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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This study investigates changes in ranking values referred to by the terms Equality and Freedom in a sample of Tennessee Head Start staff during a three- to four-month interval. The purpose is to investigate the effect of a brief interpretation of the relationship between particular rankings of these terms in a list of 18 terminal values and certain attitudes regarding the food stamp program reportedly given by another group of Head Start staff.

Importance of the Problem

Values are acknowledged as important objects of investigation in the study of human behavior, but there is no consensus concerning their definition, the processes of development and change, or their interrelationships with other determinants of behavior (Kitwood & Smithers, 1975). It is also generally agreed that values are relevant to education and, whatever assumptions are held about relationships of values/attitudes to behavior, continued efforts to understand the concept of values and their relationships to other intervening variables and behavior are well justified.

If "values are standards that guide actions as well as attitudes" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 122), then it seems reasonable to assume that the priority of equality in the value systems of Head Start staff is an important factor in implementation of the Head Start program. A primary
program goal is the provision of an equal opportunity for success in public school to economically disadvantaged children. Achievement of this goal depends on staff behaviors which, according to the assumption that values determine behaviors, depend on a high priority for the value of equality.

The number of children currently enrolled in Head Start (350,000) who would be affected by training programs which improve Head Start program effectiveness is significant, but this number is small compared to the total number such improvement might affect, including other family members, children and families to be enrolled in the future, and participants in similar social or education programs.

Although a number of studies have supported the assumption that values are a determinant of behavior and have also supported the general procedure for inducing value change used in the present study (Greenstein, 1976, Penner, 1971, Rokeach & Cochrane, 1972, Rokeach & McLellan, 1972, Sherrid & Beech, 1976; Conroy, Katkin, & Barnette, Note 1), the results of these studies cannot be generalized to Head Start staff because of important variations in many characteristics of Head Start staff from the populations which have been represented. Providing a broader population to which such results can be generalized is desirable for theoretical as well as pragmatic reasons.

Most investigations of value change have been related to long-term educational or psychotherapeutic programs. A simple, effective method of increasing the priority all staff place on the value Equality was considered desirable for improving the over-all effectiveness of training programs for Head Start staff.
If the assumption that values influence behavior is accepted and if one proposes to influence behavior by changing values, the next step is to determine the nature of the value change process. These issues will be discussed in the Review of Literature and Discussion chapters of the present study.

The Tennessee Head Start Training Program

Information about Head Start and the Tennessee Training Program is included here because of its importance in the selection of the procedure used in the present study to induce change in value systems. No attempt is made here to explain Head Start or its training program in any detail. Further background information is provided by the Head Start Program Performance Standards (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975).

The factors which influenced the selection of this procedure may be separated for the purpose of exposition into three areas: 1. the Head Start philosophy of providing comprehensive services, 2. variations in training needs and background characteristics of Head Start staff, and 3. program and training budget limitations. Because these factors overlap, the discussion of them will not adhere strictly to this separation.

The Department of Head Start Training provides training and technical assistance to Head Start programs in Tennessee in all the component areas covered by the Head Start Program Performance Standards. These components include: Education, Health (medical, dental, nutritional, mental), Social Services, and Parent Involvement.

The Tennessee Training Office began its training program in 1965 emphasizing available knowledge in the field of early childhood education
and using established methods of teacher training. This emphasis was appropriate since staff training and enrollment of children was begun almost simultaneously, and many staff had little or no previous preparation for teaching young children.

Early childhood education must remain the primary emphasis for Head Start teacher training, but there is increasing awareness of the need for cross-component training to improve staff teamwork and to provide additional skills, such as social work training for teachers to improve their effectiveness in communicating with Head Start parents.

Through its training program and participation in site visits to evaluate program implementation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Training Office discovered that the social service program is relatively less effective than other components in many programs. Many reasons for this inadequacy exist. Program resources are very limited and although provision of needed services in all components is recognized as equally important, choices must often be made as to which components must give way to provide services considered more immediately essential. In some programs, for example, health needs are great and other community health agency resources are limited, so that a large portion of the available Head Start funds are allocated to provide medical or dental services. The Performance Standards require that all children enrolled in Head Start receive a medical and dental examination and the follow-up treatment indicated, so there is no way for programs to avoid the identification of medical/dental needs and little opportunity to avoid the effort needed to meet them. Social service needs, on the other hand, are somewhat more flexible. The methods of identifying social
service needs are less clearly specified by the Performance Standards and programs are only required to refer families in which needs have been identified to appropriate social service agencies.

Another factor in the provision of social services is the ability and/or willingness of individual staff to recognize social service needs and to refer families to appropriate Head Start personnel or community social service agencies. The identification of social service needs may be affected by personal value systems which do not place a high priority on equality or attitudes which do not favor providing food, clothing or other needs through social programs.

Most of the training designed to increase identification of social service needs has been directed only to social service staff, but teachers have more frequent opportunities and are assigned responsibility in many programs for recognizing such needs and referring families to Head Start staff or community social service agencies for assistance. Therefore, if interventions to induce changes in the valuing of equality are undertaken to improve recognition and referral of social service needs, teachers as well as other staff should be included.

The Head Start training program is designed to meet training needs of staff with widely varying levels and types of educational backgrounds, socioeconomic status, age, and other characteristics which may significantly affect the results of different training approaches. A study of Head Start employee mobility (Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc., 1973) reported that less than 15% of low-mobility programs and 27% of high-mobility programs sampled had employees with a B.A. degree or higher.
Summary

A lack of consensus concerning the definition of values, processes of development and change, and interrelationships with other determinants of behavior indicates the need for further investigation of these factors. An understanding of these factors is particularly relevant to the field of education.

The Head Start philosophy of providing comprehensive services, variations in training needs and background characteristics of Head Start staff, and program and training budget limitations require that training methods be developed which produce maximal changes in the least training time possible.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of a brief interpretation of the relationship between values and attitudes reported for other Head Start staff on the rank-order of the values Equality and Freedom given three to four months later by Tennessee Head Start staff.
The Measurement of Values

Kitwood and Smithers (1975) have briefly reviewed the investigation of concepts of values. They state that the available methods of measuring values are based on several different conceptions. Morris's (1956) approach, the Ways-to-Live study, measures values as preferred life styles. There has not been much use of this approach in recent years. Buros (1972) cites 687 references to the widely-used Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values (1960). This approach assesses the "dominant interests of the personality", and does not measure values as such. Values pervade all interest areas, but they are neither synonymous nor co-extensive with them. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) treat values as answers to certain fundamental questions about the nature of reality in their famous Value Orientations Study. Gordon's Survey of Interpersonal Values (1960) and Survey of Personal Values (1964) overlap considerably with the concept of need adopted by workers such as Murray (1938). These definitions are not contradictory, but they address different concepts than those Rokeach (1973) includes in his definition of values and value systems.

Rokeach distinguishes the values concept from concepts of attitudes, social norms, needs, traits, interests, and value orientation. He defines
a value as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence. A value system is an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance" (1973, p. 5).

Using these definitions, Rokeach has constructed two lists of values. One list of 13 terminal values is concerned with end-states of existence. Another list of 13 instrumental values is concerned with modes of conduct. A complete description of the list of terminal values and the method of presentation is included in Chapter Three, Materials and Methods, and Appendix A.

Rokeach's value change theory hypothesizes that giving feedback concerning their own and others' values and attitudes should make individuals more likely to become aware of contradictions within themselves and produce systematic long-term changes in values and attitudes, in a direction designed to reduce or eliminate such contradictions.

Rokeach qualifies this hypothesis further by predicting larger and more enduring increases in either or both the values of Equality and Freedom in experimental subjects who initially place a low priority on one or both of these values than in those who place a high value on both Equality and Freedom. For a complete description of the theoretical and empirical bases of Rokeach's approach to the measurement of values, refer to The Nature of Human Values (1973). Kitwood and Smithers (1975) have expressed some problems they suggest are important in this approach. Since the primary focus in the present study is the value change process, rather than
the measurement of values, per se, only the following brief discussion of these criticisms of the Value Survey Instrument which are felt to be relevant to the present study are included here. They are presented as a basis for evaluating the results of the present and previous research using the Value Survey and the Value Change Procedure.

1. Problem: The survey assumes that there is a strict rank-ordering of the elements within the value system. "Thus the invitation to rank Self-Respect, A World at Peace, and True Friendship is about as meaningful as to ask, 'which do you prefer, strawberries, Bach, or air travel'" (1975, p. 176)?

Response: There may be few situations in which respondents would actually be forced to choose among 'strawberries, Bach, or air travel', but it may be instructive nevertheless to know how they would choose, if forced. Although this problem may impose limitations for the interpretation of the Value Survey results as a measure of values, it does not necessarily mean that the results might not be useful for investigating relationships of these values with other variables such as demographic data, interventions intended to produce changes in the rankings, or with attitudes and/or behavior.

2. Problem: The survey requires respondents to arrange only those items presented, in rank order from 1 to 13. In other words, it is ipsative. Persons who care very little about all or most of the values may rank them in the same order as those who care a great deal about some or all of them.

Response: The opportunity respondents are given to rate the intensity of feeling attached to their over-all ranking seems to this
investigator to be an attempt to deal with this problem, but comparisons between different person's assessments of such intensity cannot logically be made and, further, there may be significant variations in the intensity of feeling attached to some ranks compared to others.

3. Problem: The values are presented with very brief accompanying phrases which are open to a number of constructions by the respondent.

Response: This concern seems particularly serious to the present investigator, since it seems unlikely that any definition of an abstraction like Mature Love (or Equality or Freedom) would assure that every respondent's understanding would be the same.

This limitation may also be important in interpreting results of Rokeach's work on the modification of values. The possibility exists that during the experiments the subjects simply became more clear about what Rokeach himself meant by the value items. This concern is addressed in the discussion of the results of the present study.

4. Problem: The difficulty of the ranking task is not sufficiently taken into account. Rokeach acknowledges Miller's (1956) discussion of the number of categories which the human mind can hold simultaneously with the argument that 'The respondent's task becomes progressively lighter with every gummed label that he ranks (The labels may be moved as often as the respondent desires, with little effort--the method is explained in the instrument reproduced as Appendix A.)...after the respondent had moved twelve values...he has only six more to compare with another...thus the average length of the scale turns out to be 9.5'. Kitwood and Smithers do not find this a convincing argument.
Response: Nevertheless, the use of gummed labels makes rearrangement of the values easy and allows the list to be treated in subsets, supporting Rokeach's argument. Most respondents observed have ranked the values roughly at first and then rearranged subsets of those values closer in rank, so that at one time, those values the individual has under consideration may not exceed 7, plus-or-minus two.

5. Problem: A final question these authors have raised is about the way in which values are related to beliefs, attitudes, and actions. They state that "there are strong grounds for thinking that behaviour is rarely a direct expression of values" (1975, p. 178). They suggest the issue of the relationships of values to attitudes and to behavior assumed by Rokeach deserve further investigation.

Response: Rokeach's theory of value change does not require an assumption that behavior is a direct expression of values, only that behavioral changes based only on attitude change without underlying value change are short-lived. There has been recent support for the effect of attitudes on behavior change in four reviews cited by Eagly and Himmelfarb (1978). The effect of value change on attitudes and behavior is not under investigation in the present study, though Rokeach's assumption of the role of value-attitude relationships for inducing change in values is adopted.

Changing Values

Several definitions and Rokeach's assumptions about the relationships among these concepts are necessary for understanding the basis for the value change procedures adopted by Rokeach and used in the present study. They will be summarized here from Rokeach's presentation (1973).
Self-conceptions are "the many conceptions or cognitions that a person has about himself...including all one's cognitions, conscious and unconscious, about one's physical image; intellectual and moral abilities and weaknesses; socioeconomic position in society; national, regional, ethnic, racial and religious identity; the sexual, generational, occupational, marital, and parental roles that one plays in society; and how well or poorly one plays such roles" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 215). These conceptions are considered by Rokeach to be closer to Mead's (1934) and Cooley's (1956) social conception of the self than to Rogers' (1959) and Hilgard's (1949) more personological conception. Rokeach further represents these self-cognitions at the innermost core of the belief system, and all remaining beliefs, attitudes, and values are conceived of as functionally organized around this innermost core.

Several distinctions are made between values and attitudes, but the primary one is that an attitude refers to an organization of several beliefs (rather than a single belief) around a specific object or situation (rather than transcending objects and situations).

Rokeach assumes that the total belief system is functionally interconnected so that a change in any part of it should affect other parts and should also affect behavior.

Attempts to change persons through educational or therapeutic means may be assumed to be directed toward behavioral change, but specific behavioral changes may not be predicted, measured or evaluated.

Rokeach (1973) summarizes three approaches to personality change.

1. Therapeutic approaches have emphasized changing self-conceptions without investigating changes in values, attitudes, and behavior.
2. Social psychologists have concentrated their attention on theory and research concerning attitude change rather than value change, Rokeach concludes, because they have assumed that the more centrally located values are more resistant to change than attitudes. He also states that it is assumed that attitude change leads to behavioral change. A 1978 review of attitude research (Eagly & Himmelfarb) suggests there has been a recent increase in research concerning attitudes and attributes this partly to a more promising outlook for the attitude-behavior relationship than was apparent during the previous decade.

3. Behavioral theories, of course, are mostly concerned with behavioral change. Only Bandura's (1969) theory of observational learning is mentioned, and it does not suggest that behavioral change leads to changes in attitudes, values, self-conceptions, or personality.

Rokeach's (1973) theory of value change specifies relationships among these variables. He identifies a hierarchy in which self-conceptions are considered most central, and continuing outward are values, attitudes, and behavior. He assumes if attitudes are changed without change in underlying values, the attitudes will revert so that consistency with the values may be maintained and any resulting behavioral changes will be short-lived.

Rokeach discusses four theoretical differences between his theory and other balance theories. In the present context, the most significant points are:

1. Dissonance between self-conceptions, on the one hand, and other aspects of the belief system, on the other hand.
2. The focus on values rather than attitudes. The intent is not to deny the importance of attitudes as determinants of social behavior, but to distinguish them conceptually and operationally.

3. An attempt to understand better the conditions under which long-term as well as short-term changes can be expected.

4. An assumption that no behavioral change can be theoretically expected unless underlying values as well as attitudes are changed.

Perhaps most significant for the present study is Rokeach's theoretical suggestion that, "paradoxically ... under certain conditions values may be easier to change than attitudes. Values are less central than self-conceptions but more central than attitudes. If a person's values are in fact standards employed to maintain and enhance self-conceptions, then a contradiction between values and self-conceptions can be most effortlessly resolved by changing the less central values. A value that contradicts self-conceptions is more likely to undergo change than an attitude that is discrepant with persuasive communications or behavior. A value should undergo enduring change if maintenance or enhancement of self-conception is at stake, and its having undergone change should lead to systematic changes in other related cognitions within the belief system and should then culminate in behavioral change" (1973, p. 217).

Rationale for the Present Research Study

Despite certain weaknesses in the Value Survey and the Value Change procedure, the instruments were considered to provide a practical starting point for achieving certain objectives of the Head Start Training Office. The valuing of Equality relative to other values seems intuitively to be a very important factor in effective implementation of the Head Start
program, not just for social service personnel but for all staff. Most approaches to value change depend on therapeutic or educational methods which require large investments of provider and trainee time and a high degree of motivation which may not necessarily exist and is not easy to develop in all staff members. Experience from a competency-based certification program for teachers (the Child Development Associate) indicates that many staff have difficulty successfully completing courses which require a significant investment of time and/or effort outside the classroom. Training methods for Head Start staff must also be appropriate to wide ranges of educational background.

The study of Head Start employee mobility (Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc., 1973) is suggestive of the amount of time devoted to staff training in social services. Seventy-eight percent of educational staff received over 60 credit hours of supplementary training. Only five percent of social service staff earned as many credit hours. Most supplementary training focuses on developing competencies necessary to teachers of young children. The same is true for most inservice training. The estimate that 40 hours is needed to train replacements for their new positions is another clue to the minimal amount of time available for training.

Even if attitude change produces predictable behavior change without concomitant value change, there are so many relevant attitude/behavior relationships involved in the Head Start program that a method with more general effects would be desirable.

Taking these considerations into account, the present investigator designed a study to explore the usefulness of the Value Survey and Value
Change procedures for the Tennessee Head Start training program.

Therefore, a survey was made in 1976 to determine how a sample of Head Start staff in Tennessee ranked the value Equality relative to 17 other terminal values, their attitudes regarding the food stamp program, and the usefulness of a particular method for increasing the ranking of the value Equality.

The relative simplicity of measurement and the published reports (Penner, 1971, Rokeach & Cochrane, 1972, Rokeach & McLellan, 1972) of long-term increases in the ranking of Equality, based on the Value Change Instrument developed by Rokeach (1973), were factors in the selection of this method for exploration by the Tennessee Training Office.

Objectives of the Study

1. To measure the effect of an intervention designed to change values as a first step in determining its usefulness for a Head Start training program.

   a. To measure the rank-order of values among a sample of Head Start staff, using the Rokeach Value Survey.

   b. To measure attitudes toward the food stamp program among a sample of Head Start staff, as part of the value change procedure and to provide additional information about staff attitudes for the training office.

   c. To establish a measure of Head Start staff's congruity between their own rankings for the values Equality and Freedom with their perceptions of how other Head Start staff would rank the same values, for interpreting results of the present study
and to provide information pertinent for other training.

2. To compare results of the Value Change Procedure to published results of similar research as a basis for understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the instruments and their effects.

3. To compare results of the Value Survey to published results with a national sample to provide further information about the instrument and about characteristics of Head Start staff pertinent to training.
Several changes were made in the procedures used by Rokeach to investigate long-term value and attitude change to meet the different objectives of the Head Start Training Office. Where Rokeach used attitudes regarding civil rights demonstrations as a basis for producing self-dissatisfaction of university students toward their ranking of Equality, the present study used Head Start staff's attitudes regarding the food stamp program. A definition of equality in terms of these attitudes seemed appropriate to the purpose of improving the provision of social services in Head Start programs.

Changes in other attitudes and behavior related to social services were not included at this phase of the research. Analysis of value changes will be used to determine whether to pursue further this approach to increasing the ranking of Equality.

Elaborate assurance of confidentiality was considered necessary to minimize evaluation apprehension resulting from the fact that the study was done in the context of the subject's Head Start employee role. It was assumed that Head Start staff recognize the emphasis of the Head Start program on equality as an important value and any method of matching pretest and posttest measures which participants felt could be associated with them personally might affect the results of the study and might also
adversely affect the relationship of the staff to the Training Office.

Rokeach states that "feedback procedures were invented to help a person become aware of possible contradictions involving his values of equality and freedom and related attitudes. More important, the feedback procedures were designed to arouse self-dissatisfaction concerning possible contradictions between these two values and related attitudes on the one hand and self-conceptions on the other" (1973, p. 235).

In order to arouse this self-dissatisfaction, Rokeach provided subjects with information about their own values and attitudes, followed immediately by similar information, with which they could compare themselves, concerning others. In addition to the comparable descriptive data concerning the values and attitudes of significant others, the subject's attention was drawn to certain relations between these values and attitudes and to brief interpretations of the data, intended to point out certain contradictions existing in significant others and, by implication, possibly within their own belief systems.

Attitudes related to methods of providing social services were substituted for civil rights attitudes in the present study, because of their greater relevance to implementation of the social service component of the Head Start program. It was assumed that these attitudes might have different effects on value change than civil rights attitudes have had in previous studies.

**Intervention Procedures**

Head Start staff members in the intervention groups were first asked to rank their own terminal values. They then indicated the extent of their value commitment on an eleven-point rating scale, with 1 indicating
"I care very much about the order in which I ranked these values" and 11 indicating "It does not make much difference which order I put them in." They then ranked the same list of terminal values the way they thought "Head Start staff, on the average, would rank them." (The Value Survey and Value Change Instruments are reproduced as Appendix A.)

Intervention group staff were then shown a table giving the comparable rankings on the 13 values of "298 Head Start staff members in Region IV." This table was not based on real data, but was constructed to correspond as closely as possible to data collected by Rokeach on groups with similar income and educational levels to those of Head Start staff. The predominance of females among Head Start staff was also taken into account. The positions of Equality (11) and Freedom (1) in the table were determined by the intervention method. Reporting the average rank for Freedom to be noticeably higher than the rank for Equality provided a basis for the interpretation that some individuals value Freedom for themselves, but not for others.

The experimenter then drew the staff's attention particularly to the data concerning the two target values Equality and Freedom:

One of the most interesting findings shown in this Table is that the staff, on the average, felt that freedom was very important—they ranked it 1; but they felt that equality was considerably less important—they ranked it 11.

Then, to arouse a state of self-dissatisfaction, the experimenter offered a brief interpretation of these findings:

Apparently, Head Start staff in general are much more interested in their own freedom than they are in freedom for other people.

Participants were then invited to compare their own value rankings with the composite value rankings of Head Start staff:
Feel free to spend a few minutes comparing your own rankings on the preceding page with those of the 298 staff, shown in this Table.

The table was presented in order to arouse a state of self-dissatisfaction concerning a possible contradiction between self-conceptions and terminal values. Then, to arouse an additional state of self-dissatisfaction, this concerning possible contradictions between self-conceptions and values and attitudes, the staff were asked to record their position with respect to social services, specifically the food stamp program:

We have one other finding which we think is unusually interesting. In order to make this finding more meaningful and relevant to you personally, you should first answer honestly the following question on social services: Which of the following comes closest to your views about the food stamp program?

Participants responded on a mimeographed form by checking off one of the following three options:

_____ The food stamp program should be expanded to be sure nobody goes hungry—even if it means higher taxes.

_____ I think the food stamp program is very good as it is.

_____ I don't believe in food stamps, people who are hungry should be given food so they won't waste the money.

The intervention group was then informed that the previously tested staff had been asked the identical question and, depending on which option they chose, were divided into three groups; they were then presented to the staff in a second Table. This table displays a highly significant relation between position on the food stamp program and value for Equality.

Since most persons cannot be expected to be too interested in data displayed in tabular form, the experimenter commented in some detail about what the table showed, as described in Appendix A.
Then again, in order to arouse a feeling of self-dissatisfaction, the experimenter offered the following interpretation of the findings shown in the table:

This raises the question whether those who are against food stamps are really saying that they care a great deal about their own freedom but are indifferent to other people's freedom. Those who are for food stamps are perhaps really saying they not only want freedom for themselves, but for other people too. What do you think?

The Head Start staff were then given an opportunity to agree or disagree with the experimenter's interpretation, using a rating scale ranging from 1, "I agree strongly with this interpretation," to 6, "I'm not sure," to 11, "I disagree strongly with this interpretation." Each staff member was then once more invited to compare her own value rankings with the results shown.

The last part of the experimental session was designed to elicit the staff member's feelings about the method used to teach them something about the value systems of Head Start staff. Staff members were asked to rate their feelings on an 11-point scale for the following questions:

Did you find it thought-provoking? (1=Extremely thought-provoking to 11=Extremely boring.)

Do you think this technique of teaching will lead you to do some more thinking about your own values? (1=Yes, very much to 11=No, not at all.)

These questions were assumed to be a measure of ego-involvement.

Do you feel that your responses were somewhat hypocritical? (1=Yes, very hypocritical to 11=No, not at all.)

This question was used as a measure of hypocrisy.

Right now, how satisfied do you feel about the way you have ranked the eighteen values? (1=Extremely satisfied to 11=Extremely dissatisfied.)

This question was used to measure general self-dissatisfaction.
The participants were also asked to report their feelings of self-dissatisfaction with their rankings of each value:

Now look again for a moment at your own rankings on the first page. Which rankings do you now feel satisfied or dissatisfied with? (Please indicate whether you now feel satisfied or dissatisfied for each one, by a check mark or an X.)

The participants then checked "I am satisfied with my ranking of" or "I am dissatisfied with my ranking of" each one of the terminal values.

Participants responded with a "yes" or "no" to the question: "In your own opinion, do you think that the Head Start findings I have described to you are scientifically valid?" Space was provided for participants to explain the reasons for their opinions, and for any other comments they wished to make about the study. Finally, they were reassured that everything in the questionnaire was absolutely confidential, and to be used only for scientific purposes.

It should perhaps be emphasized that all instructions and interpretations were given in written form as well as orally, to ensure that the participants understood the information. The written material was incorporated into nine pages of mimeographed materials.

When all staff in intervention groups had completed their responses, the following remarks were given orally:

In closing, I hope that all of you learned something today about the process of learning by this method of active participation. I have tried to set the conditions for a learning experience to take place. I presented you today with some new facts. In addition, I asked each of you to think about yourself--about the things you value. One result of this may be a change in your conception of the world around you. But that is up to you. Someone who presents new facts may ask others to think about themselves, or may even say things that disturb them, all in an effort to arouse their interest so that they will learn and grow intellectually. But I do not believe one can tell others what to think or what to believe. One can only, as I have said, try to set the conditions of learning. I have
told you some things which are of deep concern to me. How you react to them is your own private business. I only hope that I have caused each of you to think seriously about your own values.

Your values and what things in life are really most important to you are matters which merit serious consideration both in your personal life and in your role as a Head Start staff member.

Knowing so well as I do how little time you all have to spend together in your efforts to achieve Head Start's goals for children and families, I am especially appreciative of this time you have shared with me. I hope you have found it personally stimulating and I want to assure you that I will do my best to use the results of our effort to improve understanding of the nature of values. Hopefully, we will be able to use such information in our continuing mutual effort to improve the Head Start program.

Non-Intervention Procedures

Staff not participating in the intervention merely filled out the first four pages of the mimeographed material. The first page requested demographic information including birth date, sex, family income level, number of family members dependent on this income, and highest grade completed. Instructions for completing the survey were also given on this page. The second page gave the list of terminal values, arranged alphabetically, which they were asked to rank. The third page asked staff in these groups to rank their intensity of feeling about the way they ranked these 18 values in general. They then ranked the values of the average Head Start staff member on the fourth page. They were not shown the two tables, or the accompanying commentaries, and, thus, were not given the opportunity to become aware of possible contradictions within their belief system. Attention was in no way drawn either to their own or to other's Equality-Freedom rankings. Non-intervention groups were usually finished in about 15 to 30 minutes and the session was ended with the following
In closing, I hope that all of you learned something today about your own system of values. I have tried to set the conditions for a learning experience to take place. One way we can do this is by getting people to examine what they believe or what is important to them. Your values and what things in life are really most important to you are matters which merit serious consideration both in your personal life and in your role as a Head Start staff member.

Knowing so well as I do how little time you all have to spend together in your efforts to achieve Head Start's goals for children and families, I am especially appreciative of this time you have shared with me. I hope you have found it personally stimulating and I want to assure you that I will do my best to use the results of our effort to improve understanding of the nature of values. Hopefully, we will be able to use such information in our continuing mutual effort to improve the Head Start program.

Posttest Procedures

The long-term effects of the experimental treatment on the rank-ordering of values were determined by repeating the Value Survey in both intervention and non-intervention groups three to four months later. The posttest administration of the Value Survey was the same as the pretest except that the ranking for other Head Start staff was omitted. A brief oral expression of appreciation for the staff members' cooperation was given in both groups.

The Subjects

Subjects in both intervention and non-intervention groups were staff members in Tennessee Head Start programs. No identification of race was made, but approximately 25 percent were black in both groups. Two groups were assigned to the non-intervention condition (N=33); three groups were assigned to the intervention condition (N=50). Only two men participated, both in intervention groups.

Participation in the survey and the intervention was voluntary. Program directors were asked to schedule sufficient time for measurement at regular staff meetings. At the meetings, the general nature and purpose of the study were explained to the staff. They were given an opportunity to leave if they did not wish to participate, but none did.
The intervention subjects came from three Head Start programs. One was an urban east Tennessee program (N=23), one a rural/urban program (N=15), and one a rural west Tennessee program (N=12). Non-intervention subjects were from two east Tennessee programs, one urban (N=23) and one rural (N=10). It should be noted that some staff in urban Tennessee Head Start programs actually live in the surrounding rural areas. The only reference to rural-urban status that can be made is by program status.

The representativeness of this sample to Head Start staff in general can not be confirmed. No demographic data have been collected either regionally or nationally on Head Start staff.

Statistical Procedures

Pretest comparisons of intervention and non-intervention groups were made by t-test for all the independent variables, including age, sex, income, family size, educational level, intensity of feeling about ranking of the terminal values list, ranking of Equality and Freedom for other Head Start staff, and pretest mean ranks for the 18 terminal values. The posttest group means for the 18 values and subgroup pretest-to-posttest changes in ranking Equality and Freedom were also compared by t-test.

A multiple regression analysis, using two stepwise techniques was performed to find which independent variables should most likely be included in a regression model. None of the stepwise techniques can be "guaranteed to represent real-world processes accurately" (Barr, Goodnight, Sall, & Helwig, 1976, p. 251).

The Backward Elimination technique performs calculations first for a model including all the independent variables. Eighteen variables were used in the analysis for the intervention group and ten variables were
included in the analysis for combined intervention and non-intervention groups. Variables were deleted one by one until all the variables remaining in the model produced "partial" $F$-statistics significant at the .10 level for staying in (at each step, the variable showing the smallest contribution to the model is the one deleted).

The Maximum $R^2$ Improvement technique was also used. It was developed by James H. Goodnight, who "considers it superior to the stepwise technique and almost as good as calculating regressions on all possible subsets of the independent variables" (Barr, Goodnight, Sall, & Helwig, 1976, p. 251). Unlike other stepwise techniques, this technique does not settle on a single model. The following quote explains the technique:

Instead, it looks for the 'best' one-variable model, the 'best' two-variable model, and so forth. It finds first the one-variable model producing the highest $R^2$ statistic. Then another variable, the one which would yield the greatest increase in $R^2$, is added. Once this two-variable model is obtained, each of the variables in the model is compared to each variable not in the model. For each comparison, the procedure determines if removing the variable in the model and replacing it with the presently excluded variable would increase $R^2$. After all the possible comparisons have been made, the switch which produces the largest increase in $R^2$ is made. Comparisons are made again, and the process continues until the procedure finds that no switch could increase $R^2$. The two-variable model thus settled on is considered the 'best' two-variable model the technique can find. The technique then adds a third variable to the model, according to the criteria used in adding the second variable. The comparing-and-switching process is repeated, the 'best' three-variable model is discovered, and so forth. This technique differs from the STEPWISE technique in that here all switches are evaluated before any switch is made. In the STEPWISE technique, removal of the 'worst' variable may be accomplished without consideration of what adding the 'best' remaining variable would accomplish (Barr, Goodnight, Sall, & Helwig, 1976, pp. 251-252).

Comparison of the Head Start sample medians for the 18 terminal values to medians found in a 1968 survey conducted on a sample of adult women from all strata of American society was accomplished by Median test (Siegel, 1956). This nonparametric test was selected to determine
statistical significance because the frequency distributions deviate markedly from normality and from one another, a circumstance to be expected with ranked data. The Median test is a chi-square test of the significance of difference between the number of persons in two or more subgroups who score above and below the group median.
Pretest Comparisons of Intervention and Non-Intervention Groups

In order to interpret changes from pretest to posttest which may have occurred in intervention vs. non-intervention groups, it is necessary to establish the similarity of the groups. Twenty-six comparisons were made between subjects participating and not participating in the intervention. These included age, sex, income, family size, educational level, intensity of feeling about their pretest ranking of the terminal values list, ranking of Equality and Freedom for other Head Start staff, and the pretest mean ranks for the 18 terminal values. Age was the only one of these factors on which the groups differed at a statistically significant level. The intervention group's average age was 38.86, which was 4.65 years older than the non-intervention group's average of 34.21. The t test shows this difference to be significant at $p<.001$ level. However, age did not enter the Maximum $R^2$ Improvement procedure for predicting changes in ranking Equality until step 6, with an increase of only .01 in the variance explained. Age entered the equation for predicting changes in Freedom at step 5, again accounting for an additional one percent of the variance. Therefore, age was not an important variable for the prediction of changes in ranking Equality or Freedom in the present study.
Although the pretest composite rank-orders of the terminal values show no statistically significant differences between the groups, the means for Freedom approach significance ($d=1.94, p<.10>.05$). Table 1 shows the composite rank-orders of the two groups compared by means.

**Ranking of Equality and Freedom for Other Head Start Staff**

Head Start staff ranked Equality 8.77, 4.47 ranks below the level they thought other Head Start staff would assign this value, 4.30. The difference is significant at the $p<.001$ level. Their perception of the way other Head Start staff would rank Freedom (7.97) was not different from their ranking of this value for themselves (7.72). Figure 1 compares the staff's ranking of Equality for other Head Start staff with changes in their own ranking of Equality on posttest. It shows that ranking of Equality for other staff did not affect changes in individual's ranking of Equality on posttest compared to pretest.

**Responses to Questions Included in the Intervention**

The following responses were made to each of the questions in Part II, the Value Change Procedure. These results are reported because of the theoretical assumptions of their importance in predicting change. Their significance is considered in Chapter Five, Discussion.

Twelve staff favored expanding the food stamp program to be sure nobody goes hungry—even if it means higher taxes. Seventeen staff thought the food stamp program is very good as it is. Eighteen staff didn't believe in food stamps, thinking people who are hungry should be given food so they won't waste the money. Figure 2 is a scattergram of attitudes about food stamps and changes in ranking of Equality, showing that these attitudes were not related to posttest changes.
Table 1—Comparison of Pretest Means of Terminal Values for Intervention and Non-Intervention Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Non-Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Comfortable Life</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Exciting Life</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A World at Peace</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A World of Beauty</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Harmony</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Love</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Friendship</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.10*>.05
Figure 1--Relationship of Changes in Respondent's Ranking of Equality to Their Ranking of Equality for Other Head Start Staff
Figure 1
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Figure 2--Relationship of Changes in Ranking Equality to Three Attitudes About the Food Stamp Program
## Attitudes About Food Stamp Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Leave As Is</th>
<th>Eliminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreases in Ranking Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**
The following responses were given on a scale from 1, "I care very much about the order in which I ranked these values" to 11, "It does not make much difference which order I put them in".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 17 12 3 6 5 4 1 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I care very much about the order in which I ranked these values. It does not make much difference which order I put them in.

Agreement with the experimental interpretation of results reported for other Head Start staff was according to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 4 2 0 2 17 1 0 0 5 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I agree strongly with this interpretation. I'm not sure. I disagree strongly with this interpretation.

The next four questions received the following frequency of responses for each point on the rating scale indicated?

Did you find it thought-provoking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 6 3 2 9 12 1 1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extremely thought-provoking Extremely boring
Do you think this technique of teaching will lead you to do some more thinking about your own values?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 3 8 5 3 7 2 2 1 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes, very much No, not at all

Do you feel that your responses were somewhat hypocritical?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 2 2 2 2 3 2 2 7 14 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes, very hypocritical No, not at all hypocritical

Right now, how satisfied do you feel about the way you have ranked the eighteen values?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 12 8 4 2 6 2 1 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extremely satisfied Extremely dissatisfied

In your own opinion, do you think that the Head Start findings I have described to you are scientifically valid?

28 Yes 15 No Seven gave other or no responses.

Three respondents indicated dissatisfaction with their pretest ranking for Equality, seven expressed dissatisfaction with their pretest ranking for Freedom.
Posttest Comparisons of Intervention and Non-Intervention Groups

There are no significant changes in means for any values from pre-test to posttest for either group, but the means of five values for intervention vs. non-intervention groups do differ on posttest. These differences result from small changes in opposite directions for the two groups, except for Family Security. Table 2 shows the posttest means for both groups.

Comparison of posttest median ranks for Equality in intervention vs. non-intervention groups shows no significant differences from pretest to posttest for either group. Examination of changes in individual ranks for Equality from pretest to posttest, however, show that 24 staff in the intervention group increased their ranking, on the average, 4.08 ranks, while 16 staff decreased their ranking an average of 4.38 ranks. Ten staff's ranks are the same on posttest. In the non-intervention group, 15 staff increased the ranking of Equality, on the average, 6.47 ranks and 15 staff decreased this value's rank an average of 4.80 ranks and three scores remained the same.

Changes in Various Subgroups on Equality and Freedom from Pretest to Posttest

Table 3 shows the mean changes in Equality and Freedom for four subgroups which varied in their pretest rankings of these values. Groups that did not participate in the intervention are also included to show similarities and differences. Although these results are not reported for Rokeach's non-intervention groups, they are reported here because of their importance for interpreting results of the present investigation.
Table 2—Comparison of Posttest Means of Terminal Values for Intervention and Non-Intervention Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Intervention</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Comfortable Life</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Exciting Life</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A World at Peace</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A World of Beauty</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Harmony</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Love</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Friendship</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
+*p<.01
Table 3—Significance Values (d) for Changes in Equality and Freedom for Four Intervention and Non-Intervention Subgroups Varying Initially on Equality and Freedom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality</th>
<th>Equality</th>
<th>Equality</th>
<th>Equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention Group Changes**

| Equality | -1.02 (21)\(^a\) | -1.23 (7) | 2.40* (16) | 2.31* (6) |
| Freedom  | -2.99† (21) | 4.45‡ (7) | -1.39 (16) | 2.04* (6) |

**Non-Intervention Group Changes**

| Equality | -2.54* (10) | -1.32 (5) | 1.01 (10) | 3.39‡ (8) |
| Freedom  | -1.02 (10) | 2.24* (5) | -2.42* (10) | 2.36* (8) |

\(^a\)Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of staff in the subgroup.

*\(p<.05\)
†\(p<.01\)
‡\(p<.001\)
Equality High--Freedom High

The ranking of Equality decreased in the non-intervention group. The change is significant at $p<.05$ level. The ranking of Freedom decreased in the intervention group. This change is significant at $p<.01$ level.

Equality High--Freedom Low

There was no change in ranking Equality in either the intervention or the non-intervention group. The ranking of Freedom increased in both groups. The intervention group change was significant at $p<.001$ level and the non-intervention group change was significant at $p<.05$ level.

Equality Low--Freedom High

The intervention group increased their ranking of Equality. The change is significant at $p<.05$ level. The value change theory predicts that the greatest increases in the ranking of Equality should occur in this subgroup. The non-intervention group decreased their ranking of Freedom.

Two further comments about changes in this subgroup should be made. The difference between the ranking of Equality and Freedom in the Head Start results interpreted to the intervention group was reported to be 10, with the rank for Freedom reported as 1 and Equality 11. Only two subjects in each group ranked these values this far apart. The two subjects in the non-intervention group, as well as those who heard the interpretation, increased their ranking of Equality on posttest.

Additionally, ignoring the difference between Freedom and Equality, a comparison of changes in ranking Equality on posttest for subjects who initially ranked this value 11 or below (the rank in the reported results)
shows that both intervention and non-intervention groups had 16 respondents in this group. Both groups increased their ranking of Equality, on the average, 3.19 ranks.

Equality Low--Freedom Low

Subjects in both groups increased their ranking of both values on posttest.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Two stepwise procedures were used to determine whether any variables might be correlated with changes in the ranking of Equality on posttest compared to pretest ranks. Changes in ranking were represented by subtracting the posttest ranks for Equality and Freedom from the pretest ranks for matched subjects on these values. The Backward Elimination and Maximum $R^2$ Improvement procedures (Barr, Goodnight, Sall, & Helwig, 1976) used 18 variables for intervention subjects and found the difference between the pretest rank for Freedom and Equality was the only variable which produced a statistically significant regression equation and accounted for 29% of the variance.

Since there are no statistically significant changes in mean value rankings for either intervention or non-intervention groups, a regression analysis of the combined groups was performed, using 10 variables. Again, only the pretest difference in the ranking of Freedom and Equality produced a significant equation, accounting for 21% of the variance in the combined group.

The Backward Elimination procedure for analyzing correlations between independent variables (demographic data, pretest scores, and intervention items) and the dependent variable (changes in ranking Freedom)
produced a four-variable model ($p<.02$ and $R^2=.30$). This model included the difference between pretest ranks for Freedom and Equality, income, family size, and degree of satisfaction with over-all value ranking.

The Maximum $R^2$ Improvement procedure entered variables in a different order. That is, some variables with lower statistical significance accounted for slightly greater portions of variance. The best four-variable model found in this analysis included the difference in pretest ranks for Freedom and Equality, attitude toward the food stamp program, over-all satisfaction with value rankings, and satisfaction with the ranking of Equality.

Regression analyses of the combined groups on changes in ranking of Freedom, like the analyses of Equality changes, showed the initial difference between Freedom and Equality ranks to be the only significant variable, accounting for 13% of the variance.

Comparison of Head Start and National Sample Medians

A survey of a national sample of adults (over 21) from all strata of American society was conducted in 1968 by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). The medians found in the Head Start sample are compared to results of this survey for females in Table 4.

Several outstanding differences should be noted. The median ranks for A World at Peace and National Security are much lower in the Head Start sample, while the rank for Salvation is much higher. Six other value medians were significantly different. Differences in sampling methods may account for some of these differences. The Head Start sample was not selected to be representative of women. The most obvious difference is that the Head Start women are employed. The selection of the Head Start sample from Tennessee may account for some differences.
Table 4--Comparison of National Opinion Research Center (NORC) and Head Start Staff (HS) Sample Medians for Terminal Values for Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>NORC Median</th>
<th>HS Median</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Comfortable Life</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Exciting Life</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>10.79‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Sense of Accomplishment</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>6.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A World at Peace</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>68.55§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A World of Beauty</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Security</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Harmony</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>7.55†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Love</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>4.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>22.58§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>18.03§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>9.67‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Recognition</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Friendship</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>3.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
†p < .01
‡p < .005
§p < .001
The comparison of pretest and posttest means for intervention and non-intervention groups shows that the intervention produced no significant changes in the ranking of Equality or Freedom on posttest. Rokeach (1973) has hypothesized that giving feedback which creates awareness of contradictions in "significant others" and, by implication, one's own values and attitudes on the one hand, and self-conceptions on the other, should produce systematic long-term changes in a direction designed to reduce or eliminate such contradictions. This hypothesis has been supported in a number of studies (Greenstein, 1976, Hamid & Flay, 1974, Hollen, 1972, McLellan, 1974, Penner, 1971, Rokeach, 1975, Rokeach & Cochrane, 1972, Rokeach & McLelland, 1972, Sherrid & Beech, 1976; Conroy, Katkin, & Barnette, Note 1).

The results of the present study do not support the hypothesis. Five main points of possible difference may account for the failure of the results from this investigation to provide this support.

First, opposition to the food stamp program may not have been interpreted by Head Start staff as contradicting their self-conceptions as fair-minded, tolerant people. Opposition to civil rights demonstrations may be more clearly or frequently seen as representing such a contradiction. College students may not see civil rights demonstrations as
threatening their own achievement of equality, while the provision of food stamps may be seen by Head Start staff as contributing to other people's equality at the expense of their own. A staff comment may be illustrative: "They have just as much money to feed their family as I do."

Second, other Head Start staff may not have been seen as "significant others" by the respondents. That is, they may not identify other Head Start staff as a positive reference group or model they wish to emulate to the degree students may wish to be like other (positively defined) groups of students.

It is apparent from this sample's significantly higher ranking of Equality for other Head Start staff than for themselves that they did not rank this value in order to appear like other Head Start staff. This may have weakened the impact of the interpreted contradictions meant to induce self-dissatisfaction.

Even though staff in the intervention group who ranked Equality 11 (the mean reported for other Head Start staff) or below \( n=16 \) did increase their ranking of Equality on posttest, one must assume that the interpretation given did not produce this change since non-intervention group staff who ranked Equality at this level \( n=16 \) increased their ranking of Equality to the same extent.

Third, self-dissatisfaction was not aroused in the intervention group, at least it was not expressed when they were given the opportunity to rate their dissatisfaction. Only six rated their over-all dissatisfaction above the middle of the rating scale of 1 to 11 and only three indicated dissatisfaction with their ranking of Equality, specifically.
This failure to produce self-dissatisfaction may have resulted from the points already mentioned or from the inadequacy of the questions for measuring dissatisfaction.

Fourth, evaluation apprehension may have been present in this study to a different degree than in the previous studies, or possibly the following criticism is relevant. Campbell and Hannah (1976) have questioned Rokeach's statement that evaluation apprehension was not a factor in his results with Michigan university students. Believing that the stress on the value rankings of the comparison groups was likely to produce such apprehension, Campbell and Hannah conducted an experiment to arouse evaluation apprehension and measure its effects. They found that a combination of high evaluation apprehension and a cue to increase the ranking of A World of Beauty produced a significant increase in the mean rank for this value on posttest.

It has been assumed that evaluation apprehension was at a minimal level in the present study. No increases in the target value occurred. Further, it seems reasonable to expect that staff who became apprehensive about being evaluated during the intervention should express dissatisfaction with their pretest rankings, but this occurred rarely.

Factors related to the design of the study are believed to have minimized evaluation apprehension. The staff knew that great precaution had been taken to avoid associating their responses with their identity. They knew and expressed trust in the investigator's assurance of their anonymity. They also had experienced other workshops in which evaluations of their efforts were not personally identified, and realized evaluation of individuals is not a Training Office role. Perhaps the sample of the
present study was simply less susceptible to evaluation apprehension than samples selected for previous research. If evaluation apprehension influenced the results in the several studies which have found significant increases in target values after intervention, different theoretical interpretations are needed.

Examination of the published reports gives few clues to the confidence subjects may have had about their anonymity, but it seems likely that without it, there should be a high degree of apprehension about one's own lower value rankings when higher ranks are associated with 'good' teachers (Greenstein, 1976), 'tolerant' police officers (Sherrid & Beech, 1976) and similar positive associations used in other studies. This author is inclined to believe that evaluation apprehension is prevalent among college students and that there is also likely to be a high degree of cynicism about the confidentiality of the results of research, at least so far as their instructor's access to these results is concerned.

Fifth, factors related to the Value Survey's validity and stability may have affected the results found here. Mueller (1974) constructed other scales to measure the constructs Equality and Freedom from 62 items submitted by social psychology students. When these scales (reduced to 22 Equality and 23 Freedom items, both with Kuder-Richardson formula 20 internal consistency coefficients close to .80) were administered, along with the Value Survey, the correlation between Rokeach's and Mueller's Equality scale was .39, and between the Freedom scales was .25. It seems likely that previously reported interventions may have clarified the definitions of Equality and Freedom for experimental subjects, not control subjects, and thereby strongly influenced the effects found. The
definitions arising from the intervention used in the present study, involving attitudes about food stamps, may not have increased the uniformity of the definition of Equality among members of the intervention group.

The analysis of results of this study also raise the question of the test-retest stability of the Value Survey. Most respondents changed their ranks for this value on posttest. The definition of Equality may not only have differed across individuals, but respondents may have changed their own definition of the value from pretest to posttest.

Other Results

The results of the comparison of Head Start staff's ranking of Equality and Freedom for themselves and other Head Start staff suggest that the program goals are recognized and understood, but neither this difference nor the experimental interpretation given to the intervention group produced dissatisfaction in many individuals regarding their ranking of Equality. This is evident from the fact that there were no changes in the mean ranking of Equality on posttest, and from responses to the question regarding each subject's satisfaction with her ranking of Equality following the pretest. Only three of 47 staff responding to this question indicated they were dissatisfied with their ranking of Equality. These results further suggest, as previously stated, that social desirability and evaluation apprehension were minimally operative in the subjects participating.

Responses to the question regarding attitudes concerning the food stamp program suggests the validity of the Training Office perception that many Head Start staff (38% of those responding) do not favor giving
people food stamps, feeling that hungry people should be given food so
money is not wasted, presumably because of the poor choices food stamp
recipients make. Attitudes about the food stamp program were not corre-
lated with posttest increases in ranking Equality. It may be that the
staff did not include providing food stamps as a way of providing for
the achievement of Equality, at least to the same extent that previous
subjects may have seen civil rights attitudes to be related to the value.

One other finding should be mentioned, because of the possibility of
interpreting the results as supporting the theoretical hypotheses, since
it is similar to the systematic change in value systems Rokeach reports
for experimental subjects. Even though the within-group changes were not
significant, five values showed significant differences between groups on
posttest. These values were A Comfortable Life, An Exciting Life, Family
Security, A World at Peace, and National Security. The posttest differ-
ences could have resulted from the intervention, the imperfect stability
of results of the Value Survey, or unidentifiable changes which may have
occurred during the three- to four-month interval between measurements.
Since none of these values changed significantly for either intervention
or non-intervention groups, the posttest differences should not be attri-
buted to the intervention. The present investigator is inclined to be-
lieve that they result from the ipsative nature of the measure.

Only a few of the comparisons between results for female Head Start
staff and for females in the National Opinion Research Center sample will
be discussed here. The differences in sampling methods should be recalled
as a warning against making unwarranted conclusions.
Nine values show no significant differences between the medians of the two samples. Three of these combined medians are in the upper third of the rank-order (1-6), two in the middle third (7-12), and four in the lower third (13-18). This suggests that on these values, at least, the present sample may be assumed to be similar to the national sample of adult females, although there is no way of knowing whether the national sample medians for these values would have been the same in 1976 as they were in 1968.

The two values with the greatest differences are A World at Peace and National Security ($p < .001$). Perhaps a national sample might have ranked these values lower in 1976 than they did in 1968, before the end of the Viet Nam war.

The Head Start sample ranked Salvation much higher than the national sample of women (1.92 vs. 7.33, $p < .001$). This may reflect the geographical location of the Head Start sample in Tennessee, part of the Bible belt.

Other median differences suggest more tentative interpretations. The higher ranking of A Sense of Accomplishment and Self-Respect (and possibly also An Exciting Life) may be related to the fact that the women in this sample are all employed. The Head Start philosophy might also have influenced these rankings.

No interpretation can be suggested by this investigator for differences between this sample's ranking of Inner Harmony, Mature Love (higher), and True Friendship (lower), although interactions with other values (such as among Inner Harmony, Mature Love and Salvation) as well as sampling differences might be involved.
The similarities in ranking many values, and the apparent explanations of several of the differences provides some tentative support for consistency of the rank-ordering of items across subjects, at least in the category of females, regardless of individual inconsistencies in defining each item.

Conclusions

The failure of the present study to support the major hypothesis that respondents given feedback designed to arouse self-dissatisfaction would increase their ranking of Equality on posttest should not be considered as evidence against Rokeach's value change theory. The small size of the Head Start sample and variations in the method used to attempt value change in the present study prevent such a conclusion.

Recommendations

The indication that the Value Survey does not provide a consistent definition of values either across subjects or over time seems to this investigator to be a serious problem. Further research on value change should provide for definitions which have the same meaning for different subjects. Further, definitions must be consistent from one time to another whether subjects do or do not participate in an intervention procedure.

The reference group used in intervention procedures should be established as significant for the sample involved in the procedures.

Evaluation apprehension should be minimized as much as possible in future efforts to change values. Methods which permit identification of the subjects by the investigator should be avoided and these precautions should be thoroughly explained to participants. The sophistication of
many potential subjects is such that they may assume that coded forms will be linked to their names by the investigator, especially in settings where evaluation is prevalent for other reasons, such as in college classrooms.

Previous results of experiments using the Value Survey and Value Change Procedure should be replicated with these precautions because of the great potential usefulness of the procedure for educational programs.

Summary

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of a brief interpretation of the relationship between values and attitudes reported for other Head Start staff on the rank-order of the values Equality and Freedom given three to four months later by Tennessee Head Start staff.

Eighty-three staff from Tennessee Head Start programs rank-ordered a list of 13 terminal values. Fifty of these staff participated in an intervention involving an interpretation of the relative rankings reportedly given the values Equality and Freedom and the relationship of these relative rankings to three attitudes about the food stamp program by another group of Head Start staff. The intervention was designed to arouse self-dissatisfaction regarding respondent's ranking of Equality and produce increases in ranking this value on posttest three to four months later.

The hypothesis was not supported. Several factors considered to be involved in this failure were identified. The inconsistency of meanings given the value Equality may not have been reduced in intervention group respondents to the same degree that such inconsistency of meaning was reduced in previous interventions. Other factors considered important
in this study's failure to confirm results of previous studies include: interpretations using food stamp program attitudes may not produce conflicts with self-conceptions, a lack of identification of the sample with the reference group used in the intervention, and the role of evaluation apprehension which was considered to be minimal in this study compared to previous studies.

It is recommended that future research using these instruments and procedures include precautions against these factors' effects.
APPENDIX A
INSTRUMENTS

VALUE SURVEY - PART 1

BIRTH DATE _________________________ MALE _____ FEMALE_____

FAMILY INCOME UNDER $2,000_____  
$2 - 3,999_____  
$4 - 5,999_____  
$6 - 7,999_____  
OVER $10,000_____

NO. OF FAMILY MEMBERS DEPENDENT ON THIS INCOME_____

HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED 6th GRADE_____  
9th GRADE_____  
12th GRADE_____  
SOME COLLEGE_____  
COLLEGE DEGREE_____  

INSTRUCTIONS

This is a scientific study of value systems. There are no right or wrong answers in this study. The best answer is your own personal opinion.

This questionnaire is intended not only to gather new scientific facts, but also as a teaching device. In return for your cooperation, we hope to provide you with some interesting insights into yourself.

One or more lists of 18 values are included in the survey. They are each listed in alphabetical order. We are interested in finding out the relative importance of these values to you.

Each value is printed on a gummed label which can be easily peeled off and pasted in the spaces on the left-hand side of the page. Study the first list carefully and pick out the one value which is the most important for YOU, as a guiding principle in YOUR life, peel it off and paste it in space 1 on the left.

Then pick out the value which is second most important for you. Peel it off and paste it in space 2. Then do the same for each of the remaining values. The value which is least important goes in space 18.

Work slowly and think carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. The labels peel off easily and can be moved from place to place. The end result should truly show how you really feel.
Rank these values in order of their importance to YOU.

1 ____________________________
2 ____________________________
3 ____________________________
4 ____________________________
5 ____________________________
6 ____________________________
7 ____________________________
8 ____________________________
9 ____________________________
10 ____________________________
11 ____________________________
12 ____________________________
13 ____________________________
14 ____________________________
15 ____________________________
16 ____________________________
17 ____________________________
18 ____________________________

A COMFORTABLE LIFE
(a prosperous life)

AN EXCITING LIFE
(a stimulating, active life)

A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT
(lasting contribution)

A WORLD AT PEACE
(free of war and conflict)

A WORLD OF BEAUTY
(beauty of nature and the arts)

EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)

FAMILY SECURITY
(taking care of loved ones)

FREEDOM
(independence, free choice)

HAPPINESS
(contentedness)

INNER HARMONY
(free from inner conflict)

MATURE LOVE
(sexual and spiritual intimacy)

NATIONAL SECURITY
(protection from attack)

PLEASURE
(an enjoyable, leisurely life)

SALVATION
(saved, eternal life)

SELF-RESPECT
(self-esteem)

SOCIAL RECOGNITION
(respect, admiration)

TRUE FRIENDSHIP
(close companionship)

WISDOM
(a mature understanding of life)

When you are satisfied with your value rankings, go on to the next page.
Now we are interested in knowing how you feel about the way you ranked these 18 values in general. Please circle one number on the following scale:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

I care very much about the order in which I ranked these values.

It does not make much difference which order I put them in.
Rank these values the way you think HEAD START STAFF, on the average, would rank them.

1. A COMFORTABLE LIFE
   (a prosperous life)

2. AN EXCITING LIFE
   (a stimulating, active life)

3. A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT
   (lasting contribution)

4. A WORLD AT PEACE
   (free of war and conflict)

5. A WORLD OF BEAUTY
   (beauty of nature and the arts)

6. EQUALITY
   (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)

7. FAMILY SECURITY
   (taking care of loved ones)

8. FREEDOM
   (independence, free choice)

9. HAPPINESS
   (contentedness)

10. INNER HARMONY
    (free from inner conflict)

11. MATURE LOVE
    (sexual and spiritual intimacy)

12. NATIONAL SECURITY
    (protection from attack)

13. PLEASURE
    (an enjoyable, leisurely life)

14. SALVATION
    (saved, eternal life)

15. SELF-RESPECT
    (self-esteem)

16. SOCIAL RECOGNITION
    (respect, admiration)

17. TRUE FRIENDSHIP
    (close companionship)

18. WISDOM
    (a mature understanding of life)
VALUE SURVEY - PART 2

NOW COPY YOUR ANSWERS FROM THE VALUE SCALE ON PAGE 1 (YOUR OWN VALUE RANKINGS) ONTO THIS PAGE.

MY OWN VALUE SYSTEM

_____ A COMFORTABLE LIFE
_____ AN EXCITING LIFE
_____ A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT
_____ A WORLD AT PEACE
_____ A WORLD OF BEAUTY
_____ EQUALITY
_____ FAMILY SECURITY
_____ FREEDOM
_____ HAPPINESS
_____ INNER HARMONY
_____ NATURE LOVE
_____ NATIONAL SECURITY
_____ PLEASURE
_____ SALVATION
_____ SELF-RESPECT
_____ SOCIAL RECOGNITION
_____ TRUE FRIENDSHIP
_____ WISDOM

WHEN YOU HAVE FINISHED THIS PAGE:

1. HAND IN PART 1.
2. WAIT FOR FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS. DO NOT GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.
Now, I would like to tell you some things we have already found out about the value systems of Head Start staff. I am sure that many of you would like to know what they are.

This same value system scale was filled out by 298 staff in other Head Start programs. The responses of these staff were obtained and averaged together. The table below shows the results.

**Rank Order of Importance to 298 Head Start Staff Members in Region IV**

- 7 A Comfortable Life
- 10 An Exciting Life
- 12 A Sense of Accomplishment
- 2 A World at Peace
- 14 A World of Beauty
- 11 Equality
- 3 Family Security
- 1 Freedom
- 6 Happiness
- 13 Inner Harmony
- 16 Mature Love
- 10 National Security
- 17 Pleasure
- 5 Salvation
- 4 Self-Respect
- 15 Social Recognition
- 9 True Friendship
- 8 Wisdom

One of the most interesting findings shown in this Table is that the staff, on the average, felt that freedom was very important—they ranked it 1; but they felt that equality was considerably less important—they ranked it 11. Apparently, Head Start staff value freedom far more highly than they value equality. This suggests that Head Start staff in general are much more interested in their own freedom than they are in freedom for other people.

Feel free to spend a few minutes comparing your own rankings on the preceding page with those of the 298 staff, shown in this Table. After doing that, please stop and wait for further instructions. DO NOT GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.
We have one other finding which we think is unusually interesting. In order to make this finding more meaningful and relevant to you personally, you should first answer honestly the following question on social services.

Which of the following comes closest to your views about the food stamp program?

- The food stamp program should be expanded to be sure nobody goes hungry - even if it means higher taxes.
- I think the food stamp program is very good as it is.
- I don't believe in food stamps, people who are hungry should be given food so they won't waste the money.

The 298 Head Start staff who participated in the previous study of value systems were asked this same question. They were divided into three groups, according to how they responded. The following table shows the average rankings of Freedom and Equality for each of these three groups.

AVERAGE RANKINGS OF FREEDOM AND EQUALITY BY HEAD START STAFF: FOR EXPANDING OR ELIMINATING FOOD STAMPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For Expanding</th>
<th>For Keeping As It Is</th>
<th>For Eliminating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREEDOM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUALITY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice in the table that:

1. Pro- and anti-food stamp program staff all value freedom relatively highly. Of 18 values all groups rank freedom among the top six.
2. Staff who are strongly for the food stamp program value equality rather highly - they ranked it 5; but those against the food stamp program place a much lower value on equality - they ranked it 17 in importance. Those who want to keep the food stamp program as it is ranked equality 11.
3. The distance between freedom and equality is +1 for the strong food stamp group, -10 for the middle group, and -15 for the anti-food stamp group.

Apparently both freedom and equality are important to some people, while to others freedom is very important but equality is not.

This raises the question whether those who are against food stamps are really saying that they care a great deal about their own freedom but are indifferent to other people's freedom. Those who are for food stamps are perhaps really saying they not only want freedom for themselves, but for other people too. What do you think?

(Please circle one number)

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11

I agree strongly with this interpretation.  I disagree strongly with this interpretation.  I'm not sure.

Before you go on to the last part of this questionnaire, please spend a few minutes comparing your own rankings from the first page with these results. Then go on to the next page.
We would now be most interested to find out how you feel about the method we have used to teach you something about the value systems of Head Start staff.

Did you find it thought-provoking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely thought-provoking</td>
<td>Extremely boring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think this technique of teaching will lead you to do some more thinking about your own values?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very much</td>
<td>No, not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you feel that your responses were somewhat hypocritical?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very hypocritical</td>
<td>No, not at all hypocritical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Right now, how satisfied do you feel about the way you have ranked the eighteen values?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.
Now look again for a moment at your own rankings on the first page. Which rankings do you now feel satisfied or dissatisfied with? (Please indicate whether you now feel satisfied or dissatisfied with each one, by a check mark or an X.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am satisfied with my ranking of:</th>
<th>I am dissatisfied with my ranking of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A COMFORTABLE LIFE</td>
<td>AN EXCITING LIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT</td>
<td>A WORLD AT PEACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A WORLD OF BEAUTY</td>
<td>EQUALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY SECURITY</td>
<td>FREEDOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPPINESS</td>
<td>INNER HARMONY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATURE LOVE</td>
<td>NATIONAL SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEASURE</td>
<td>SALVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-RESPECT</td>
<td>SOCIAL RECOGNITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL RECOGNITION</td>
<td>TRUE FRIENDSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISDOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your own opinion, do you think that the Head Start findings I have described to you are scientifically valid?

Yes  No

In the space below, please explain why you answered the previous question the way you did.

Do you have any other comments you wish to make about this study? Please comment in the space below. Remember, everything in this questionnaire is absolutely confidential, and to be used only for scientific purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation.
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