt to have as their goal not the total abolition of war, but the prevention of the particular kinds of warfare for which they themselves feel an uncomfortable special responsibility—such as the use of pesticides in Vietnam.

In this sense, then, of having moved into a present for which none of us was prepared by our understanding of the past, our interpretations of ongoing experience or our expectations about the future, all of us who grew up before World War II are pioneers, immigrants in time who have left behind our familiar worlds to live in a new age under conditions that are different from any we have known. Our thinking still binds us to the past—to the world as it existed in our childhood and youth. Born and bred before the electronic revolution, most of us do not realize what it means.

We still hold the seats of power and command the resources and the skills necessary to keep order and organize the kinds of societies we know about. We control the educational systems, the apprenticeship systems, the career ladders up which the young must climb, step by step. The elders in the advanced countries control the resources needed by the young and less advanced countries for their
development. Nevertheless, we have passed the point of no return. We are committed to life in an unfamiliar setting; we are making do with what we know. We are building makeshift dwellings in old patterns with new and better understood materials.

The young generation, however, the articulate young rebels all around the world who are lashing out against the controls to which they are subjected, are like the first generation born into a new country. They are at home in this time. Satellites are familiar in their skies. They have never known a time when war did not threaten annihilation. Those who use computers do not anthropomorphize them; they know that they are programmed by human beings. When they are given the facts, they can understand immediately that continued pollution of the air and water and soil will soon make the planet uninhabitable and that it will be impossible to feed an indefinitely expanding world population. They can see that control of conception is feasible and necessary. As members of one species in an underdeveloped world community, they recognize that invidious distinctions based on race and caste are anachronisms. They insist on the vital necessity of some form of world order.

They live in a world in which events are presented to them in all their complex immediacy; they are no longer bound by the simplified linear sequences dictated by the printed word. In their eyes the killing of an enemy is not qualitatively different from the murder of a neighbor. They cannot reconcile our efforts to save our own children by every known means with our readiness to destroy the children of others with napalm. Old distinctions between peacetime and wartime, friend and foe, "my" group and "theirs"--the outsiders, the aliens--have lost their meaning. They know that the people of one nation alone cannot save their own children; each holds the responsibility for the others' children.

Although I have said they know these things, perhaps I should say that this is how they feel. Like the first generation born in a new country, they listen only half-comprehendingly to their parents' talk about the past. For as the children of pioneers had no access to the landscape's memories of which could still move their parents to tears, the young today cannot share their parents' responses to events that deeply moved them in the past. But this is not all that separates the young from their elders.
Watching, they can see that their elders are groping, that they are managing clumsily and often unsuccessfully the tasks imposed on them by the new conditions. They have no firsthand knowledge of the way their parents lived far across the seas, of how differently wood responded to tools, or land to hoe. They see that their elders are using means that are inappropriate, that their performance is poor, and the outcome very uncertain. The young do not know what must be done, but they feel that there must be a better way.

What is to be done about this gap? Solutions range from rhetoric (Reich, 1970; Roszak, 1969) to communes (Slater, 1970), and on to a "psychological moratorium" for youth to resolve their tensions, a solution proposed by Muus (1968), who professes to see practical moratoriums already developing in the Peace Corps and the hippie society. Madison (1969) indicates that there is a transition period which can be characterized as "the adult transition" (approximate age 18-25) when erosion of the initial organization of values makes way for integration and reintegration of old and new experiences. Rappoport (1972) indicates both the problem of the "generation gap" and possible avenues for reducing tension:

Adolescent rebellion is complicated because it can take the traditional form of a struggle for power, or a new form involving rejection of values underlying adult power. And rebellion in either form can coexist in various ways with conformity. However, despite the absence of "hard" data, it is the opinion of most experts that growing dissatisfaction with adult society can be met by further opening society to the needs and values of youth, and by eliminating the more arbitrary restrictions placed upon them. (Italics not in original material.)
Values and the Adolescent Period

All people are products of the social environment in which they live. This social environment produces the values by which we live, in interaction with the individual's responses to this subculture.

Most of us spend our social lives in interaction with people who are like us in important ways. We grow up in neighborhoods which are clusters of persons with jobs of roughly similar status or prestige, with similar educational histories, and therefore with shared ways of perceiving, thinking and behaving. We usually go to neighborhood schools through elementary and high school and so interact outside the family with people much like ourselves. Our parents and our friends' parents usually have about the same amount of money to spend on goods and services and often spend that money in the same way. In other words, we grow up in a certain subculture. And we learn--internalize--the values of these subcultures as children and adolescents. (Developmental Psychology Today, 1971)

Erikson (1968) outlines the interactive aspect of this encounter between the individual and society:

As technological advances put more and more time between early school life and the young person's final access to specialized work, the stage of adolescing becomes an even more marked and conscious period and, as it has always been in some cultures in some periods, almost a way of life between childhood and adulthood. Thus in the later school years young people, beset with the physiological revolution of their genital maturation and the uncertainty of the adult roles ahead, seem much concerned with faddish attempts at establishing an adolescent subculture with what looks like a final rather than a transitory or, in fact, initial identity formation.
The following description of the adolescent period (Mussen, Conger, and Kagan, 1969) shows the kind of choice necessities that confront the adolescent:

Probably at no time in his life is the average individual more likely to be concerned about the problem of moral values and standards than during adolescence. There appears to be a number of reasons for this heightened concern. For one thing, the realistic demands which the adolescent faces are changing, and this fact in itself requires a reappraisal of his value system. The average younger child lives in a world which, at least relatively, is more homogeneous, more immediate, and more limited than that of the adolescent. As a result, he faces fewer demands for making moral choices. Living according to a fairly circumscribed set of rules, established for the most part by parents, he and his peers learn to find satisfaction of their needs from day to day within this context. Granted, the child must learn to establish internal controls as a necessary part of the socialization process. He cannot do what he wants whenever he wants to do it. And, certainly, as we shall see, controls are related to the problem of values. But establishing controls is not synonymous with learning to make value decisions, often under ambiguous circumstances.

In contrast with the younger child's position, the adolescent must make choices. He himself is changing, and this change requires a rethinking of former childhood values, which may have been adopted over time with little conscious intent. For example, increases in sexual drive may confront the adolescent with a whole new set of value choices for which his childhood experiences have provided little preparation. Similarly, in his increased sophistication, the adolescent can no longer adopt without question the social or political beliefs of his parents in the happy conviction that solely because his parents have particular beliefs, all right-thinking persons must necessarily share them.

Not only is the adolescent himself changing—physiologically; socially, and psychologically—he is also confronted with an increasingly diverse world in which the opportunities and the necessity for choice are multiplied. He finds, for example, that there are many ways to live his life and that he must make choices.
That all of the adolescent's choices are not necessarily ideal is shown by Horrocks (1969):

The adolescent as a person tends to be highly idealistic. He is likely to adopt a high standard of values and to think about them a great deal. Unfortunately, he is immature and inexperienced and his values may be exceedingly unrealistic.

The moral-ethical aspect of the developmental tasks of the adolescent period are clearly highlighted by Havighurst (1953):

(1) achievement of new and more mature relations with age-mates of both sexes
(2) achievement of a socially approved masculine or feminine social role
(3) acceptance of one's physique and the effective use of the body
(4) achievement of emotional independence of parents and other adults
(5) achievement of the assurance of economic independence in the sense of feeling that one could make one's own living if necessary
(6) selection and preparation for an occupation
(7) preparation for marriage and family life
(8) development of intellectual skills and concepts necessary for civic competence
(9) the desiring and achieving of socially responsible behavior
(10) acquisition of a set of values and an ethical system as a guide to behavior.

The effect of values upon behavior and choices is described by Thompson (1962) in the following manner:

Theoretically, values play an important role in determining what activities and goal-objects an individual will seek, and what behavior he will display during these goal-oriented acts... values make an individual perceptually sensitive, or receptive, toward valued stimuli; and defensive, or unreceptive, toward threatening or in other ways personally unacceptable stimuli. This process of "value resonance" has the disadvantage of "blinding" an individual with respect to some events, but has the advantage of enabling the individual to maintain his values under difficult personal-social conditions.
Values help to motivate and guide a child's sequences of behavior. Well established value-systems also tend to increase the child's feelings of security. They help the child to differentiate desirable from undesirable patterns of behavior, and to seek certain object-goals to the neglect of others. Values, like low-level motor habits, enable children to handle in almost automatic fashion many recurrent decisions. This saving in psychological energy permits them to devote a greater proportion of their time to more abstract problems. Clearly differentiated personal values also promote children's feelings of security in the choice of companions and friends.

The tie between the characteristics of the adolescent period, the operation of values, and choice is clearly shown in a series of quotations from Horrocks and Jackson (1972):

To understand one of the most puzzling and exasperating aspects of the adolescent period—their insurgence, unreasonableness, rebellion, contrariness, espousal of peculiar (to adults) causes and activities— one must realize that they have attained a period of life characterized by hypothesized idealism. During this period of idealism adolescents develop hypotheses and thoughts, and postulate ideas by interrelating their criteria in an attempt to achieve their ideals. With additional refinement, modification, deletion, and elaboration of criteria for self-structures, the individual is able to relate his modes of conduct toward achieving his ideals. He develops operationalized means (behavior) by which he strives to exemplify his ideals through his behavior. Thus, values determine standards for the means (his behavior styles or modes of conduct) and for ends (ideals or end states of existence). Values are conceptual criteria; rules are behavior-event applications.

Values consist of rules and standards and must be both operationalized and measurable: operationalized in the sense of becoming capable of being achieved through conduct and behavior; measurable in terms of directional attempts at achieving goals or ideals.
A value or set of values assumes a guidance function when an action decision must be made. Operationally, a value is a meaning representing the conceptualization and elaboration of a rule.

Values are relational, interpretive, evaluational schema processed from an individual's past experiences and are part of the cognitive-affective information system serving to formulate his rules for decision making.

What are the values chosen by a majority of the youth in the American subculture today? A summary of today's youth's values is given by Mussen, Conger, and Kagan (1969) in the following elaboration:

Adolescents currently appear to place a relatively high value on open and meaningful interpersonal relationships . . . they tend to view sexual relationships without love as far less acceptable morally than those in which love is present. As a group, they seem genuinely opposed to promiscuity, not only in principle, but for the most part in behavior.

In contrast, while a majority of adolescents would probably acknowledge in principle that cheating in school was wrong, this conviction does not appear to be strongly held for a variety of reasons (and rationalizations). It is frequently argued that our system of education, with its large classes, impersonality, and machine-scoring of standardized tests, is itself essentially false and does not truly measure the individual's knowledge or ability . . .

Pressure for grades is viewed as a doubtful value by many students, although they see themselves as yielding to it in order to advance, to get into college, to obtain a job, or simply, as one student phrased it, "to stay on the treadmill."

What values do adolescents currently hold? As stated above, they place a relatively strong emphasis on being natural, open, and honest in relations with peers of both sexes. They decry "phoniness," as adolescents have traditionally done, but probably with even more vigor.
... appear to have more concern with issues such as discrimination and civil rights than their parents did. In their attitudes they seem to be reflecting flexibility, tolerance, and lack of prejudice as much as, or more than, crusading zeal.

Today's adolescents do not appear to be a generation of hero-worshipers.

Adolescents speak frequently of their opposition to "materialistic values," but paradoxically they seem to accept readily this generation's relative affluence, which is by all odds the greatest in history. It is estimated that allowances and part-time and summer jobs put twelve billion dollars annually in the pockets of today's adolescents, of whom more than 60 percent own records, transistor radios, record players, and encyclopedias.

While a number of relatively small subgroups of today's adolescents are either strong activists, dedicating their efforts to causes with which they are deeply concerned, or are "social dropouts," disillusioned with what they view as the inability of an immoral, unjust, and impersonal society to change, most adolescents are far more docile. They go their own way with values that are in many respects admirable, troubled by some aspects of their society (pressure, war, the draft, civil rights, economic injustice), but largely uninterested in "making waves" and generally fairly satisfied with themselves and with their way of life.

It is evident that young people in the adolescent period are faced with the task of finding values with which they can live. Whether they are the same values as those of previous generations is a valid question.

Values and the Socialization Process

The process of socialization must be considered, in general terms, in order to understand individual value formation, and some of the major developmental variables which may be valuable in describing differential value choices.
The intensely vital area of socialization relating to the dynamics of child-rearing will be covered separately in a later section. There is no effort, either, to cover all possible developmental variables that grow out of the socialization process, but only the process itself and in very brief fashion, a few of the pertinent factors involved in that process.

Piaget (1967) notes that "The first moral feelings ensue from the unilateral respect of the young child for his parents or other adults and how this respect leads to the formation of a morality of obedience or heteronomy." The process of constructing a personal value system out of this interaction is elaborated further in the same work by Piaget in this manner:

Personality formation begins in middle to late childhood (eight to twelve years) with the autonomous organization of rules and values, and the affirmation of will with respect to the regulation and hierarchical organization of moral tendencies. But there is more to the person than these factors alone. These factors are integrated with the self into a unique system to which all the separate parts are subordinated. There is then a "personal" system in the dual sense that it is peculiar to a given individual and implies autonomous coordination. Now this personal system cannot be constructed prior to adolescence, because it presupposes the formal thought and reflexive constructions . . .

In yet another area of value system construction, the socialization process is described in very practical terms by Coopersmith (1967):
A second factor contributing to our self-esteem is our history of successes and the status and position we hold in the world. Our successes generally bring us recognition and are thereby related to our status in the community. They form the basis in reality for self-esteem and are measured by the material manifestations of success and by indications of social approval. These indices of success and approval will not necessarily be interpreted equally favorably by all persons. It is by living up to aspirations in areas that he regards as personally significant that the individual achieves high self-esteem. Thus experiences are interpreted and modified in accord with the individual's values and aspirations. Success and power and attention are not directly and immediately perceived but are filtered through and perceived in the light of personal goals and values.

Three developmental variables very prominent in recent research are birth order, father-absence, and sex differences. Gilmore and Zigler (1964) found a pertinent relationship between birth order and need for social reinforcers, with firstborns evidencing less need for social reinforcers. Sampson and Hancock (1967) found that firstborns receive more motivation from inner needs for autonomy and achievement. MacDonald (1969) found that firstborns were more conforming in keeping appointments, and concluded that they were more socialized and therefore more likely to do what was expected of them. Birth order, then, seems to have some bearing, through the socialization process, upon value formation and conforming behavior.

A number of researchers have reviewed and studied the effect of father-absence on value formation. Biller (1970) presents a very thorough review of this area of developmental research, concluding that the timing and length of
father absence, sociocultural milieu, relative availability of surrogate models, and individual differences in maternal behavior are all factors which must be taken into account in order to understand the effect of father absence on the developing male child. Santrock (1970a) found that father-absent males with older brothers were significantly more masculine than father-absent boys with older female siblings, and that father-absent boys with a father substitute were significantly less dependent than father-absent boys with no father substitute. Mischel (1961) showed a significant relationship between father absence and the ability to delay gratification, with father-absent younger children opting for more immediate rewards. Blanchard and Biller (1971) found that early father-absent boys were generally underachievers, that the late father-absent and low father-present boys usually functioned somewhat below grade level, and the high father-present group performed consistently above grade level. Santrock (1970b) concluded that early father-absence contributes more to detrimental personality characteristics than later father-absence, inferring that loss of the father during the first two years of life serves as a negative force in the necessary development of basic trust. The hypothesis was also put forward in this article that the mother may be unable to relate effectively to the infant child without the presence of the child's father, producing shame, guilt, inferiority and distrust.
Sex differences have long been noted in the literature. The definitive work in this area is the book edited by Mac-coby (1966) in which various contributors report sex differences in various areas of personality and human behavior. An interaction between differences in sex hormones and differential parental attitudes toward the different-sex child can account for a great deal of difference in this area. Gordon (1963) reports consistent sex differences in many studies on interpersonal values in American samples. That this is in part a cultural phenomena can be seen in other studies (Garsee and Glixman, 1967; Barry, Bacon, and Child, 1957), which have shown that different cultural configurations contribute to greater or lesser sex differences on personality variables, including value choices. Kohlberg (1964) has also talked about sex differences in morality, showing that many variables of the socialization process affect moral-ethical choices. D'Andrade (1966) notes that the "cross-cultural mode is that males are more sexually active, more dominant, more deferred to, more aggressive, less responsible, less nurturant, and less emotionally expressive than females."

In summary, the socialization process produces developmental differences which can be conceptualized as variables which become influential in determining many personality choices, especially those involved with values.
Values and Internalization

One productive area of theory construction and testing, with important implications for an understanding of value choices, is that which relates to the process by which an individual internalizes the values of his dominant social environment. Erikson (1962) has given a now-popular name to this process in the following explanation:

I have called the major crisis of adolescence the identity crisis; it occurs in that period of life cycle when each youth must forge for himself some central perspective and direction, some working unity, out of the effective remnants of his childhood and the hopes of his anticipated adulthood; he must detect some meaningful resemblance between what he has come to see in himself and what his sharpened awareness tells him others judge and expect him to be.

In another theory-explanation, Gewirtz and Stingle (1968) posit a dependence-attachment relationship to a model who reinforces certain behavior as a part of, or a partial result of, the identification process by which a person is said to acquire the motives, values, and ideals of another, or others. They feel, however, that a discriminated-operant learning model can account for this generalized imitation-learning without recourse to the more psychoanalytic theories. Bronfenbrenner (1960), on the other hand, feels that identification is invariably based on an emotional tie with the parent. For him, the nature or quality of this tie may be one of fear of losing the parent, or of fear of the parent as an aggressor. The former type Bronfenbrenner refers to as anaclitic identification, and to the later as aggres-
sive identification. Studies building on the identification theories include Waterman's (1972) finding showing correlation between the components of psychosocial development described by Erikson (Identity, Intimacy, and Autonomy) and four measures of the expectations of college held by entering students. Successful psychosocial development is related to high expectations concerning the faculty, the administration, the students, and the major field. Autonomy, however, was related negatively to anticipated satisfaction.

It may be pertinent at this point for the writer to interject the observation of a friend with psychiatric training and experience who has observed the college where the writer is currently employed: it is his contention that the emotional maturity level of the students is decidedly retarded. It may be difficult to determine whether this means they have chosen new values for themselves in opposition to their parents, or whether they are more inclined to continue to "parrot" the value-statements and moral beliefs of their parents, without thinking.

Another kind of theory deals with imitative behavior, or modeling. The basic goal states, or needs of the child for mastery over the environment and the need for love and affection, serve as the motivating force. The mechanics of the process are described in this way by Mussen, Conger, and Kagan (1970):

1. The child perceives that the parent possesses goals and satisfactions.
2. The child wishes to possess parents' characteristics in order to obtain those possessions.

3. This relationship is reinforced each time the child perceives, or is told, that he is similar to the parent.

4. The child must not only perceive similarity, but must experience some of the desired, affective goal states of the parent.

Bandura, Ross, and Ross (1963) show that the distribution of rewarding power within the family constellation may be highly influential in determining which adult model the child will identify with, and whose values he will internalize. A study by Stein (1967) shows that a yielding model increases yielding in a temptation setting, but that a resisting model does not necessarily increase resistance by the subject. A number of other researchers (Hicks, 1965; Slaby and Parke, 1971; and Bell, 1970), working from this theoretical base, have shown, respectively, that a peer-group model has the most immediate effect upon children's aggressive responses while an adult model had the most lasting effect; that differential reward and punishment of a model affects elementary school children differently depending upon type of consequence, sex of the child, and affective responses of the model; and that different areas of role modelship (educational, occupational, and personal) and interaction are not highly related, nor are the types of
role-model relations (similarity, imitation, assimilation) any more highly related. This is an indication of the complexity of both the process and number of variables in operation in internalization of values.

Bandura and Associates have published a large number of research-oriented articles (Bandura and MacDonald, 1963; Bandura and Perloff, 1967; Bandura and Walters, 1959; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Bandura and Whalen, 1966) investigating the dynamics of the relationship between model and observer, and their implications for internalization of observed values. Hoffman analyzes the research in this way:

The most clear-cut conclusion to emerge from our analysis of the experimental findings on imitative modeling is that the direct observation of a model who yields to temptation and deviates from a social norm or prohibition has a disinhibiting effect on the observer whether the model is rewarded or not . . . Stated differently, there is far more evidence that the observation of models is capable of undermining the effects of the child's past socialization in impulse and self-denial than that it is an effective means of furthering these aspects of moral development. In brief, it appears that models can more readily reduce than increase the child's inhibition of impulse expression.

Although the proponents of neither theoretical base are ready to admit that their formulations cannot explain all internalization of values, a picture begins to emerge which may eventually mean that those who identify with identification have seized on internalization of positive values and those who identify with modeling behavior have unknowingly seized on the process for the internalization of negative values. It is not impossible, of course, that a
redefinition of terms could bridge the gap between the two, or that continued research could show the final picture. There is still a lot to be discovered about the internalization of values, before general laws about the interaction of all variables can be stated with confidence and authority.

Values and Child-Rearing

The intricacies of the dynamic interactions between the individuals in the limited and limiting environment of the home, with the attending implications for development, are poetically described by Erikson (1962) as:

The general problem of man's exploitability in childhood, which makes him the victim not only of overt cruelty, but also of all kinds of covert emotional relief, of devious vengefulness, or sensual self-indulgence, and of sly righteousness—all on the part of those on whom he is physically and morally dependent. Some day, maybe, there will exist a well-informed, well-considered, and yet fervent public conviction that the most deadly of all possible sins is the mutilation of a child's spirit; for such mutilation undercuts the life principle of trust, without which every human act, may it feel ever so good and seem ever so right, is prone to perversion by destructive forms of conscientiousness.

Toman (1969) builds up an understanding of the complexities of the child-rearing situation by mentioning the "sixty-four types of conflict between children and their parents." In describing the necessary environment for a therapeutic home for the rehabilitation of aggressive children, Redl and Wineman (1952) point out both the necessary aspects of a healthy home environment and the potential damage to the developing child when these are missing—relaxing
routines, protection from fear, tax-free love and gratification grants, freedom to escape, and emergency help.

Research at some of the large universities began after World War II to emphasize understanding of the variables which affect child-rearing and development. Havighurst and Davis (1969) compared the Chicago and Harvard studies of social class differences in child-rearing, finding some major disagreement between them, seeming to point to difficulties in sampling and interviewing techniques, as well as significant social class changes between the time of the two studies. Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) wrote a definitive work, reviewing all the research done on different patterns of child-rearing, with an emphasis upon the difference in child-rearing practices between different social class and ethnic groups. Erikson (1963) drew a realistic caricature of the moralistic, domineering mother who makes pathogenic demands on her children:

1. She is the unquestioned authority in matters of mores and morals in the home and community, but is also vain in her appearance, egotistical in her demands, and infantile in her emotions;

2. In situations where this discrepancy diminishes the respect of her children, she blames them, and never herself;
3. She shows determined hostility to any expression of the most naive forms of sensual and sexual pleasure by her children and views sexual demands by her husband as a bore, but is unwilling to sacrifice youthful dresses, exhibitionism, and other forms of sexual competition, as well as sexual display in books, art, and gossip;

4. She teaches self-restraint and self-control, but cannot manage her own caloric intake;

5. She expects her children to be hard on themselves, but is hypochondriacally concerned with her own well-being;

6. She stands for the superior values of tradition, yet she herself does not want to become "old."

Dobson (1971) advises parents to "avoid extremes in control and love. An awareness of, and a search for, the variables which are effective in child rearing has become a major part of developmental research.

A cross-cultural study comparing various types of families (nuclear, extended), marriages (monogamous, polygynous) and strength of socialization was carried out by Whiting (1959), who concluded that maximization of rivalry between father and child and early socialization combine to
produce the strong internalization of moral values and a readiness to accept blame.

Relationships between dimensions of child-rearing practices and personality development have proliferated. Epstein and Liverant (1963) found parental warmth, awareness, and salience and power contribute toward the development of parent-child identification. Eron, Walder, Toigo, and Lefkowitz (1963) found that punishment for aggression and social class as determined by father's occupation are both important factors in a child's aggression as rated by peers in school, with increased punishment resulting in increased aggression. Burton, Maccoby, and Allinsmith (1961) studied the antecedents of resistance to temptation in four-year olds, searching for antecedents in techniques of punishment, parental consistency, timing of punishment, and warmth or identity of disciplining agent. Results were inconclusive, although a positive relationship between activity level and resistance to temptation was found. Studying nursery school children, Hatfield, Ferguson, and Alpert (1967) investigated the interrelation between two factors in maternal care, involvement versus laissez-faire and love versus hostility. They found that the maternal "rejection" quadrant (reflecting a combination of hostile and laissez-faire mother behavior) was associated with the more subdued, internalized and socialized forms of aggression and restless activity in girls. A similar study by Heilbrun, Harrell, and Gillard (1967) looked at children reared in the
different homes occasioned by all possible combinations of high/low control and high/low nurturance:

1. High control and high nurturance (overprotected);
2. High control and low nurturance (rejected);
3. Low control and high nurturance (accepted);
4. Low control and low nurturance (ignored).

They found that rejected children expect unfavorable outcomes to their actions, show avoidance--withdrawal tendencies, experience heightened motivational sensitivity to social reinforcement, and demonstrate greater cognitive disruption to negative social reinforcement.

Peck and Havighurst (1960) felt that moral character was primarily developed in the first ten years of life, and that the family was crucial in character development. Their conclusions may be summarized thus:

1. Amoral individuals come from chaotic families with no love or discipline;
2. Parental permissiveness leads to expedient child behavior;
3. Autocratic and severe punishment produces conforming behavior on the part of the child.

Baumrind (1966) adds to this list:

1. Close supervision, high demands, and extreme authority provoke rebelliousness in children, particularly at adolescence;
2. firm parental control generates passivity and dependence, and inhibits creative thrust;
3. parental restrictiveness decreases normal self-assertiveness and buoyance.

She adds two other pertinent observations: boys and girls react differentially to similar patterns of child rearing; and controlling parents act out of fear of the loss of control, almost compulsively.

Frenkel-Brunswick (1949) studied intolerance of ambiguity and simplicity-complexity. He defined the former as a "tendency toward black-white solutions, oversimplified dichotomizing," and pointed to child-rearing practices as an antecedent cause. He concluded that the trait is generally found to a high degree in persons who have been reared with strict, unexplained discipline and who have accordingly developed strongly ambivalent feelings toward parents. Cooper-smith (1967) studied the antecedents of self-esteem and notes that:

Families of children with high self-esteem not only establish the closest and most extensive set of rules, but are also the most zealous in enforcing them. This establishes the authority of the parent, defines the environment, and provides standards by which the child can judge his competence and progress. Parental treatment within these limits is noncoercive and recognizes the rights and opinions of the child. His views are sought, his opinions are respected, and concessions are granted to him if differences exist.

He shows, further, that to determine policies without consulting the child, to refuse to tolerate deviant opinions,
and to resolve differences by dictum and by force contribute to low self-esteem in the child.

Busse (1969) notes that severe punishment suppresses flexible thinking, and that overprotective, overcontrolling maternal behavior limits flexible thinking. Nakamura and Rogers (1969) showed that, even in nursery children, parental expectation for assertive autonomy accounted for the level of autonomy more than did practical autonomy. A study of the relationship between honesty and identification with parents (Mussen, Harris, Rutherford, and Keasey, 1970) found that girls who were honest and altruistic had warm, intimate interactions with their mothers. Boys' honesty was negatively correlated with gratifying relationships with parents, but altruism was associated with good personal ego strength.

Schaefer (1965) points out the validity of analyzing children's perceptions of parental child-rearing behaviors under three orthogonal dimensions—acceptance versus rejection, psychological autonomy versus psychological control, and firm control versus lax control. Burger and Armentrout (1971) found, in fifth and sixth graders' reports about parental child-rearing behavior that for females, the factors for mothers and fathers were nearly identical. For males, the same three factors were obtained, but they emerged in different order in that the first two factors for males' mothers, the acceptance and autonomy factors, appeared in reversed order for males' fathers. In a comprehensive
monograph researching current patterns of parental authority, Baumrind (1971) identified Authoritarian, Authoritative, Authoritative-Nonconforming, and Nonconforming patterns of parental authority. She also identifies the emergence of a new kind of parent, referred to as Harmonious, who were non-conforming, provided a very enriched environment, and encouraged independence.

Aronfreed (1968) emphasizes the two opposite forms of discipline: induction includes less directly punitive forms of discipline, while sensitization involves direct physical and verbal attack. The former method induces more internalized monitors of the child's anxiety, and of its instrumental resources for reduction of anxiety, in response to a transgression. Sensitization prepares children to anticipate and control the potential punitive reactions of others, but does not easily permit their anxiety, or the anxiety-reducing value of their suppression and reactions to transgression, to become independent of external sources of control.

Hoffman (1970) describes what the writer perceives to be the typical child-rearing methods utilized in a majority of religious homes, in the following terms:

Power assertion includes physical punishment, deprivation of material objects or privileges, the direct applications of force, or the threat of any of these. The term "power assertion" is used to highlight the fact that in using these techniques the parent seeks to control the child by capitalizing on his physical power or control over material resources. Rather than rely on the child's inner resources (e.g., guilt, shame,
dependency, love, or respect) or provide him with information necessary for development of such resources, the parent punishes the child physically or materially, or relies on his fear of punishment.

Nonpower-assertive techniques are more varied, especially in the degree to which love withdrawal either predominates or is a minor part of a technique focused primarily on the consequences of the child's behavior. We define love-withdrawal techniques as those in which the parent simply gives direct but non-physical expression to his anger or disapproval of the child for engaging in some undesirable behavior. Examples are ignoring the child, turning one's back on him, refusing to speak or listen to him, explicitly stating a dislike for the child, and isolating or threatening to leave him. Like power assertion, love withdrawal has a highly punitive quality. Although it poses no immediate physical or material threat to the child, it may be more devastating emotionally than power assertion because it poses the ultimate threat of abandonment or separation. Whereas power assertion ordinarily consists of discrete aversive acts that are quickly over and done with, love withdrawal is typically more prolonged—lasting minutes, hours, or even days—and its duration may be variable and unpredictable.

Hoffman's (1970) description of the effects of the different types of parental discipline are exceedingly pertinent to this research:

Techniques which are predominantly power assertive are least effective in promoting development of moral standards and internalization of controls because they elicit intense hostility in the child and simultaneously provide him with a model for expressing that hostility outwardly as well as a relatively legitimate object against which to express it.

Love withdrawal stands midway between the other two techniques in the attributes that promote internalization... A characteristic of love withdrawal techniques is to
separate the parent from the child, thus reduc­
ing or stopping communication between them.
As a result, they are less effective than in­
ductions because they do not include the cog­
nitive material needed to heighten the child's
awareness of wrongdoing and facilitate his
learning to generalize accurately to other
relevant situations; or, if cognitive material
is included, the anxiety aroused disrupts com­
prehension of the message. Finally, these
techniques fail to capitalize on the child's
capacity for empathy.

Although the picture is not too clear or complete, the
preceding review of some of the literature on child-rearing
is sufficient to indicate that a child's moral choices have
to be seen in relation to the dynamics in the home envirom­
ment; that affirmation of, or rebellion against, the values
of the parents, must be explained in terms of many vari­
ables made operative through previous association with the
parents.

Values and Cognitive Development

A number of meaningful efforts have been made to re­
late conceptual development in progressively complex cog­
nitive stages to differences in moral judgment. Peck and
Havighurst (1960) posited five different levels of morality
that corresponded roughly to stages of personality develop­
ment.

1. Amoral—no internalized values (infancy)
2. Expedient—selfish, seeking comfort (early
   childhood)
3. Conforming—use of specific rules and par­
tially-developed conscience (later childhood)
4. Irrational—Conscientious—internalized, but unrealistic, individualistic responses (adolescence)

5. Rational Altruistic—socially relevant, realistic, unselfish (adulthood)

These authors then related six personality aspects of character development to these stages. Maturity related positively with moral stability, ego strength, superego strength, spontaneity, and friendliness; immaturity that grew out of severe discipline related negatively to good character development. This effort to tie development to conceptual development and interpersonal dynamics in the social environment had some possibilities for diagnosis and understanding adolescent pathology, but seemed to offer too little explanation for normal development to capture the imagination of researchers. It may be, also, that the term "character" has connotations too judgmental for most researchers to deal with.

A lengthy treatise by Piaget (1966) has contributed greatly to understanding the cognitive changes that affect moral choices. The development of moral judgment is matched to the other well-developed stages in Piaget's theory of cognitive development. Aronfreed (1968) notes that all of these age-correlated changes in the expression of conscience might be described as a movement from an external to a more internalized orientation. For Piaget there were substantial individual differences in the timing and extent of the
changes, even among children in his relatively homogeneous sample. Some of the principles of Piaget's ideas about moral development are as follows:

1. Children are **first** characterized by moral egocentricity, in which physical or emotional pain is the only reason for compliance.

2. There follows a stage of moral heteronomy, when children obey rules as if they were sacred, and they felt that immanent justice (built into nature itself) would punish wrong-doers.

3. Later, children reach a stage of moral cooperation, where the rules have elasticity, and function as agreed upon by the mutual consent of the group. Punishment in this stage is retributive, fitting the misdeed by reciprocity or expiation.

4. Finally, children reach the stage of moral autonomy, where motives are considered in judgment more than the consequences of a misdeed. In this stage, justice is distributive, and eventually is tempered with equity.

Piaget talks about the opposition of two moralities which create continuing disequilibrium in the child—the morality of authority, duty and obedience and then again, the
morality of mutual respect. The path from the former to the latter takes place, for Piaget, on a developmental continuum that hopefully leads the individual to a domain of justice characterized by equality and reciprocity.

Some research seems to indicate that there are other variables which tend to affect moral development, and the stage concept certainly has its detractors. Grinder (1964) feels, after research, that behavior may be mediated by cues that are primarily affective, rather than verbal or cognitive. He also indicates his belief that conceptual schemata necessary for mature moral judgment does not guarantee significant alteration of habits previously established by reinforcement contingencies. A study by Harris (1970) showed, in a study with boys 9 1/2 to 11 1/2 years of age, that maturity on moral values was positively related to social class on all five subtests, to white race on two of the five subtests, and also to vocabulary skills. This finding seems to suggest strongly that factors other than age have a bearing on the development of moral attitudes and moral maturity. Using an adult sample, Weisbroth (1970) found no sex differences in moral judgment, but did find that identification with both parents is significantly related to high moral judgment in males, while identification with the father is significantly related to high moral judgment in females. Again, the dynamics of socialization seem to be crucial in the development of moral judgment.
Kohlberg (1963; 1968) holds to the stage concept of moral development but does indicate that the pace may be slower in some cultures than in others, and that, in fact, those in some cultures may never reach the highest stage. For Kohlberg, there are three levels of moral development, with two types in each level:

1. Pre-Moral level
   Type 1: Punishment and obedience orientation
   Type 2: Naive instrumental hedonism

2. Morality of Conventional Role-Conformity
   Type 3: Morality of gaining approval of others
   Type 4: Morality maintained by authority

3. Morality of Self-Accepted Principles
   Type 5: Contractual, mutual, democratic law
   Type 6: Individual conscience maintains principles of morality providing equality for all.

Kohlberg admits that it may be possible that the last stage for a given individual to be Type 5 or Type 6, but not necessarily a progression from the former to the latter. In research related to Kohlberg's theory, Keasey (1971) found that stage of moral development was found to be positively related to the extent of social participation whether judged by self, peers, or teachers, a social phenomenon not related to age necessarily, or conceptual development either. Aronfreed (1968) notes that values which are relevant to the control of conduct can be altered substantially when adults
are placed under severe stress, that there are large differences in the orientation of conscience among groups of adults who differ in their commitment to various religious and political institutions, and concludes that "specific patterns of socialization can siphon cognitive development into the formation of conscience along more than one channel." Hoffman (1970) defines those channels in this manner:

... moral development proceeds along four tracks whose end products are behavioral conformity, perception of authority as rational, impulse inhibition, and consideration for others. Each appears to have its own experiential base, as follows:

1. Social learning theory seems best suited to account for the early forerunners of morality which consist of the expression and inhibition of specific acts defined by socialization agents as good or bad and rewarded or punished accordingly ... .

2. With further cognitive development the child may re-evaluate and shift his view of authority and rules so that they are no longer external, arbitrary, and constraining but largely objective and rational ... .

3. The third (process) stresses the taming of antisocial impulses and builds upon the initial opposition between the child's impulses and the norms of society ... .

4. A fourth process of moral development builds upon the child's potential for prosocial affect--mainly the capacity for empathy.

It appears that simply knowing the age, and therefore the approximate developmental stage of an individual, is probably a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for predicting the level of moral development and the moral choices that the individual may make.
Values and Cultural Differences

The cross-cultural study of personality has gotten a great amount of interest since Mead's history-making research in Samoa (Mead, 1949). Hsu (1961) has studied the effects of culture on psychological development. Kluckhohn and Strodbeck (1961) found that they could differentiate several cultures on the basis of their value orientations. Honigmann (1961) commented favorably on the methodological innovations of the Harvard Values Project spearheaded by Kluckhohn, noting that values research provides a procedure promising a higher measure of objective reliability than many people would see residing in more subjective approaches. Gordon (1963) points out cultural differences in interpersonal values for a number of different cultural samples. Whiting (1963) has shown the relation between differential parental behavior in different cultures and resulting differences in personality development.

Many researchers have been involved with differences in the development of moral "character" and the expression of value choices in different cultures. A study by Luria, Goldwasser, and Goldwasser (1963) found that peer group socialization, as opposed to parental socialization, in the Israeli kibbutz, produces a less highly developed conscience as measured by a readiness to confess. This seems to tie in with Bettelheim's (1968) conclusions about the kibbutz-reared children, i.e., that their responses to potentially
emotional situations are leveled out, and that they conform more highly to peer-group expectations than to adult-oriented expectations.

That the way guilt is expressed is a function of the ethnic background of the individual is the conclusion of McMichael and Grinder (1966) in research done with children of varying ethnic background. In an earlier work, the same authors (Grinder and McMichael, 1963) showed that children from a relatively primitive society characterized by control through fear of external reprobation (Samoa—"A Shame Society") were less likely to resist temptation and show susceptibility toward remorse, confession, and restitution after transgression than were children (American Caucasian) born in the American mainland (A "guilt society"). Some implications of this research can be seen also in the findings of Garsee and Glixman (1967), who measured Samoan adolescents on such interpersonal values as conformity, independence, benevolence, and leadership.

One researcher who has consistently studied value systems in other societies is Urie Bronfenbrenner. In an analysis of Soviet methods of character education (1962) he points out the relationship between the methods used and the eventual goal of "socialist morality." The use of peer-group rewards and sanctions, public recognition and criticism, and external controls result in conformity to group expectations. In a more comprehensive work, Bronfenbrenner (1968) cannot resist the temptation to deplore the abdication
of moral education in America from the school first, then from the church, and now from the home. He also deplores the increased use of television as a baby-sitter, with the attendant decrease of interaction with adults, and the attendant increase of peer group pressures without stated goals and supervised objectives. It can be accurately shown from his analysis that generation differences do exist and that youth are probably opting for more individualistic values, rather than group goals.

The culture, and accordingly, the subculture, in which an individual lives, will make a great impression upon that individual in the formation of a basic value orientation and also will operate as a valid influence in the expression of specific value choices.

Values and Religious Belief

It seems to be commonplace knowledge that religious belief and values interact vitally, and that religion seems to increase strength of conviction in value choices in some cases, at least, but yet there is a great paucity of research material relating to the subject. Horrocks (1969) has a brief section that relates to religion, but cites less than half a dozen sources on religion during adolescence. Aronfreed (1968) uses terms that normally have religious connotations—guilt, reparation, conscience, shame—but has no reference to religion in the index to his work. However, the "idealism" of the
adolescent period described by the Group for the Advancement
of Psychiatry (1968) often propels young people into relig­
gious expression in value choices:

Adolescents normally take a serious interest in
ethics and religion, as part of the delineation of
their own standards and values. A continuous ef­
fort is exerted to mediate between instinct and
the now uncertain demands of conscience, in the
service of forming new ideals and reshaping the
conscience to accommodate them. The adolescent
shows great concern for the moral probity of par­
ents and other adults and constantly compares
words with deeds. Cynicism and feelings of hope­
lessness alternate with renewed idealism as the
repeated discovery of the discrepancy between the
ideal and the real necessitates evaluation of the
cultural institutions and of one's own values.

Kuhlen and Arnold (1944) showed that religious beliefs
tend to become more abstract and less literal between the
ages of 12 and 18. This could easily help to account for
perceived generation differences in value choices that re­
late to a religious value system, especially in specific
cases where young people become less literal in their inter­
pretation of religious value choices than their parents.
This difference would further tend to be accentuated in
cases where the young person is more educated in the liberal
arts than the parents were. Nunn" (1964) points out that con­
formity to parental religious moral values is often sought by
parents through threats involving the power, wrath, and
judgment of God. It is the contention of this article that
weak parents usually utilize this method to enhance their
control of their children. If this analysis is true, the
final result among college-age young people who are somewhat
liberated from the constricting environment of the parental home, may be great loss of continuing identification with previous parental values, as a function of the rebellion against authority in the process of molding an individual identity.

McDonald (1969b) showed a significant interaction between birth order and religious affiliation. Church attendance was more pronounced among first and only children, with a statistical significance at the .001 level. This indicates the strong possibility of a connection between the socialization process, the value orientation, and probably religious belief, especially where contact with a particular religious orientation has been a part of the socialization experience.

**Hypotheses**

In given fixed force choice situations, sources of variance in response can be correlated with developmental variables such as sex, degree of identification with parents, intensity of warmth and power in adult models, and perception of parental expectation.

It was hypothesized that:

1. Students in the adult transition age period, from a homogeneous, religious college environment, would tend to accept positive value choices, and reject negative value choices, where the respective choices were
based on expectations of the value sub-
culture.

2. Female students would tend to be more ac-
cepting of positive value choices than
male students, and more rejecting of neg-
ative value choices than the males. In
other words, males should be more permis-
sive and less influenced by social ex-
pectations.

3. Both male and female students would per-
ceive differences between personal value
choices and the expectations of parents
in the same value choice, in the case of
either father's expectations or mother's
expectations.

4. Female students would perceive greater
similarity between personal value choices
and maternal expectations, while male
students would perceive greater similarity
between personal value choices and paternal
expectations.

5. Both male and female students would perceive
differences between maternal and paternal
expectations in value choice situations.
Although no hypothesis is made in the matter,
it will be exceedingly interesting to ascer-
tain whether male or female Ss perceive the
greater discrepancy between the two parental expectations.
CHAPTER 2

VARIABLES, SUBJECTS, AND METHOD

Variables

The primary concern of the writer is to ascertain some of the developmental correlates of perceived generation differences in value role-taking choices. The areas chosen for primary investigation include the following:

1. Sex of Subjects
2. Sex of Parents
3. Subjects' Perceptions of Parental Values and Attitudes
4. Subjects' Perceptions of Differential Levels of Personal Role-Taking Choices
5. Subjects' Perceptions of Parental Expectations in Ss' Value Choices
6. Differential Choice Situation—Positive and Negative

Other possible variables were conceived as:

1. Parental Absence
2. Marital Status of Subjects
3. Birth Order
4. Relation to Guardian
Subjects

The total sample consisted of 413 students enrolled in Mount Vernon Nazarene College, Mount Vernon, Ohio. After 10 incomplete responses were eliminated, there were 403 retained—202 females and 201 males. The total represents more than 80% of the total enrollment of Mount Vernon Nazarene College.

The Mount Vernon Nazarene College is a two-year church-sponsored college, supported by the East Central Zone (Ohio, West Virginia, and Eastern Kentucky) of the Church of the Nazarene. The church is fundamentalist, and the students represent an atypical value system, when compared with the population at large. Approximately 80% of enrolling students express a preference for the Church of the Nazarene, but church membership is not a prerequisite for enrollment in the College, nor is agreement with the church doctrines and practices. However, enrolling students tacitly agree to abide by rules quite similar to the denominational value system when they are on the campus and in college buildings.

Analyses of the data resulted in removing 18 additional Ss from the group (see Chapter 4). The remaining 385 students are described as follows, from information found in The Survey.
Only 1 of the Ss was classified as a junior, with 122 females and 115 males registering as freshmen, and 69 females and 78 males as sophomores.

Regarding marital status of Ss, 3 females and 10 males were married, with 2 additional males divorced.

The age for females (N=191) ranged from 16 or 17 (N=2) to 26-40 (N=1), with all but 4 within the 18 to 22 age brackets. The average age for females was 18.8 years of age. The age for males (N=194) ranged from 16 or 17 (N=1) to 26-40 (N=4), with 13 males outside the 18-22 age ranges. The average age for males was 19.0 years of age.

There were 5 females and 7 males who were only children; there were 61 other females and 74 other males who were first-born in families with 2 or more children; there were 41 females and 40 males who were last-born in families with 2 or more children; there were 76 females and 67 males who were born in an intermediate position in families with 3 or more children; and 8 females and 6 males marked no response.

There were only 3 females and 1 male who were adopted children; there was only 1 male who was a foster child; 185 females and 188 males were natural children; 3 females and 4 males marked no response.

None of the Ss was completely orphaned; 3 females and 1 male had a father only alive; 3 females and 4 males had a mother only alive; 183 females and 185 males had both parents living; 2 females and 4 males made no response.
Only 3 females had parents who were separated, but not divorced; 10 females and 5 males had divorced parents; 171 females and 180 males had parents who were living together; 15 females and 14 males did not mark a response, indicating contamination of this item on The Personal Information section, with the previous item on parental mortality.

There were 5 females and 13 males who lived with neither parent; 3 females and 3 males who live with father and stepmother; 7 females and 5 males live with mother and stepfather; 2 females and 1 male live with father only; 9 females and 3 males live with mother only; 163 females and 165 males live with both natural parents; 2 females and 4 males marked no response. The Ss do not represent a typical sample from the viewpoint of church preference, and are probably not representative of a larger population with regard to parental or marital status or relationship to guardians.

Method

The Survey of Values was administered to all students who were present in several large classes, and to others who volunteered. The testing period covered a total of 10 days, and all the student body were asked to refrain from discussing items on The Survey during that period of time, to help insure individual, rather than consensus, responses.
An effort was made to include in the testing instrument choices about behavioral items that correspond to stated guides for conduct in official church and college publications. Since completely honest responses might be potentially compromising to the student, the writer took every precaution to insure (and advertise) the anonymity of the individual responses. This, of necessity, negated the possibility of checking all students off a master enrollment list as they marked The Survey, then making appointments for any absent or missing students. To be brutally honest, the writer hoped to draw on a reservoir of "good faith" deposited with the students in previous associations for their almost unanimous and voluntary cooperation, with anonymity still maintained as the top priority. The writer's thinking was basically this: less error will derive from "absent Ss" than from "dishonest, or threatened Ss."

A retest group was chosen from 3 of the classes, and identical Surveys were marked by those in these classes 7 days after the initial Survey. The original Survey and the Retest were compared to measure test reliability. (See Chapter 3)

The eighteen Ss whose responses were removed from the sample because they left large sections of The Survey blank were placed in a sub-sample and called "Parent-Absent" Ss. There was only 1 female who was Mother-Absent; there were 10 females who were Father-Absent, and 7 males were Father-Absent. These 18 Ss will be compared to the 385 Ss in the
large sample on The Personal Value Choice sections only.
CHAPTER 3
THE SURVEY OF VALUES

It was necessary to develop a method to gain personal information with differential developmental variable inputs, to assess student perceptions of maternal and paternal attitudes and values, to measure differential levels of perceived personal role-taking in hypothetical value choice situations, to measure individual perceptions of maternal and paternal expectations in the same value choice situations to compare with personal choices for ascertaining direction and degree of any perceived generation differences, and to evaluate S's attitudes toward the instrument devised. The Survey of Values (see Figure 6, Appendix I) is an instrument devised by the writer to endeavor to accomplish these purposes, and is composed of four basic parts.

1. The **Personal Information** section is a series of nine items devised to gather information from students about potential developmental differences, for possible correlates of generation differences in the later value role-taking choices.

2. The **Semantic Differential** dealing with "My Mother's Values and Attitudes" and "My
Father's Values and Attitudes provide twenty (20) attitudinal responses about individual percept of parental child-rearing practices for each sex parent. These also provide some possible correlates of the degree of generation differences in the later value role-taking choices. Nunnally (1967) has pointed out the value of the use of the semantic differential in assessing attitudinal positions and perceptions. The final choices of twenty items for this test were the product of a pilot study done with 100 students of Mount Vernon Nazarene College, using thirty-two paired opposites (see Figure 1, Appendix I) for each of six different headings:

FATHER'S VALUES
FATHER'S DISCIPLINE
FATHER'S ATTITUDES
MOTHER'S VALUES
MOTHER'S DISCIPLINE
MOTHER'S ATTITUDES

A frequency distribution was done for each semantic differential space on each paired opposite under each of the six headings. Means and standard deviations were computed for each paired opposite
under each heading. It was found that the N varied (from 90 to 100) for each item in the analysis, due to missing responses, obviously usually occasioned by father-absent or mother-absent students who did not feel that they had enough information about the given item to respond meaningfully.

All paired opposites with means greater than 5.89 were discarded; others with little or no discriminatory value at the extremes of the semantic spaces were discarded; and most items that tended to duplicate meaning were narrowed down to a single possible response possibility, although a few similar items were retained as checks on "faked" or unthinking responses.

The headings on "Father's Discipline" and "Mother's Discipline" were discarded due to the fact that the stimulus-term "discipline" seemed to have connotations with possibilities for definition too divergent by most students. It could not be determined readily whether the term related to parents' discipline of self, discipline of child, or both.
The headings on "Values" and Attitudes" were combined for each sex parent, since students responded to both in very nearly equal terms.

The order for response was then scrambled on "The Survey of Values."

3. The **Value Choice Role-Taking Test** is composed of a series of possible responses to fourteen (14) specific behavioral (but hypothetical in the literal sense, since all responses are made on paper only) items. These fourteen items include seven (7) items of positive behavior. The final seven (7) negative items were chosen from a list of twenty-three (23) negative items (Figure 2, Appendix I) given to a pilot study sample (N=99) Mount Vernon Nazarene College students. The final items (see Figure 5, Appendix I) were chosen for their powers of discrimination and for their Guttmann-type ranking (though equal space between each is not claimed) from "very bad" to "not very bad," as assigned by the student responses.

The final seven (7) positive items were chosen from a list of fifteen (15) positive items given to a pilot study sample
of ninety Mount Vernon Nazarene College students (Figure 3, Appendix I). The final items (see Figure 4, Appendix I) were chosen for their powers of discrimination and the Guttman-type ranking they were assigned by the student responses, from "very good" to "not very good." Only item number 7 of the fourteen (14) finally chosen (Figure 4, Appendix I) was not ranked according to the student response, but is so innocuous that it seems appropriate for the "least good" item.

In Figures 4 and 5 it can be seen that:

1. An effort has been made to rank all fourteen (14) behavioral items from "best to worst";
2. The items are certainly not typical of a larger American college sample;
3. The items are appropriate for the atypical population of Mount Vernon Nazarene College;
4. There is a higher valuation of all positive items than many negative items, i.e., the negative items got more "spread" than the positive ones;
5. These are items with emotional and attitudinal components, with built-in possibilities for generation differences;

6. Items 7 and 8 have been conceived as test validity items. Extreme rejection of either one would be a strong indication that S is faking his responses.

Item Number 10 (Figure 5, Appendix I) was changed to "USE TOBACCO" to get away from artificial distinctions. On The Survey of Values these fourteen (14) items have been scrambled so that Ss cannot perceive a progressive pattern in the kind of items presented.

Under each of the fourteen major behavioral items, the S is asked to mark one of six possible responses. The relation of values to differing degrees of role-taking is elaborated in a new work by Horrocks and Jackson (1972) and has been altered slightly by the writer to accommodate differential motivations for role-
playing. The concept of role-rejection, although not explicit in the theoretical formulations of Horrocks and Jackson (1972), is nevertheless implied. An explanation of these is as follows:

A. Response indicates total role-acceptance, (role-taking);

B. Response indicates role-playing, with likelihood of acceptance, especially in a social situation where peer group approval seems to indicate participation;

C. Response indicates role-playing in an experimental sense, where no feeling exists to indicate prohibition or acceptance;

D. Response indicates role-playing in a rebellious sense, trying the particular item of behavior in spite of feelings that S should not do so;

E. Response indicates role-fugmenting (or role-fantasizing), trying to imagine one's self doing a certain thing, with little
P. Response indicates total role-rejection. These responses have been placed in random order under each item under The Survey of Values. Each S was asked to mark first his own responses on these value choices, and then asked to mark on other sections with identical possible responses his percept of what his father, and then his mother, would expect (or hope for) him to mark; or to mark the responses in the other sections as if his father and mother would be told of the results. The responses have been analyzed in such a way as to identify generation differences in either direction away from the parental responses, toward positive or negative role-taking choice.

4. The **Attitude Measure** was devised to determine S's attitude and response to the testing situation in relation to degree of honesty, cooperation, and awareness of anonymity.
The four basic parts of the testing instrument were put together, printed, and administered as The Survey of Values (Figure 6, Appendix I).

Since it was conceived as a measure of the effectiveness of The Survey rather than as a part of the search for correlates and antecedents of generation differences in values, the Attitude Measure will be excluded from analysis in the Results of The Survey. The responses on that section of The Survey will serve primarily to show individual attitudes toward The Survey and their own responses on it, and indirectly as an index of The Survey's effectiveness. On the first four items of this section, dealing with Ss' attitudes toward the research itself, the lowest response was 5.32, and the highest was 5.85. The average response on all four items was 5.69, a relatively high positive rating.

The next six items on this semantic differential related to the honesty and openness, as well as the perceived anonymity of the S, in making the responses. All six of these items received quite high ratings, the lowest being 6.07 (responses well reasoned out), the highest being 6.61 (responses open). The average on all six of these items was 6.35. The responses of all Ss (N=385) on each of 10 items can be seen in Table 1, with frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations.

Another check on effectiveness was built into The Survey itself. It was conjectured that extreme rejection
TABLE 1

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
OF TOTAL SAMPLE ON ATTITUDE MEASURE (N=385)
NEGATIVE TO POSITIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The research is:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good-----bad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foolish-----important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningless-----meaningful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak-----strong</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My responses were:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dishonest-----honest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simply-----well reasoned guesses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merely-----truly representative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guesses out</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My anonymity was:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not guarded-----guarded closely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closely enough</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I felt my responses could be:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>guarded-----open</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Value=1) on either of the two relatively innocuous items (Numbers 7 and 8) in the Personal Value Choices might indicate unthinking, "faked," or rebellious responses. A look at the results of The Survey on these items seems to strengthen reliance on the discriminatory powers of The Survey for the sample tested.

Only 5 girls and 1 boy marked Response 6 (Total Rejection) on Item No. 7. Only 9 girls and 2 boys marked Response 6 (Total Rejection) on Item No. 8. Thus, there were only 17 total responses on these two items at the Total Rejection point on The Scale. This seems to indicate that the majority of Ss were discriminating. Actually, the larger number of girls who marked both items could be partly accounted for by the social implications of each item. Girls are more reticent about speaking to strangers because of potential sexual and safety connotations. Girls are less likely also to be regular drivers, so would not hesitate as much to reject the possibility of minor speeding.

An examination of Table 4 will show that there are directional differences with regard to sex, generation, positive versus negative value choices, maternal versus paternal expectations, and maternal versus paternal values and attitudes, all of which seem to indicate a relatively stable and consistent ability, in all sections of The Survey, to discriminate and identify variable differentiation.
Since the personal value choice items were the primary original contribution of the writer to potentially meaningful research, a discriminant function analysis was undertaken on those items, comparing the test and retest (N=94). Table 2 shows that there is no significant variance for the entire 14-choice section, no significant variance for either the positive value choice section or the negative value choice section, and very little significant variance on the analysis of individual items. There were two items in the negative choice section which showed some significant variance: item number 8 ("Drive Five Miles Over The Speed Limit In An Uninhabited Area") was significantly different at the .10 level; item number 14 was significantly different at the .05 level. Although the mean differences were quite low for both of these items, the deviations from the means were so low that the mean differences were significantly different, over the 7-day period of the test-retest.

Test-retest coefficients for the Survey were satisfactory in most sections. The Attitude Measure seemed to have altogether too much variance in it, even though the means in both test and retest remained equally high. A group of ninety-four students took The Survey seven days apart. The results by section may be seen in Table 3. The range of coefficients on individual items within each section is also included in this table, and it can easily be
# TABLE 2

**DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS, TEST TO RETEST**  
(N=94) PERSONAL VALUE CHOICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Value Choices</td>
<td>14,173</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14 Items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Value Choices</td>
<td>7,180</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Value Choices</td>
<td>7,180</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Test-Retest)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>-.309</td>
<td>2.041</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>2.572</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>2.830</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>4.507</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seen that removal or reconstruction of relatively few items in each section could stabilize The Survey more.

In summary, the face, content, and construct validities of The Survey of Values are satisfactory. The internal consistency and stability of the individual sections (with the exception of the Attitude Measure) are also reasonably well established. The Survey of Values could certainly be improved, but seems adequate for the proposed research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Coefficients</th>
<th>STABILITY COEFFICIENTS (TEST / 7 DAYS / RETEST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High: 1.000 Low: 0.623</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.780 .409 .843 .552 .758 .511 .928 .424 .756 .463 .956 .151 .891 .551 .916 .437 .765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Information (9 Items)</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Values and Attitudes (20 Items)</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Values and Attitudes (20 Items)</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Positive Value Choices (7 Items)</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Negative Value Choices (7 Items)</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Father's Expectations, Positive (7 Items)</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Father's Expectations, Negative (7 Items)</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Mother's Expectations, Positive (7 Items)</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Mother's Expectations, Negative (7 Items)</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Measure (10 Items)</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The initial procedure in the analysis of the data was converting it from responses in The Survey booklets to computer cards. Two computer cards for each S were punched. A total of 57 complete Survey booklets was then compared by hand, with the punched cards, and a total of only 9 errors was found. The number of punches contained in the cards for those 57 Ss was 6,108; this is an error of only .00142.

A computer program was then written to recognize and total blank responses, which had been left unpunched on the raw data cards. It was evident that 18 Ss had left large, total sections of The Survey blank, dealing with Parental Values and Attitudes or Parental Expectations, or both. These 18 Ss were removed from the group for analysis. There were 11 females and 7 males, leaving an N of 191 females and 194 males, or a total N of 385. A sub-analysis of this small group of Parent-Absent Ss was planned to ascertain whether there were any significant differences from Parent-Present Ss on Personal Value Choices. The results of this sub-analysis will be found in a later part of this chapter.

A re-run of the computer program to recognize remaining blanks revealed that, except for The Personal Information and Attitude Measure sections of The Survey, the greatest
number of blanks for any Survey item was 4. There were 50 items with no remaining blanks, 20 items with only 1 blank in the total 385 possible responses, 8 items with 2 blanks, 2 items with 3 blanks, and 2 items with 4 blanks. This is a total of only 50 blanks out of 33,570 possible items.

In order to avoid unequal Ns in the item analyses, a computer program was written to punch the 50 blanks. The Personal Information section was excluded from this manipulation. On the semantic differential items ("My Mother's Values and Attitudes," "My Father's Values and Attitudes," and the "Attitude Measure," the blanks were assigned the neutral value of 4. On the sections for Value Choices, blanks were assigned, at random, either a C or a D response, the two choices that constitute the neutral possibilities.

A computer program was written to permute the data into orderly progression for easier analysis, and to re-punch cards in this order, a Reformulated Data deck. Figure 7 reveals the proper order for items in the sections of The Survey that are constituted by the semantic differential. These items are negative on the left (value = 1) and positive on the right (value = 7). They correspond, from number 1 to number 20, to items in computer printouts numbered 10 to 29 (for "My Mother's Values and Attitudes") and 30 to 49 (for "My Father's Values and Attitudes."). In Figure 8, the progression of the permuted data for The Value Choice sections of The Survey is seen. These are in the order of "best to worst," numbered 1 through 14. Under each behavioral value
TABLE 4

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, BY SEX AND TOTAL, FOR MAJOR SECTIONS, SURVEY OF VALUES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM CHOICE NUMBER</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. My Mother's Values and Attitudes</strong> (20 items, 7 possible responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Female (N=191)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Male (N=194)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. TOTAL (N=385)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>2058</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. My Father's Values and Attitudes</strong> (20 items, 7 possible responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Female (N=191)</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Male (N=194)</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. TOTAL (N=385)</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. My Personal Value Choices - Positive</strong> (7 items, 6 possible responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Female (N=191)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Male (N=194)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. TOTAL (N=385)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. My Personal Value Choices - Negative</strong> (7 items, 6 possible responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Female (N=191)</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Male (N=194)</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. TOTAL (N=385)</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Choice numbers 1 indicate the most negative responses on the semantic differentials, and a choice of a 1 indicates the greatest degree of rejection of the items on value choice sections.*
### ITEM CHOICE NUMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My Perception of My Father's Expectations - Positive Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 items, 6 possible responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Female (N=191)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Male (N=194)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. TOTAL (N=385)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My Perception of My Father's Expectations - Negative Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 items, 6 possible responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Female (N=191)</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Male (N=194)</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. TOTAL (N=385)</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My Perception of My Mother's Expectations - Positive Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 items, 6 possible responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Female (N=191)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Male (N=194)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. TOTAL (N=385)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My Perception of My Mother's Expectations - Negative Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7 items, 6 possible responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Female (N=191)</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Male (N=194)</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. TOTAL (N=385)</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Attitude Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10 items, 7 possible responses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Female (N=191)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Male (N=194)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. TOTAL (N=385)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
choice item, the differential levels of role-taking are ordered from total acceptance (A) to total rejection (F). These levels of potential role-taking choice were also changed from "letter values" to "numerical values," with total acceptance given a value of 6, varying gradually to a value of 1 for the total rejection response. It should be noted that for positive choice items, acceptance would give a high score, and that for negative choice items, rejection would produce a low score.

Programs for frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations for each Survey item, and for each Survey section, were run. Table 4 shows the preliminary analysis for the major sections of The Survey.

The data from The Survey were organized in different ways, appropriate for the hypotheses, then analyzed to confirm or disconfirm the hypotheses presented earlier. The t-test was shown to be an effective method for testing the data since the data meets the conditions laid down by Siegel (1956).

Acceptance/Rejection Comparisons

That the sample as a group accepted the positive personal value choices while rejecting the negative personal value choices was shown conclusively. Table 5 shows the means, standard deviations, and statistical comparisons for all students on the positive and negative personal value
**TABLE 5**

**MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND COMPARISONS OF ACCEPTANCE/REJECTION ON POSITIVE VERSUS NEGATIVE-PERSONAL VALUE CHOICES**

(N=385)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \overline{X} )</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7 Items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7 Items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison**

Positive-Negative 2.56*

* \( p < .0001 \), one-tailed t-test

choice sections. The \( t \)-value of the mean differences was 24.95, a difference significant far beyond the power of most tables to distinguish. The differences on response to the two sections are clearly shown to be a function of the atypical value system of the sample, and not chance.

This same result can be seen by looking at Tables 7 and 8, which show that females' mean scores on positive choices range from 4.38 up to 5.55; males' mean scores on positive choices range from 4.13 up to 5.38; all of these responses are considerably above the middle possible score of 3.5, and represent acceptance responses. The same tables show that females' mean scores on negative choices range from 3.51 down to 1.22; males' mean scores on negative choices
range from 4.20 down to 1.25; only two of these responses were higher than 3.5 (4.20 for males and 3.51 for females on "Driving Five Miles Over the Speed Limit In An Uninhabited Area") and all others (as well as the average) represent rejection responses.

Hypothesis 1 is also visually confirmed by FIGURE "A," which shows the scale profiles for males and females on all fourteen of the personal value choice items. The items to the right of the vertical median are negative value choices (numbered 8-14), and the items to the left of the vertical median are positive value choices (numbered 1-7). It is pertinent to note that all positive choices are in the acceptance quadrant above the horizontal median, and the great majority of negative choices are in the rejection quadrant.

**Sex Comparisons**

Hypothesis 2 held that there would be significant differences between males and females on personal value choices. Sex comparisons on all the major sections of The Survey of Values may be seen in Table 6, which shows indeed that the greatest mean differences on any of the sections are on the two personal value choice sections. The differences for the negative value choice section reached a level of statistical significance, although the differences for the positive value choice section did not.
FIGURE A
SCALE PROFILE OF SEX COMPARISONS
PERSONAL VALUE CHOICES

VALUE CHOICE ITEMS

ROLE-TAKING CHOICES (MEANS)

FEMALE

MALE
When broken down into an analysis and sex comparison for each item in the value choice sections, the picture of statistical significance becomes more clear. The results of sex comparisons for the positive personal value choices may be seen in Table 7. On every item, females were more accepting than males, with statistical significance on three choice items—Read the Bible and Pray Regularly (.02), Give At Least 10% Of My Income to the Church (.02), and Invite Someone Else to Attend My Church (.05). The results of sex comparisons for the negative personal value choices may be seen in Table 8. On every item, females were more rejecting than males, with statistical significance on five of the choice items—Drive Five Miles Over the Speed Limit in an Uninhabited Area (.01), Use Tobacco (.05), Drink Beer (.01), Have Sexual Intercourse Outside the Marriage Relationship (.01), and Smoke Marijuana (.05).

This hypothesis is confirmed visually in FIGURE "A," also, where the cross-over from relative rejection of positive choices for males (in the left half of the scale profile) to greater relative acceptance of negative choices (in the right half of the scale profile) can be clearly seen.

There are also sex differences in the generation comparisons which will be elaborated on in the ensuing two sections.

Sex comparisons on the students' perceptions of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Measure</th>
<th>Father's Expectations</th>
<th>Mother's Expectations</th>
<th>Father's Personal Choices</th>
<th>Mother's Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, one-tailed t-test

Female-Male differences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For MAJOR SECTIONS, SURVEY OF VALUES:
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND SEX COMPARISONS

Table 6
TABLE 7

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND SEX COMPARISONS
POSITIVE PERSONAL VALUE CHOICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Choice Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{S.D.})</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{S.D.})</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparisons:</strong></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female-Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{One-tailed t-test})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND SEX COMPARISONS
NEGATIVE PERSONAL VALUE CHOICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Choice Items</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{S.D.})</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{S.D.})</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparisons:</strong></td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female-Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{One-tailed t-test})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
parental values and attitudes were made, and two-tailed t-tests (since no hypothesis about direction of sex differences on these items) were computed on the mean differences for each of these items, with male means subtracted from female means. For "Mother's Values and Attitudes," there were three items with statistical sex differences: males perceived mothers more selfish than females did (mean difference = -.32; t-value = 2.38; significance level = .02); males perceived mothers as more humble than females did (mean difference = .63; t-value = 3.46; significance level = .001); and males perceived mothers as more excitable than females did (mean difference = .42; t-value = 2.31; significance level = .05). For "Father's Values and Attitudes" there were three items with statistical sex differences: males perceived fathers as more reasonable than females did (mean difference = -.41; t-value = 2.41; significance level = .02); males perceived fathers as more trusting than females did (mean difference = -.36; t-value = 2.06; significance level = .05); and males perceived fathers as more insensitive than females did (mean difference = .31; t-value = 1.97; significance level = .05).

Although the responses on the Attitude Measure were reported primarily in Chapter 3, one interesting factor emerged in the sex comparisons that can be seen in Table 9. On all 10 of the items, females scored higher than males; the differences ranged from .06 to .35.
## TABLE 9

**MEAN SCALE SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND SEX COMPARISONS ON TEN-ITEM ATTITUDE MEASURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female-Male</th>
<th>.23</th>
<th>.18</th>
<th>.30**</th>
<th>.35***</th>
<th>.06</th>
<th>.06</th>
<th>.08</th>
<th>.08</th>
<th>.30*</th>
<th>.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05, two-tailed t-test  
** ** p < .02, two-tailed t-test  
*** *** p < .01, two-tailed t-test
On three items, the variance was statistically significant, two of which dealt with the value of the research, and the last one of which concerned perception of anonymity. This could be accounted for by male Ss' negative attitudes toward themselves (self-concept), toward social pressures to conform, toward the intrusion into personal values occasioned by The Survey, or toward the writer.

Generation Comparisons

Hypothesis 3 held that students' perceptions of personal value choices would be different from their perceptions of parental expectations in the same value choices. The results of the generation comparisons on the positive and negative choice sections for females are shown in Table 10. Females' personal positive choices were not significantly different from father's expectations, but they were significantly different from mother's expectations (.05). For both parents, the direction of differences was toward parental expectation of greater acceptance of positive value choices for the females. On the personal negative value choice section, females were significantly different from both father's (.05) and mother's (.001) expectations. For both parents, the direction of differences was toward parental expectation of greater rejection of negative value choices for the females.
### TABLE 10

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND GENERATION COMPARISONS ON COMBINED VALUE CHOICE ITEMS FOR FEMALES (N=191)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Value Choices</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of Father's Expectations</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of Mother's Expectations</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparisons:**

- **Personal—Father's Expectations**: 
  - -.12
  - .30*

- **Personal—Mother's Expectations**: 
  - -.40*
  - .48**

- **Father's Expectation—Mother's Expectation**: 
  - -.18
  - .18

* p < .05, two-tailed t-test
** p < .001, two-tailed t-test
TABLE 11
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND GENERATION COMPARISONS ON COMBINED VALUE CHOICE ITEMS FOR MALES (N=194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Value Choices</td>
<td>X 4.62</td>
<td>S.D. 1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Father's Expectations</td>
<td>X 4.95</td>
<td>S.D. 1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Mother's Expectations</td>
<td>X 5.10</td>
<td>S.D. 1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons:

- Personal—Father's Expectations  
  - .33*  
  - .56**

- Personal—Mother's Expectations  
  - .48**  
  - .78**

- Father's Expectation—Mother's Expectation  
  - .15  
  - .24*

* p ≤ .05, two-tailed t-test
** p < .001, two-tailed t-test
The results of the generation comparisons on the positive and negative choice sections for males are shown in Table 11. Males' personal positive value choices were significantly different from both father's expectation (.05) and mother's expectation (.001). Both parents' expectations were perceived by males as moving toward greater acceptance of positive value choices. Males' personal negative value choices were significantly different from both father's expectation (.001) and mother's expectation (.001). For both parents, males perceived expectations as moving toward greater rejection of negative value choices.

A comparison of mean differences or levels of significance in Tables 10 and 11 point up the fact that generation differences are greater for negative value choices for both sexes than for positive value choices. Another revealing observation is apparent from this comparison: the generation differences are greater for males than for females, as revealed at least in their perceptions recorded in their responses on The Survey of Values.

A multivariate analysis was done using sex as one variable, and the treatments in the three value choice sections as another major domain of variables. Unfortunately, the analysis did not break the treatments down, but combined the variation in all three sections. With this analysis, the sex X treatment interaction was found to be insignificant for all fourteen items when considered as a group; the sex X
treatment interaction was also insignificant when the seven-item sections on positive and negative value choices were considered by sections. On univariate F tests, when considered item by item, the sex X treatment interaction was significant for only one item, "Drink Beer" (F=5.459; df 2, 1149; p < .004).

The results of this multivariate analysis showed sex to be significant for the fourteen-item group (F=3.918; p < .001), for the seven-item positive choice section (F=5.066; p < .001), and for the seven-item negative choice section (F=2.758; p < .008). Univariate F tests on individual choice items showed significant variance for sex on items numbered 1 (Read The Bible And Pray Regularly), 5 (Invite Someone Else to Attend My Church), 7 (Speak In A Friendly Manner To A Stranger On The Street), 8 (Drive Five Miles Over The Speed Limit In An Uninhabited Area), 10 (Use Tobacco), 11 (Drink Beer), and 12 (Have Sexual Intercourse Outside The Marriage Relationship). The probabilities on these items (from the computer printout) were, respectively .050; .032; .001; .038; .015; .005; and .041. This analysis is slightly different from those previously reported in the sex comparisons: the F tests did not find item number 2 (Give At Least 10% Of My Income To The Church) significant; the F test did find item number 7 (Speak In A Friendly Manner To A Stranger On The Street) significant; the F test did not find item number 13 (Smoke Marijuana) significantly
different for sex. All other items (numbers 1, 5, 8, 10, 11, and 12) were adjudged to be significant by both means of comparison.

TABLE 12
UNIVARIATE F TESTS
TESTING EFFECT OF COMBINED TREATMENT ON FOURTEEN VALUE CHOICE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE CHOICE ITEM</th>
<th>$F(2,1149)$</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>$p$ LESS THAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.600</td>
<td>23.422</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.634</td>
<td>23.107</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>152.705</td>
<td>212.600</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.135</td>
<td>6.720</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.508</td>
<td>11.894</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.820</td>
<td>21.482</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.121</td>
<td>49.040</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.337</td>
<td>40.626</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.775</td>
<td>111.501</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.792</td>
<td>35.598</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.566</td>
<td>33.291</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.893</td>
<td>16.512</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.954</td>
<td>4.458</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2215.156</td>
<td>1948.079</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multivariate analysis showed high significance for treatment (.001) on the fourteen-item group, high significance for treatment on both the positive value choice section
and the negative value choice section (.001). The univariate F tests on the individual fourteen value choice items showed significant treatment effect for every item. The results of this computation may be seen in Table 12.

Since the treatment variable on this analysis combined generation differences on the value choice items between personal and father and between personal and mother, further analyses were employed to endeavor to locate more accurately the sources of difference. The results of generation comparisons on positive choice items for females can be seen in Table 13. There were significant differences between females' personal positive value choices and father's expectations on items numbered 1 (Read The Bible And Pray Regularly), 4 (Visit A Sick Friend), 5 (Invite Someone Else To Attend My Church), and 7 (Speak In A Friendly Manner To A Stranger On The Street). There were significant differences between female personal positive value choices and mother's expectations on every item, indicating a wider generation "gap" between females and mothers on value choices than between females and their fathers.

On all comparisons with father's expectations except three (numbers 2, 3, and 7), females felt that fathers expected higher acceptance. It is interesting to note that especially on the matter of "speaking in a friendly manner to a stranger on the street" girls felt they were more socially inclined than fathers expected them to be. On all
TABLE 13
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, GENERATION
AND PARENTAL COMPARISONS

POSITIVE VALUE CHOICES
FOR FEMALES (N=191)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Value Choices</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Perception of My Father's Expectations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Perception of My Mother's Expectations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons:

- Personal—Father's Expectations
- .48** .04 .11 -.45** -.22* -.05 .22*

- Personal—Mother's Expectations
- -.80** -.27** -.18** -.49** -.50** -.21** .37**

- Father's Expectations—Mother's Expectations
- -.32** -.31** -.29** -.04 -.28** -.16* .15

* p < .05, one-tailed t-test
** p < .01, one-tailed t-test
comparisons with mother's expectations except one (number 7), females felt that mothers expected higher acceptance of positive values than they would choose personally.

The results of generation comparisons on negative choice items for females can be seen in Table 14. There were significant differences between females' personal negative value choices and father's expectations on items numbered 1 (Read Bible), 2 (Give 10%), 5 (Invite Someone To Church), 6 (Give Food And Clothing), and number 7 (Speak To A Stranger). On every item but one, number 3 (Attend Church Regularly), females perceived that fathers expected greater rejection of negative value choices than they would choose personally. Again, there were significant differences between personal negative value choices and mother's expectations on every item, with the comparative magnitude of mean differences confirming that the generation "gap" for value choices is greater between females and their mothers than between females and their fathers. It would be interesting to find out if this is a function of the atypical value subculture of this sample, or whether it would hold for a larger segment of the larger American culture.

The results of generation comparisons on positive choice items for males can be seen in Table 15. There were significant differences between males' personal positive value choices and father's expectations on items numbered 1 (Read The Bible And Pray), 2 (Give 10%), 4 (Visit A Sick
**TABLE 14**

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, GENERATION
AND PARENTAL COMPARISONS

NEGATIVE VALUE CHOICES
FOR FEMALES (N=191)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Value Choices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My Perception of My Father's Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My Perception of My Mother's Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons:

Personal —
Father's Expectations

.70** .61** .11 .01 .36** .37** .13**

Personal —
Mother's Expectations

.96** .74** .23** .21** .59** .39** .18**

Father's Expectations —
Mother's Expectations

.26** .13 .39** .20** .23** .02 .05*

* p < .05, one-tailed t-test
** p < .01, one-tailed t-test
## TABLE 15
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, GENERATION AND PARENTAL COMPARISONS
POSITIVE VALUE CHOICES
FOR MALES (N=194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Value</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Perception</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of My Father's</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Perception</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of My Mother's</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons:

- Personal—Father's Expectations: -.76**-.34**-.09 -.75**-.27**-.08 -.02
- Personal—Mother's Expectations: -.15**-.63**-.26**-.63**-.54**-.30** .11
- Father's Expectations—Mother's Expectations: -.39**-.29**-.17* .12 -.27**-.22** .13

* p < .05, one-tailed t-test
** p < .01, one-tailed t-test
Friend), and 5 (Invite Someone To Church). On every one of
the seven items, males perceived that fathers expected
higher acceptance of positive value choices than males
would choose personally. There were significant differences
between male personal positive value choices and mother's
expectations on six of the seven items, with item number 7
(Speak To A Stranger) being the only one not significant.
On every item except number 7, males perceived that mothers
expected higher acceptance of positive value choices than
they would choose personally. This seems to indicate that
the generation difference for males, too, is greater between
male and mother, than between male and father.

The results of generation comparisons on negative
choice items for males can be seen in Table 16. There were
significant differences between male personal negative value
choices and father's expectations on six of the seven items;
on item number 10 (Use Tobacco), there was no significant
generation difference between males and fathers. There were
significant differences between male personal negative value
choices and mother's expectations on every one of the seven
items, confirming the fact that in our atypical sample, the
generation differences in value choices are greater for both
males and females between self and mother than between self
and father.

One other interesting fact emerges from a visual com-
parison of Tables 13 and 15 with Tables 14 and 16, looking
TABLE 16

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, GENERATION
AND PARENTAL COMPARISONS

NEGATIVE VALUE CHOICES
FOR MALES (N=194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Value Choices</td>
<td>X 4.20</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 1.25</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My Perception of My Father's Expectations | X 3.11 | 2.49 | 1.66 | 1.66 | 1.40 | 1.05 | 1.02 |
|          | S.D. 1.53 | 1.55 | 1.49 | 1.39 | 1.02 | .22  | .14  |

My Perception of My Mother's Expectations | X 2.68 | 2.27 | 1.19 | 1.34 | 1.15 | 1.01 | 1.03 |
|          | S.D. 1.55 | 1.53 | .81  | .99  | .58  | .10  | .17  |

Comparisons:

Personal—Father's Expectations
1.09** .82** -.02 .28** .80** .58** .23**

Personal—Mother's Expectations
1.52**1.04** .45** .60**1.05** .62** .22**

Father's Expectations—Mother's Expectations
.43** .22* .47** .32** .25** .04**-.01

* p < .05, one-tailed t-test
** p < .01, one-tailed t-test
at the differential levels of significance and differential mean differences for positive versus negative value choices: the generation differences are greater relating to negative value choices than to positive value choices, for both sexes and with regard to either-sex parent.

Identification Comparisons

It was hypothesized, Hypothesis 4, that females would identify with maternal expectations on value choices, and that males would identify with paternal expectations. This, is the only hypothesis not confirmed by the results.

An effort to look at whatever identification is going on is assayed in Table 17. In view of the great generation differences, it is doubtful whether any great degree of value identification is valid to talk about. For females, cross-sex identification seems to be operative in value choices. There is the least mean difference and the least significance between females' personal value choices and their perception of their father's expectations, whether positive or negative value choices are concerned. The rest of the picture is rather unclear, but these things stand out:

1. Except for female-father cross-sex identification on negative value choices, there is greater identification for positive value choices than for negative value choices.
TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF GENERATION DIFFERENCES
LOW TO HIGH

VALUE CHOICE SECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Choice Group</th>
<th>Mean Differences</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive, Female--Father</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative, Female--Father</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.174</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive, Male--Father</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>2.291</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positive, Female--Mother</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>2.215</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Positive, Male--Mother</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>3.504</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Negative, Female--Mother</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Negative, Male--Father</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.552</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Negative, Male--Mother</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>5.506</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. There is the greatest "identification gap" for males on negative value choices, whether relating to mother or father.

3. Females relate better to mother's expectations on positive value choices than males do.

4. Males relate better to fathers on positive value choices than they do to fathers on negative value choices.

5. Males tend to same-sex identification on values more than females, but not as strongly as females tend to cross-sex identification.
Parental Comparisons

The comparisons shown in Tables 13, 14, 15, and 16 contained confirmation of Hypothesis 5, that Ss would perceive a discrepancy between maternal and paternal expectations.

Females felt that mothers expected higher acceptance of positive items (Table 13) than fathers did on all of the seven positive items except number 7; they felt that mothers would expect them to speak to a stranger on the street more than fathers would, although the difference was not significant. This may be accounted for by females' perceptions of their father's concern about flirting. There were significant differences on all but two of the positive choice items (number 4--"Visit A Sick Friend" and number 7).

Females felt that mothers expected greater rejection of negative value choice items than fathers did (Table 14) on every one of the negative choice items. There were significant differences on five of the negative choice items, but not on numbers 9 (Go To A Motion Picture) and 13 (Smoke Marijuana). On those two negative choice items, females perceived agreement between their parents on the level of rejection expected.

Males felt that mothers expected greater acceptance of positive value choices than fathers did (Table 15) on five of the positive choice items, and all five reached the
level of significance. On the two items numbered 4 (Visit A Sick Friend) and 7 (Speak To A Stranger), they felt that fathers expected greater acceptance of these positive values than mothers did, but neither was significantly different.

Males perceived significant differences between maternal and paternal expectations on all but one of the negative value choice (Table 16) items. Item number 14 (Push Heroin) was not significantly different. On all of the items except number 7, males perceived that mothers expected greater rejection of the choice than fathers did.

A partial confirmation of the stereotyped "religious home" begins to emerge from this comparison. The mother's value choice expectations are at the extremes of the continuum, expecting great acceptance of positive value choices and great rejection of negative value choices. The father's value choice expectations are intermediate in both positive and negative choice situations. A look back at the section on generation differences reveals that young people are on the opposite end of the continuum from mother. Father is caught in the middle on value choice expectations, between an idealistic wife and children forging their own values.

A comparison of the perceived parental differences in Tables 13 and 15 (positive value choices) with Tables 14 and 16 (negative value choices) shows that in both differential of mean differences and levels of significance,
there is greater parental discrepancy on the negative choice items than on the positive ones. It would be helpful to know whether this parental inconsistency created the greater generation difference in negative than in positive value choices, or whether differential parental reaction to the generation differences produced the parental differences.

**Parent-Absent Analysis**

The 18 Ss who were removed from the original sample for failing to fill out large sections of The Survey that related to parental attitudes and expectations were compared with the entire group on personal value choices. No effort was made to separate these 18 Ss on the basis of sex or on the differential basis of which parent was absent, due to the ridiculously small Ns which would result. The means, standard deviations and comparisons between the total sample (N=385) and the parent-absent group (N=18) may be seen in Tables 18 and 19. Mean differences ranged from .01 to -.48 on the positive value choices, but none of the mean differences was statistically significant. Mean differences ranged from .04 to .43 on the negative value choices, but none of the mean differences was statistically significant.

**Investigation of Perceived Child-Rearing Influences**

Three rather extensive approaches were utilized to endeavor to establish antecedents of the degree of perceived
### TABLE 18
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND COMPARISONS OF TEST GROUP AND PARENT-ABSENT GROUP

**POSITIVE VALUE CHOICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Group (N=385)</td>
<td>X 4.32</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 1.51</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Absent (N=18)</td>
<td>X 4.32</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 1.49</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons:

Test Group — Parent-Absent Group

|        | 10   | -.28 | -.10 | -.48 | .09  | .01  | .24  |

### TABLE 19
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND COMPARISONS OF TEST GROUP AND PARENT-ABSENT GROUP

**NEGATIVE VALUE CHOICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Group (N=385)</td>
<td>X 3.85</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 1.22</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Absent (N=18)</td>
<td>X 4.17</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 1.77</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons:

Test Group — Parent-Absent Group

|        | -.32 | -.30 | .15  | .43  | .27  | .04  | -.05 |

Parent-Absent Group

| n.s. | n.s. | n.s. | n.s. | n.s. | n.s. | n.s. | n.s. |
generation similarity or difference on the personal value choices in perceptions of parental values and attitudes. First, an 82 X 82 intercorrelation matrix for each sex was computed. This compared all 40 semantic differential items for parental values and items with one another, as well as showing degree of correlation with the 42 personal value choice items. This analysis provided the following information:

1. There are clusters of highly correlated items within the semantic differential, which could be identified with an orthogonal factor analysis;

2. There are items within the value choice section which correlate fairly high with each other, which could also be factor-analyzed to provide a new set of mutually independent choice items; and

3. The correlations between individual items on the semantic differential and individual items on the personal value choice section were not high enough to chart meaningfully, although there were occasional items with correlations as high as .45 or .50.

A step-wise multiple regression analysis was run to endeavor to partial out the primary influence in each of the value choices. The findings were exceedingly voluminous
and inconclusive. On some items, perception of father's values and attitudes contributed the greatest portion of variance, and on others, perception of mother's values and attitudes provided the preponderance of influence. On still other items, a combination of six to eight semantic differential items, taken together, from both the sections, provided the best method of prediction. Nevertheless, no single factor (mother's values, father's values, combined responses) contributed as much as .50 of the total variance. Continued analysis in this direction seemed to involve more time than the possible results could warrant, with no clear picture of a dominant source of variation.

In a last effort to establish some validity for the effect of perceived parental values and attitudes as antecedents of personal value choices, efforts were made to divide the large sample (N=385) into three groups for each sex on the basis of their responses on the semantic differential to Parental Values and Attitudes. These sub-groups are conceived as those who responded at the negative end of the continuum (lows), in the intermediate range ( mediums), and at the positive end of the semantic spaces (highs). Comparisons of these three sub-groups in personal value choices and parental expectations may reveal some directional differences that would be meaningful with regard to the generation differences. The writer had a suspicion that students scoring negatively (lows) on the semantic
differential perceived parents as "rejective, inhumane" and would experience greater variation between personal value choices and parental expectations; that students who scored in the intermediate range (mediums) perceived parents as "realistic, human" and would experience the least variation on generation differences; and that students who scored most positively (highs) on the semantic differential perceived parents as "perfectionistic and controlling," and would perceive an intermediate amount of generation variation.

Males were divided into three such groups: those whose averages on the 40 semantic differentials were 5.4 or above (N=53); those whose averages fell between 4.7 and 5.399 (N=56) and those whose averages went from 4.699 downward (N=80). The absolute values of all differences between personal value choices and an average of parental expectations was computed for each group, and then the absolute values were divided by the N in each group, to arrive at a mean amount of variation for each group, for an entire section of personal value choices. The results of this investigation may be seen in Table 20. Actually, the least amount of total generation variation for males was in the High group; there was an intermediate amount for the Medium group, and indeed the greatest amount of variation was for the Low group.
TABLE 20
AVERAGE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERSONAL VALUE CHOICES AND PARENTAL EXPECTATIONS FOR HIGH, MEDIUM, AND LOW GROUPS ON PARENTAL VALUES AND ATTITUDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Value Choices (7 Items)</td>
<td>6.121</td>
<td>5.879</td>
<td>9.148</td>
<td>5.147</td>
<td>6.286</td>
<td>6.563</td>
<td>3.301</td>
<td>4.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Value Choices (7 Items)</td>
<td>4.831</td>
<td>5.112</td>
<td>7.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Female (14 Items)</td>
<td>10.952</td>
<td>10.991</td>
<td>16.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Male (14 Items)</td>
<td>8.448</td>
<td>10.831</td>
<td>12.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 Females were also divided into three groups: those whose semantic differential averages on all 40 responses averaged 5.4 or above (N=62); those whose response averages fell between 4.9 and 5.399 (N=58); and those whose averages went from 4.399 downward (N=71). The same type of computations were made, and the results may be seen in Table 20. There was almost no difference between the Highs and Mediums for females in perceived generation differences.

It is interesting to note that females had more absolute value variance both as to range of mean variance and amount within a group.

There are two important problems in this analysis, which could conceivably be corrected in further study: there is no way to assess the direction of the variation (negative movement away from parents' expectations in the direction of rejection or positive movement away from the parents' expectations in the direction of acceptance) and there are no tests of statistical significance which have been applied to this way of analyzing the data.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The literature on generation differences in values is broad and primarily conjectural, or extremely specific (and with younger age groups usually) if research-oriented. There persist, however, the following indications:

1. There are probably generation differences in value choices; or there are at least differences in values perceived by members of both generations.

2. Value choices may be best studied when related to specific behavioral situations.

3. There is a great deal of dynamic value change during the adolescent period.

4. There are developmental variables—especially sex differences, birth order differences, and father-absent versus father-present differences—which are greatly affected by the socialization process.

5. The degree of internalization of values dominant in the social environment depends upon complex conceptual-developmental processes.
6. The relationship of parents with children in the dynamic child-rearing situation affects both the intergenerational transmission of values and the personality variables of the child which influence value choice decisions.

7. Cognitive development— influenced by culture, social class, and religious affiliation—often influences or determines the particular mode of response to value decision choices.

It was hypothesized that college students in an atypical, religious college setting would perceive (1) personal value choices characterized by acceptance of positive values and rejection of negative values; (2) sex differences on both value choice situations; (3) generation differences in value choices; (4) same-sex identification with parents on value choices; and (5) parental differences with regard to maternal and paternal expectations in value choices. It was also thought that parent-absent Ss would respond differently than parent-present Ss on value choices; and that perception of negative, intermediate, and positive parental values and attitudes would have differential effects on perceived generation differences.

The hypotheses were tested by administering the Survey of Values to a large number of college students. The Survey of Values was constructed specifically for this purpose, and the behavioral choice items were adapted especially to the
specific atypical value subculture sample. It was designed to measure level of role-taking choice on seven positive behavioral values arranged in graduated form (from best to least good) and on seven negative behavioral values arranged in graduated form (from least bad to worst). There were six levels of role-taking choice possible for each item:

1. Role-acceptance;
2. Role-playing with likelihood of acceptance where social norms indicate peer-group approval;
3. Role-playing, with no feelings of negative or positive approbation, in an experimental sense;
4. Role-playing, in a rebellious sense, in spite of feelings of "ought";
5. Role-fantasizing, or imagining experimenting, with little likelihood of actual participation;
6. Role-rejection.

In addition, the Survey of Values contained a section for assessing perception of parental values and attitudes and for assessing attitude of Ss toward the research instrument itself.
Summary of the Findings

1. Both sexes showed a marked difference in responses to positive and negative value choice items, with high acceptance of positive choices and greater rejection of negative choices.

2. There were sex differences on both positive and negative value choices, with girls more conforming to high acceptance of positive and greater rejection of negative choice items. There were more and greater sex differences on negative choice items than on positive ones.

3. There were highly significant generation differences on a large majority of the specific choice items, with greater generation difference for negative than for positive value choices. There was a greater generation difference between all Ss and mother's expectations than between Ss and father's expectation in value choice situations. Boys experienced a greater "generation gap" in values than did girls.

4. Girls experienced greater cross-sex identification in relation to parental value expectations, while boys experienced same-sex identification, although not as strongly as the girls.
5. Both sexes perceived great discrepancy between maternal and paternal value choice expectations on most of the items, with slightly greater inconsistency between parents, on negative choices.

6. Parent-absent Ss showed no significant differences from the larger parent-present sample on either positive or negative value choices.

7. There were numerical differences in perceived generation differences for Ss who perceived parental values as positive versus negative, with those rating parental values more negative showing considerably greater variation from parental expectations in personal value choices.

Conclusions

Most of the hypotheses were confirmed on most of the choice items. The major exception was the finding of cross-sex identification with parents on value choices for females. The supposition that parent-absent Ss would respond differently on value choices was not confirmed; the stated expectation of differential cross-generation identification for groups responding negatively and positively to parental values was confirmed, although it was not subjected to statistical tests of significance.

It seems safe to conclude that (1) the major hypotheses were confirmed, with exceptions outlined above, and
(2) The Survey of Values (especially the 42-item value choice section) does provide a method for discriminating differential perceptions of different value choices.

Implications For Future Research

The study of the research reported herein reveals several possible manipulations and analyses that would be meaningful, using the present data set.

1. A comparison of Ss with birth-order differences on value choices and on possible generation differences, might reveal interesting differences.

2. A factor analysis of the semantic differential items on parental values and attitudes might provide components which could be more meaningfully related to generation differences in value choices, enabling the writer to say more about child-rearing antecedents of value identification trans-generationally.

3. A factor analysis of the value choices might also provide a smaller number of situations which could then be correlated to the factors found for the semantic differential to enable more effective discrimination.
4. A refinement of the groups formed on the basis of responses to parental values and attitudes looks promising as an aid to the establishment of antecedents for generation differences. Two groups for each sex (Highs and Lows) with equal Ns in each group would present an opportunity for statistical comparisons that might well be revelatory, especially if the analysis also included the capability for determining direction of generational difference.

5. Since the ordering of the behavioral items, using actual means gained in the analyses, does not correspond exactly to the ordering used in The Survey of Values (based on the original pilot study), it might be useful to use a Newman-Keuls test (Winer, 1962) on the ordering of the behavioral choice items, to ascertain whether there is significant distance between the items as ordered by Ss' responses.

Although the Survey of Values needs some refinement, it seems to have some possibilities for discriminating value choices. The specific behavioral items would have to be ascertained and ordered through observation and preliminary research in the population to be tested, but the six different levels of role-taking seem very appropriate for
use in any possible population. The only possible change in these six levels would be the D-responses ("I feel I should, but probably would not") which seems to offer a different response capability on the negative choices than it does on the positive choices. It seems from a study of the frequency distributions in Table 4 that the "D-response" on positive choices were more positive to the sample than were "B" and "C" responses.

There are some interesting results of this study which need to be investigated in other populations—female cross-sex identification, generation differences, greater "gaps" on negative values than on positive, and sex differences. There is some possibility that some or all of these findings are functions of the atypical subculture of the sample.

It should be very meaningful also to investigate the perceptions of the parental generation with regard to these same value choices, to ascertain whether there are perceptual discrepancies for each other between the two generations.
APPENDIX I
FIGURE 1

INSTRUCTIONS AND PAIRED OPPOSITES FOR ORIGINAL SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this study is to measure the meanings of certain things to various people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. On each page of this booklet you will find a different concept to be judged and beneath it a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check mark as follows:

or

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely, you should place your check mark as follows:

or

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

or
FIGURE 1—Continued

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends
upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most character-
istic of the things you're judging. If you consider the
concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale
equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is com-
pletely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you
should place your check mark in the middle space:


IMPORTANT: (1) Place your check marks in the middle of
spaces, not on the boundaries:

This Not This
___ : X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ X ___

(2) Be sure you check every scale for every
concept--do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one check mark on a
single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same item
before on the test. This will not be the case, so do not
look back and forth through the items. Do not try to re-
member how you checked similar items earlier in the test.
Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work
at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or
puzzle over individual items. It is your first impres-
sions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we
want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, be-
cause we want your true impressions.
moral__:____:____:____:____:____:immoral
exciteable__:____:____:____:____:____:____:calm
wise__:____:____:____:____:____:____:foolish
cold__:____:____:____:____:____:____:warm
humble__:____:____:____:____:____:____:proud
unpleasant__:____:____:____:____:____:____:pleasant
selfish__:____:____:____:____:____:____:unselfish
affectionate__:____:____:____:____:____:____:hateful
severe__:____:____:____:____:____:____:lenient
serious__:____:____:____:____:____:____:humorous
sensitive__:____:____:____:____:____:____:insensitive
unconcerned__:____:____:____:____:____:____:concerned
sincere__:____:____:____:____:____:____:insincere
closed__:____:____:____:____:____:____:open
silent__:____:____:____:____:____:____:talkative
good__:____:____:____:____:____:____:bad
unreasonable__:____:____:____:____:____:____:reasonable
consistent__:____:____:____:____:____:____:inconsistent
rigid__:____:____:____:____:____:____:flexible
permissive__:____:____:____:____:____:____:restrictive
communicative__:____:____:____:____:____:____:uncommunicative
irreligious__:____:____:____:____:____:____:religious
fair__:____:____:____:____:____:____:unfair
impulsive__:____:____:____:____:____:____:controlled
trusting__:____:____:____:____:____:____:distrusting
pessimistic:____:____:____:____:____:optimistic
strong:____:____:____:____:____:weak
kind:____:____:____:____:____:unkind
tense:____:____:____:____:____:relaxed
accepting:____:____:____:____:____:rejecting
immature:____:____:____:____:____:mature
realistic:____:____:____:____:____:unrealistic
FIGURE 2

ORIGINAL POSSIBLE NEGATIVE VALUE CHOICES

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME OR ANY OTHER IDENTIFYING MARKS ON THIS PAPER. IT IS HOPED THAT THE ANONYMITY WILL PRODUCE OPEN AND OBJECTIVE RESPONSES.

On the blank provided in front of each of the following statements, please number from 1-10 indicating how bad you think these things are: a (10) means that they are very bad; a (1) would indicate that it is not very bad.

1. ___ to wear gaudy, immodest clothing
2. ___ to tell a lie to hurt someone else
3. ___ to covet (want very badly) your neighbor's new car or new house
4. ___ to kill someone
5. ___ to drive two (2) miles over the speed limit in an uninhabited area
6. ___ to gamble on a football game or horse race
7. ___ to get a divorce
8. ___ to curse, swear, take God's name in vain
9. ___ to attend a rock music festival
10. ___ to gossip about an acquaintance
11. ___ to buy groceries or gas on Sunday
12. ___ to tell a lie to protect yourself
13. ___ to cheat on a test in a college class
14. ___ to steal money or material from a company I work for
15. ___ to have sexual intercourse outside marriage relationship
16. ___ to go to the motion picture theatre
17. ___ to smoke cigarette, cigar, or pipe
18. ___ to drink beer
19. ___ to drink hard liquor
20. ___ to smoke marijuana
21. ___ to use LSD, heroin, or other hard drugs
22. ___ to sell or push heroin, LSD or other hard drugs
23. ___ to quarrel, fight and try to hurt someone else physically
FIGURE 3

ORIGINAL POSSIBLE POSITIVE VALUE CHOICES

Please do not write your name or any other identifying marks on this paper. It is hoped that the anonymity will produce open and objective responses.

On the blank provided in front of each of the following statements, please number from 1-10, indicating how good you think these things are: a (10) means that they are very good; a (1) would indicate that it is not very good.

1. _____ to forgive an enemy who has wronged me
2. _____ to pray and read my Bible every day
3. _____ to make life's decisions in line with a complete personal commitment to God
4. _____ to give someone else a positive personal witness about Christ's love
5. _____ to invite someone else to attend my church
6. _____ to give food and clothing to the poor
7. _____ to be kind and respectful to my parents
8. _____ to visit the people in jail
9. _____ to pray with someone who is emotionally depressed
10. _____ to visit a sick friend
11. _____ to speak in a friendly way to strangers on the street
12. _____ to attend church regularly on Sunday and at midweek
13. _____ to give at least 10% of my income to the church
14. _____ to keep the rules of the Manual of the Church of the Nazarene
15. _____ to obey the stated rules of the college
**FIGURE 4**

SEVEN POSITIVE BEHAVIORAL CHOICE ITEMS ADOPTED

TEST OF VALUES

(N, Means, and Standard Deviations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Choice Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. READ THE BIBLE AND PRAY REGULARLY</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GIVE AT LEAST 10% OF MY INCOME TO THE CHURCH</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ATTEND CHURCH REGULARLY ON SUNDAY AND AT MIDWEEK</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. VISIT A SICK FRIEND</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. INVITE SOMEONE ELSE TO ATTEND MY CHURCH</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GIVE FOOD AND CLOTHING TO THE POOR</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SPEAK IN A FRIENDLY MANNER TO A STRANGER ON THE STREET*</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were three items on the list of original positive choice items (Figure 2, Appendix I) that were scored lower than this one, but only one of them was actually used--Item 6 on this list. Item 7 was still deemed innocuous enough to warrant inclusion at the lowest point on the positive scale of choices.*
FIGURE 5

SEVEN NEGATIVE BEHAVIORAL CHOICE ITEMS ADOPTED
TEST OF VALUES
(N, Means, and Standard Deviations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Choice Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. DRIVE FIVE MILES OVER THE SPEED LIMIT IN AN UNINHABITED AREA</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. GO TO MOTION PICTURE THEATRE</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SMOKE CIGARETTES, CIGARS, OR A PIPE*</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. DRINK BEER</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. HAVE SEXUAL INTERCOURSE OUTSIDE THE MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SMOKE MARIJUANA</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SELL, OR &quot;PUSH&quot; HEROIN, LSD, OR COCAINE</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This item was changed in the final publication of the Test of Values to "USE TOBACCO," to avoid artificial distinctions.
SURVEY
OF
VALUES

By Jarrell W. Garsee
General Instructions

1. Please do not write your name or any identifying mark anywhere on these papers. Complete anonymity is desired to encourage open and objective responses.

2. Please do not turn ahead to another page before completing the page you are on.

3. Please do not turn back to a previous page after you have completed it and gone on. Your memory of previous responses is all right, but review may destroy the validity of your responses.

4. Please mark all responses that pertain to you. Skip only the ones not pertinent. (For example, if you have no memory of a father, your father's attitudes would be unknown to you.)

5. Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same item before on the survey. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the survey. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed through this survey. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.

6. In some cases it may be difficult to decide which statement to mark. Make the best decision that you can. This is not a test; there are no right or wrong answers.
Personal Information

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read all of the possible responses under each major numbered item, then check one box only (the single most appropriate response) for each one.

1. I am: [ ] MALE
   [ ] FEMALE

2. I am: [ ] in high school
   [ ] a Freshman in college
   [ ] a Sophomore in college
   [ ] a Junior in college
   [ ] a Senior in college
   [ ] not in school
   [ ] a graduate student

3. I am: [ ] single
   [ ] married
   [ ] divorced

4. I am: [ ] 15 years of age or younger
   [ ] 16 or 17 years of age
   [ ] 18 years of age
   [ ] 19 years of age
   [ ] 20 - 22 years of age
   [ ] 23 - 25 years of age
   [ ] 26 - 40 years of age
   [ ] 41 or over

5. I am: [ ] an only child
   [ ] the first-born (oldest) child in a family with 2 or more children
   [ ] the last-born (youngest) child in a family with 2 or more children
   [ ] a middle-born child in a family with 3 or more children
Personal Information

6. I am:  
   1. an adopted child
   2. a natural child
   3. a foster child

7. My parents are:  
   1. both living
   2. mother only living
   3. father only living
   4. neither one still living

8. My parents are:  
   1. divorced
   2. living together
   3. separated, but not divorced

9. I live with:  
   1. both natural parents
   2. mother only
   3. father only
   4. mother and stepfather
   5. father and stepmother
   6. neither parent
Instructions

The purpose of this study is to measure the meanings of certain things to various people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this survey, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. On each of the next two pages you will find a different concept to be judged and beneath it a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:
If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging. If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your check-marks in the middle of space, not on the boundaries:

This

Not This

(2) Be sure you check every scale for every concept - do not omit any

(3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale

Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same item before on the test. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.
My Mother's Values and Attitudes

My Father's Values and Attitudes

excitable: calm
cold: warm
humble: proud
selfish: unselfish
severe: lenient
serious: humorous
sensitive: insensitive
closed: open
silent: talkative
unreasonable: reasonable
consistent: inconsistent
rigid: flexible
permissive: restrictive
impulsive: controlled
trust: distrusting
pessimistic: optimistic
tense: relaxed
accepting: rejecting
immature: mature
realistic: unrealistic
My Personal Value Choices

INSTRUCTIONS: On the following 14 value choice items, read carefully all six possible responses under each item of possible behavior, and then place a mark by the one response which best describes your own view of your probable choice.

1. **READ THE BIBLE AND PRAY REGULARLY**
   - A) I have no feeling about it, but would occasionally try it.
   - B) I feel I should, but would probably not do so consistently.
   - C) I would always do so, if well and in control of my senses.
   - D) I would definitely not do so, under any circumstances.
   - E) I would think about it, but probably not ever actually get to it.
   - F) I would try to do so, especially if others in my social circle did so.

2. **VISIT A SICK FRIEND**
   - A) I would be glad to go with a group of my friends to visit a mutual sick friend.
   - B) I just can't even imagine myself as the kind of person who would be visiting a sick friend.
   - C) I would think about it, but probably not actually do so.
   - D) I have no feelings about it, and would probably do so on occasion.
   - E) I would conscientiously make it a consistent practice to visit all my sick friends.
   - F) I feel I should, but would probably not do so consistently.

3. **DRIVE 5 MILES OVER THE SPEED LIMIT IN AN UNINHABITED AREA**
   - A) I would not hesitate to do so if others in my group were doing so.
   - B) I would think about the possibility of doing so, but wouldn't actually "speed."
   - C) I have no feelings about it, and would probably do so on occasion.
   - D) I definitely would never do so.
   - E) I feel I should not, but might do so every now and then.
   - F) I would do so as a matter of course.
My Personal Value Choices

4. ATTEND CHURCH REGULARLY ON SUNDAY AND AT MIDWEEK
   A) I would try to do so, especially if my closest acquaintances did.
   B) I have no feeling about it, but would probably go occasionally.
   C) I would definitely not attend regular services of the church.
   D) I would think about going, but probably not attend.
   E) I feel I should, but would probably attend only on very special occasions, like Easter or Christmas.
   F) I would always do so, if physically able.

5. USE TOBACCO
   A) I have no feelings about it, and would certainly try it to see if it was enjoyable.
   B) I feel I should not, but might occasionally experiment with it.
   C) I would do so as a normal part of my style of life, regardless of the activities or attitudes of others.
   D) I have tried to imagine what it would be like but probably would not go so far as to actually try it.
   E) I would certainly do so when with a group of people who do.
   F) I definitely would never use tobacco, under any circumstances.

6. SELL, OR "PUSH" HEROIN, LSD, OR COCAINE
   A) I would do so if the laws against it were relaxed, and I needed the money.
   B) I feel I shouldn't, but I might try it once or twice.
   C) I would never do so even once; the idea is repulsive to me.
   D) I would be glad to do so.
   E) I wouldn't want this to be my primary occupation in our present society, but certainly wouldn't mind doing it occasionally if I didn't get caught.
   F) I have tried to imagine what this kind of life would be like, but wouldn't ever try it.
My Personal Value Choices

7. GIVE AT LEAST 10% OF MY INCOME TO THE CHURCH
   ______ A) I feel like I should, but would probably not do so consistently.
   ______ B) I would try to do so, if it was expected in my local church.
   ______ C) I have no feeling about it, but I might if I liked the preacher or the church.
   ______ D) I would think about it, but would probably not do it.
   ______ E) I very definitely would do so, regardless of the activities of others.
   ______ F) I very definitely would not do so, under any circumstances.

8. SMOKE MARIJUANA
   ______ A) I am curious and have tried to imagine what it's like, but would not actually try it.
   ______ B) I have no feelings about it, and would probably experiment with it to see if it was enjoyable.
   ______ C) I feel I should not, but might try it once or twice.
   ______ D) Rejecting even the idea, I would never do so.
   ______ E) I would smoke marijuana occasionally in social groups.
   ______ F) I would smoke marijuana frequently, as a part of my normal life, without regard to the actions and attitudes of others.

9. SPEAK IN A FRIENDLY MANNER TO A STRANGER ON THE STREET
   ______ A) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would speak in a friendly manner to a stranger on the street.
   ______ B) I would certainly do so in a regular and consistent manner.
   ______ C) If others in a group I was with spoke to a stranger, I would also.
   ______ D) I would think about, but probably would not actually speak.
   ______ E) I have no feeling about it, but might speak if he spoke first or looked directly at me in a friendly personal way.
   ______ F) I feel I should, but probably just wouldn't get involved that way.
My Personal Value Choices

10. HAVE SEXUAL INTERCOURSE OUTSIDE THE MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP

A) I feel I should not, but might do so if I was in love and we both agreed to do so.

B) I am certainly curious and would try to imagine what it would be like, but probably would not actually have intercourse outside marriage.

C) I have no feelings about it, and would probably do so occasionally as long as I didn't hurt someone else.

D) I probably would on occasion if I was involved with a peer group where it was accepted.

E) I would definitely never do so.

F) I would regard this as normal behavior, and would certainly do so if the other party was in full agreement.

11. INVITE SOMEONE ELSE TO ATTEND MY CHURCH

A) I might occasionally invite someone to attend church with me if the subject came up in a conversation with friends.

B) I would do so regularly and consistently, as a routine part of my life.

C) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would invite anyone else to attend church.

D) I would think about it, but probably would not actually say anything about it to anyone else.

E) I have no feeling about it, but would probably occasionally mention the possibility of someone attending my church with me.

F) I feel I should, but would probably not be forward enough to mention this to anyone else.

12. DRINK BEER

A) I have no negative feelings about it, and would probably try it to see if it was enjoyable.

B) I would do so frequently as a normal part of my life, no matter what others think or do.

C) I would try to imagine what it's like, but would not try it.

D) I feel that I should not, but I would still try it.

E) I would do so as part of any social gathering or social occasion where others were drinking beer.

F) I definitely would never do so, under any circumstances.
My Personal Value Choices

13. GIVE FOOD AND CLOTHING TO THE POOR
   ___ A) I might occasionally give to a community or church drive to accumulate items for other people.
   ___ B) I have no feeling about it, but might give to the Good Will or Salvation Army every once in a great while.
   ___ C) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would give food and clothing to the poor.
   ___ D) I feel I probably should, but wouldn't ever get around actually to giving.
   ___ E) I would do so regularly and consistently.
   ___ F) I would think about it, but probably would not actually give anything.

14. GO TO MOTION PICTURE THEATRE
   ___ A) I have tried to imagine what it would be like, but probably would not actually go.
   ___ B) I feel I should not, but I go to those shows which I consider to be "good."
   ___ C) I would do so frequently even by myself with no effort to discriminate as to the type of show.
   ___ D) I would be glad to go with a group of friends for an evening of fun.
   ___ E) I have no feelings about it, and would certainly go from time to time.
   ___ F) I definitely would never do so, under any circumstances.
My Perception of My Father's Expectations

INSTRUCTIONS FOR MARKING:
On the following 14 value choice items, read carefully all six possible responses under each item of behavior, and then place a mark by the one response which you feel best describes the choice your father would expect (or hope for) you to make. (One way to do this would be to imagine that these items were being read, and you were being asked to give your response out loud, knowing that your father would hear you, and try to choose the response which would bring the greatest pleasure to your father.)

1. DRINK BEER
   ____ A) I would do so frequently as a normal part of my life, no matter what others think or do.
   ____ B) I definitely would never do so, under any circumstances.
   ____ C) I have no negative feelings about it, and would probably try it to see if it was enjoyable.
   ____ D) I would do so as part of any social gathering or social occasion where others were drinking beer.
   ____ E) I would try to imagine what it's like, but would not try it.
   ____ F) I feel that I should not, but I would still try it.

2. ATTEND CHURCH REGULARLY ON SUNDAY AND AT MIDWEEK
   ____ A) I have no feeling about it, but would probably go occasionally.
   ____ B) I would think about going, but probably not attend.
   ____ C) I feel I should, but would probably attend only on very special occasions, like Easter or Christmas.
   ____ D) I would try to do so, especially if my closest acquaintances did.
   ____ E) I would definitely not attend regular services of the church.
   ____ F) I would always do so, if physically able.

3. GO TO MOTION PICTURE THEATRE
   ____ A) I feel I should not, but I go to those shows which I consider to be "good".
   ____ B) I have no feelings about it, and would certainly go from time to time.
   ____ C) I definitely would never do so, under any circumstances.
   ____ D) I have tried to imagine what it would be like, but probably would not actually go.
   ____ E) I would do so frequently even by myself with no effort to discriminate as to the type of show.
   ____ F) I would be glad to go with a group of friends for an evening of fun.
My Perception of My Father's Expectations

4. DRIVE 5 MILES OVER THE SPEED LIMIT IN AN UNINHABITED AREA
   A) I would not hesitate to do so if others in my group were doing so.
   B) I have no feelings about it, and would probably do so on occasion.
   C) I would do so as a matter of course.
   D) I would think about the possibility of doing so, but wouldn't actually "speed".
   E) I definitely would never do so.
   F) I feel I should not, but might do so every now and then.

5. SELL, OR "PUSH", HEROIN, LSD, OR COCAINE
   A) I would do so if the laws against it were relaxed, and I needed the money.
   B) I would be glad to do so.
   C) I feel I shouldn't, but I might try it once or twice.
   D) I have tried to imagine what this kind of life would be like, but wouldn't ever try it.
   E) I wouldn't want this to be my primary occupation in our present society, but certainly wouldn't mind doing it occasionally if I didn't get caught.
   F) I would never do so even one time; the idea is repulsive to me.

6. READ THE BIBLE AND PRAY REGULARLY
   A) I would think about it, but probably not ever actually get to it.
   B) I have no feeling about it, but would occasionally try it.
   C) I would definitely not do so, under any circumstances.
   D) I would always do so, if well and in control of my senses.
   E) I would try to do so, especially if others in my social circle did so.
   F) I feel I should, but would probably not do so consistently.
My Perception of My Father's Expectations

7. SPEAK IN A FRIENDLY MANNER TO A STRANGER ON THE STREET
   A) I feel I should, but probably just wouldn't get involved that way.
   B) I have no feeling about it, but might speak if he spoke first or looked directly at me in a friendly, personal way.
   C) If others in a group I was with spoke to a stranger, I would also.
   D) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would speak in a friendly manner to a stranger on the street.
   E) I would think about it, but probably would not actually speak.
   F) I would certainly do so in a regular and consistent manner.

8. HAVE SEXUAL INTERCOURSE OUTSIDE THE MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP
   A) I would regard this as normal behavior, and would certainly do so if the other party was in full agreement.
   B) I feel I should not, but might do so if I was in love and we both agreed to do so.
   C) I am certainly curious and would try to imagine what it would be like, but probably would not actually have intercourse outside marriage.
   D) I probably would on occasion if I was involved with a peer group where it was accepted.
   E) I have no feelings about it, and would probably do so occasionally as long as I didn't hurt someone else.
   F) I would definitely never do so.

9. INVITE SOMEONE ELSE TO ATTEND MY CHURCH
   A) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would invite anyone else to attend church.
   B) I have no feeling about it, but would probably occasionally mention the possibility of someone attending my church with me.
   C) I would do so regularly and consistently as a routine part of my life.
   D) I might occasionally invite someone to attend church with me if the subject came up in a conversation with friends.
   E) I feel I should, but would probably not be forward enough to mention this to anyone else.
   F) I would think about it, but probably would not actually say anything about it to anyone else.
My Perception of My Father's Expectations

10. GIVE AT LEAST 10% OF MY INCOME TO THE CHURCH

   ___ A) I very definitely would not do so, under any circumstances.
   ___ B) I very definitely would do so, regardless of the activities of others.
   ___ C) I would try to do so, if it was expected in my local church.
   ___ D) I feel like I should, but probably not do so consistently.
   ___ E) I have no feeling about it, but I might if I liked the preacher or the church.
   ___ F) I would think about it, but would probably not do it.

11. GIVE FOOD AND CLOTHING TO THE POOR

   ___ A) I might occasionally give to a community or church drive to accumulate items for other people.
   ___ B) I feel I probably should, but wouldn't ever get around actually to giving.
   ___ C) I have no feeling about it, but might give to the Good Will or Salvation Army every once in a great while.
   ___ D) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would give food and clothing to the poor.
   ___ E) I would do so regularly and consistently.
   ___ F) I would think about it, but probably would not actually give anything.

12. USE TOBACCO

   ___ A) I definitely would never use tobacco, under any circumstances.
   ___ B) I have no feeling about it, and would certainly try it to see if it was enjoyable.
   ___ C) I have tried to imagine what it would be like but probably would not go so far as to actually try it.
   ___ D) I would certainly do so when with a group of people who do.
   ___ E) I feel I should not, but might occasionally experiment with it.
   ___ F) I would do so as a normal part of my style of life, regardless of the activities or attitudes of others.
My Perception of My Father's Expectations

13. VISIT A SICK FRIEND

_____ A) I would be glad to go with a group of my friends to visit a mutual sick friend.

_____ B) I feel I should, but would probably not do so consistently.

_____ C) I would think about it, but probably not actually do so.

_____ D) I have no feeling about it, but would probably occasionally visit a sick friend.

_____ E) I just can't even imagine myself as the kind of person who would be visiting a sick friend.

_____ F) I would conscientiously make it a consistent practice to visit all my sick friends.

14. SMOKE MARIJUANA

_____ A) I would smoke marijuana frequently, as a part of my normal life, without regard to the actions and attitudes of others.

_____ B) Rejecting even the idea. I would never do so.

_____ C) I have no feeling about it, and would probably experiment with it to see if it was enjoyable.

_____ D) I would smoke marijuana occasionally in social groups.

_____ E) I feel I should not, but might try it once or twice.

_____ F) I am curious and have tried to imagine what it's like, but would not actually try it.
My Perception of My Mother's Expectations

INSTRUCTIONS FOR MARKING:
On the following 14 value choice items, read carefully all six possible responses under each item of behavior, and then place a mark by the one response which you feel best describes the choice your mother would expect (or hope for) you to make. (One way to do this would be to imagine that these items were being read, and you were being asked to give your response out loud, knowing that your mother would hear you, and try to choose the response which would bring the greatest pleasure to your mother.)

1. SPEAK IN A FRIENDLY MANNER TO A STRANGER ON THE STREET
   _____ A) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would speak in a friendly manner to a stranger on the street.
   _____ B) I would think about it, but probably would not actually speak.
   _____ C) If others in a group I was with spoke to a stranger, I would also.
   _____ D) I feel I should, but probably just wouldn't get involved that way.
   _____ E) I have no feeling about it, but might speak if he spoke first or looked directly at me in a friendly, personal way.
   _____ F) I would certainly do so in a regular and consistent manner.

2. SELL, OR "PUSH" HEROIN, LSD, OR COCAINE
   _____ A) I would be glad to do so.
   _____ B) I wouldn't want this to be my primary occupation in our present society, but certainly wouldn't mind doing it occasionally if I didn't get caught.
   _____ C) I would do so if the laws against it were relaxed, and I needed the money.
   _____ D) I have tried to imagine what this kind of life would be like, but wouldn't ever try it.
   _____ E) I would never do so even once; the idea is repulsive to me.
   _____ F) I feel I shouldn't, but I might try it once or twice.
My Perception of My Mother's Expectations

3. INVITE SOMEONE ELSE TO ATTEND MY CHURCH

A) I have no feeling about it, but would probably occasionally mention the possibility of someone attending my church with me.

B) I feel I should, but would probably not be forward enough to mention this to anyone else.

C) I might occasionally invite someone to attend church with me if the subject came up in a conversation with friends.

D) I would think about it, but probably would not actually say anything about it to anyone else.

E) I would do so regularly and consistently, as a routine part of my life.

F) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would invite anyone else to attend church.

4. USE TOBACCO

A) I would certainly do so when with a group of people who do.

B) I would do so as a normal part of my style of life, regardless of the activities or attitudes of others.

C) I definitely would never use tobacco, under any circumstances.

D) I have tried to imagine what it would be like but probably would not go so far as to actually try it.

E) I feel I should not, but might occasionally experiment with it.

F) I have no feelings about it, and would certainly try it to see if it was enjoyable.

5. SMOKE MARIJUANA

A) I would smoke marijuana occasionally in social groups.

B) I would smoke marijuana frequently as a part of my normal life, without regard to the actions and attitudes of others.

C) Rejecting even the idea, I would never do so.

D) I feel I should not, but might try it once or twice.

E) I have no feelings about it, and would probably experiment with it to see if it was enjoyable.

F) I am curious and have tried to imagine what it's like, but would not actually try it.
My Perception of My Mother's Expectations

6. **GIVE AT LEAST 10% OF MY INCOME TO THE CHURCH**
   - A) I would try to do so, if it was expected in my local church.
   - B) I have no feeling about it, but I might if I liked the preacher or the church.
   - C) I very definitely would do so, regardless of the activities of others.
   - D) I very definitely would not do so, under any circumstances.
   - E) I feel like I should, but would probably not do so consistently.
   - F) I would think about it, but would probably not do it.

7. **HAVE SEXUAL INTERCOURSE OUTSIDE THE MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP**
   - A) I feel I should not, but might do so if I was in love and we both agreed to do so.
   - B) I am certainly curious and would try to imagine what it would be like, but probably would not actually have intercourse outside marriage.
   - C) I would regard this as normal behavior, and would certainly do so if the other party was in full agreement.
   - D) I would definitely never do so.
   - E) I probably would on occasion if I was involved with a peer group where it was accepted.
   - F) I have no feelings about it, and would probably do so occasionally as long as I didn't hurt someone else.

8. **VISIT A SICK FRIEND**
   - A) I feel I should, but would probably not do so consistently.
   - B) I would conscientiously make it a consistent practice to visit all my sick friends.
   - C) I have no feeling about it, but would probably occasionally visit a sick friend.
   - D) I just can't even imagine myself as the kind of person who would be visiting a sick friend.
   - E) I would think about it, but probably not actually do so.
   - F) I would be glad to go with a group of my friends to visit a mutual sick friend.
My Perception of My Mother's Expectations

9. GIVE FOOD AND CLOTHING TO THE POOR
   A) I feel I probably should, but wouldn't ever get around actually to giving.
   B) I would do so regularly and consistently.
   C) I have no feeling about it, but might give to the Good Will or Salvation Army every once in a great while.
   D) I would think about it, but probably would not actually give anything.
   E) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would give food and clothing to the poor.
   F) I might occasionally give to a community or church drive to accumulate items for other people.

10. READ THE BIBLE AND PRAY REGULARLY
    A) I feel I should, but would probably not do so consistently.
    B) I would try to do so, especially if others in my social circle did so.
    C) I have no feeling about it, but would occasionally try it.
    D) I would definitely not do so, under any circumstances.
    E) I would think about it, but probably not ever actually get to it.
    F) I would always do so, if well and in control of my senses.

11. ATTEND CHURCH REGULARLY ON SUNDAY AND AT MIDWEEK
    A) I would think about going, but probably not attend.
    B) I would definitely not attend regular services of the church.
    C) I feel I should, but would probably attend only on very special occasions, like Easter or Christmas.
    D) I have no feeling about it, but would probably go occasionally.
    E) I would always do so, if physically able.
    F) I would try to do so, especially if my closest acquaintances did.
My Perception of My Mother's Expectations

12. DRIVE 5 MILES OVER THE SPEED LIMIT IN AN UNINHABITED AREA
   ______ A) I have no feelings about it, and would probably do so on occasion.
   ______ B) I would think about the possibility of doing so, but wouldn't actually "speed".
   ______ C) I would do so as a matter of course.
   ______ D) I would not hesitate to do so if others in my group were doing so.
   ______ E) I definitely would never do so.
   ______ F) I feel I should not, but might do so every now and then.

13. DRINK BEER
   ______ A) I feel that I should not, but I would still try it.
   ______ B) I definitely would never do so, under any circumstances.
   ______ C) I would do so as part of any social gathering or social occasion where others were drinking beer.
   ______ D) I would try to imagine what it's like, but would not try it.
   ______ E) I would do so frequently as a normal part of my life, no matter what others think or do.
   ______ F) I have no negative feelings about it, and would probably try it to see if it was enjoyable.

14. GO TO MOTION PICTURE THEATRE
   ______ A) I have no feelings about it, and would certainly go from time to time.
   ______ B) I would be glad to go with a group of friends for an evening of fun.
   ______ C) I definitely would never do so, under any circumstances.
   ______ D) I have tried to imagine what it would be like, but probably would not actually go.
   ______ E) I would do so frequently even by myself with no effort to discriminate as to the type of show.
   ______ F) I feel I should not, but I go to those shows which I consider to be "good".
Attitude Measure

INSTRUCTIONS:
Place a mark at the appropriate place between the two opposing scales for each of the following ideas in relation to this survey.

1. In my opinion, this research is:
   good _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: bad
   important _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: foolish
   meaningful _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: meaningless
   weak _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: strong

2. My own responses on these questionnaires were:
   dishonest _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: honest
   well reasoned out _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: simply guesses
   truly representative of me _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: merely random choice
   open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: devious

3. I felt that my anonymity:
   was _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: was not guarded closely enough

4. I felt that I could be:
   open _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: guarded in my responses.
APPENDIX II
FIGURE 7

PERMUTED SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, NEGATIVE TO POSITIVE

FIGURE 8

PERMUTED VALUE CHOICES, BEST TO WORST
ON NUMBERED ITEMS, ACCEPTANCE TO REJECTION ON LETTERED RESPONSES

1. READ THE BIBLE AND PRAY REGULARLY

___ A) I would always do so, if well and in control of my senses.

___ B) I would try to do so, especially if others in my social circle did so.

___ C) I have no feeling about it, but would occasionally try it.

___ D) I feel I should, but would probably not do so consistently.

___ E) I would think about it, but probably not even actually get to it.

___ F) I would definitely not do so, under any circumstances.

2. GIVE AT LEAST 10% OF MY INCOME TO THE CHURCH

___ A) I very definitely would do so, regardless of the activities of others.

___ B) I would try to do so, if it was expected in my local church.

___ C) I have no feeling about it, but I might if I liked the preacher or the church.

___ D) I feel like I should, but would probably not do so consistently.

___ E) I would think about it, but would probably not do it.

___ F) I very definitely would not do so, under any circumstances.
3. ATTEND CHURCH REGULARLY ON SUNDAY AND AT MIDWEEK

___A) I would always do so, if physically able.

___B) I would try to do so, especially if my closest acquaintances did.

___C) I have no feeling about it, but would probably go occasionally.

___D) I feel I should, but would probably attend only on very special occasions, like Easter or Christmas.

___E) I would think about going, but probably not attend.

___F) I would definitely not attend regular services of the church.

4. VISIT A SICK FRIEND

___A) I would conscientiously make it a consistent practice to visit all my sick friends.

___B) I would be glad to go with a group of my friends to visit a mutual sick friend.

___C) I have no feeling about it, but would probably occasionally visit a sick friend.

___D) I feel I should, but would probably not do so consistently.

___E) I would think about it, but probably not actually do so.

___F) I just can't even imagine myself as the kind of person who would be visiting a sick friend.
FIGURE 8--Continued

5. **INVITE SOMEONE ELSE TO ATTEND MY CHURCH**

   A) I would do so regularly and consistently, as a routine part of my life.

   B) I might occasionally invite someone to attend church with me if the subject came up in a conversation with friends.

   C) I have no feeling about it, but would probably occasionally mention the possibility of someone attending my church with me.

   D) I feel I should, but would probably not be forward enough to mention this to anyone else.

   E) I would think about it, but probably would not actually say anything about it to anyone else.

   F) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would invite anyone else to attend church.

6. **GIVE FOOD AND CLOTHING TO THE POOR**

   A) I would do so regularly and consistently.

   B) I might occasionally give to a community or church drive to accumulate items for other people.

   C) I have no feeling about it, but might give to the Good Will or Salvation Army every once in a great while.

   D) I feel I probably should, but wouldn't ever get around actually to giving.

   E) I would think about it, but probably would not actually give anything.

   F) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would give food and clothing to the poor.
FIGURE 8—Continued

7. SPEAK IN A FRIENDLY MANNER TO A STRANGER ON THE STREET

   ____ A) I would certainly do so in a regular and consistent manner.

   ____ B) If others in a group I was with spoke to a stranger, I would also.

   ____ C) I have no feeling about it, but might speak if he spoke first or looked directly at me in a friendly, personal way.

   ____ D) I feel I should, but probably just wouldn't get involved that way.

   ____ E) I would think about it, but probably would not actually speak.

   ____ F) I just can't imagine myself as the kind of person who would speak in a friendly manner to a stranger on the street.

8. DRIVE FIVE MILES OVER THE SPEED LIMIT IN AN UNINHABITED AREA

   ____ A) I would do so as a matter of course.

   ____ B) I would not hesitate to do so if others in my group were doing so.

   ____ C) I have no feelings about it, and would probably do so on occasion.

   ____ D) I feel I should not, but might do so every now and then.

   ____ E) I would think about the possibility of doing so, but wouldn't actually "speed."

   ____ F) I definitely would never do so.
9. GO TO MOTION PICTURE THEATRE

   A) I would do so frequently even by myself with no effort to discriminate as to the type of show.

   B) I would be glad to go with a group of friends for an evening of fun.

   C) I have no feelings about it, and would certainly go to them from time to time.

   D) I feel I should not, but I go to those shows which I consider to be "good."

   E) I have tried to imagine what it would be like, but probably would not actually go.

   F) I definitely would never do so, under any circumstances.

10. USE TOBACCO

   A) I would do so as a normal part of my style of life, regardless of the activities or attitudes of others.

   B) I would certainly do so when with a group of people who do.

   C) I have no feelings about it, and would certainly try it to see if it was enjoyable.

   D) I feel I should not, but might occasionally experiment with it.

   E) I have tried to imagine what it would be like but probably would not go so far as to actually try it.

   F) I definitely would never use tobacco, under any circumstances.
## FIGURE 8—Continued

### 11. **DRINK BEER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I would do so frequently as a normal part of my life, no matter what others think or do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>I would do so as part of any social gathering or social occasion where others were drinking beer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>I have no negative feelings about it, and would probably try it to see if it was enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I feel that I should not, but I would still try it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>I would try to imagine what it's like, but would not try it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I definitely would <strong>never</strong> do so, under any circumstances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. **HAVE SEXUAL INTERCOURSE OUTSIDE THE MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I would regard this as normal behavior, and would certainly do so if the other party was in full agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>I probably would on occasion if I was involved with a peer group where it was accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>I have no feelings about it, and would probably do so occasionally as long as I didn't hurt someone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I feel I should not, but might do so if I was in love and we both agreed to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>I am certainly curious and would try to imagine what it would be like, but probably would not actually have intercourse outside marriage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I would definitely <strong>never</strong> do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. SMOKE MARIJUANA

   _A_ I would smoke marijuana frequently, as a part of my normal life, without regard to the actions and attitudes of others.

   _B_ I would smoke marijuana occasionally in social groups.

   _C_ I have no feelings about it, and would probably experiment with it to see if it was enjoyable.

   _D_ I feel I should not, but might try it once or twice.

   _E_ I am curious and have tried to imagine what it's like, but wouldn't actually try it.

   _F_ Rejecting even the idea, I would never do so.

14. SELL, OR "PUSH" HEROIN, LSD, OR COCAINE

   _A_ I would be glad to do so.

   _B_ I would do so if the laws against it were relaxed, and I needed the money.

   _C_ I wouldn't want this to be my primary occupation in our present society, but certainly wouldn't mind doing it occasionally if I didn't get caught.

   _D_ I feel I shouldn't, but I might try it once or twice.

   _E_ I have tried to imagine what this kind of life would be like, but wouldn't ever try it.

   _F_ I would never do so even one time; the idea is repulsive to me.
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