

Values

*Valerie A. Braithwaite and William A. Scott*

The study of values is central to and involves the intersection of interests of philosophers, anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists. Values are presumed to encapsulate the aspirations of individuals and societies: They pertain to what is desirable, to deeply engrained standards that determine future directions and justify past actions. Values have been postulated as key constructs in the socialization process, and have found their way into cultural, religious, political, educational, occupational, and family research. Other intellectual traditions see values as also having an individual function shaped by the biological and psychological needs of each person. This perspective has fostered research linking values to the attitudes and personality of individuals and to the maintenance and enhancement of self-esteem.

In spite of widespread acceptance of the relevance of values to human activity at both the individual and social levels of analysis, developments in the field have been hampered by problems of definition and doubts about the empirical viability of the construct. Concern about theoretical fragmentation and conceptual diversity was a major theme in Levitin's (1968) review. Smith (1969) concurred that the empirical study of values had "started from different preconceptions and . . . altogether failed to link together and yield a domain of cumulative knowledge" (p. 98). Much has happened in the past two decades to improve this situation, most of it attributable to the innovative contribution of the late Milton Rokeach (1968, 1973). Convergence of views at the conceptual level, however, is still not reflected in the scales that are available to measure values. They are testaments to the diverse ways in which the value construct was conceptualized some thirty years ago.

Although the notion of value as an absolute attribute of an object had been firmly rejected by the 1950s, social scientists differed on the appropriate referent for value (Adler, 1956). Was value an attribute of the person "doing the valuing" or the object "receiving the valuing"?

A second widely discussed topic was the distinction between value as the desirable and value as the desired, the difference between what one "ought" to do and what one "wants" to do. Out of such deliberations in the 1950s and 1960s a unifying consensus emerged that values were "person-centered" and pertained to "the desirable," a consensus captured in the definition proposed by Clyde Kluckhohn (1951):

A value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action. (p. 395)

In spite of a unifying theme at the conceptual level, convergence in empirical values research did not follow. The first drawback was that the most established measures of personal and cultural values at that time were not consistent with the notion of "conceptions of the desirable." The Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey *Study of Values* (1960) assessed personal interests and preferences. Florence Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) measure of cultural values was concerned with existential and general beliefs about human beings, and their relationships with each other and with their world.

A second factor blocking progress in values research was that although Clyde Kluckhohn's (1951) definition specified the desirable, the elements that constituted that domain could relate to anything from the way a person interacted with another through individual lifestyles or philosophies of life to the way a person thought the world should be. Adequate operationalization was made difficult by an inability to specify the elements of the value domain to ensure systematic item sampling. The result has been the adoption of piecemeal approaches in which a few dimensions have been measured with little justification for why they were the most important.

A third operational difficulty concerned the appropriate level of abstraction for item sampling. Values were widely accepted as general rather than specific: as "generalized ends" (Fallding, 1965, p. 227), as "nearly independent of specific situations" (Williams, 1968, p. 284), as "abstractions concerning general classes of objects" (Katz & Stotland, 1959, p. 432) or as generalized attitudes (Bem, 1970; Dukes, 1955; Newcomb, Turner, & Converse, 1965; Smith, 1963). It has never been clear, however, whether values were to be inferred from responses to specific attitude statements or more directly from general orienting responses. Furthermore, at what point on the specific-general continuum did attitudes become values?

Thus, while some conceptual agreement was being reached in the late 1960s about the nature of value, there was no emerging consensus on the operationalization of the construct. Handy (1970) was led to conclude that "the official definitions given sometimes do not conform to what was studied, and there often appears to be little effective control over what putatively was measured" (p. 207). This was the state of the art when Rokeach's (1968, 1973) work first appeared, providing the conceptual and operational synergy that had been eluding value research for so long.

### **Rokeach's Contribution to Empirical Values Research**

Rokeach set about measuring values by asking respondents first to rank-order 18 instrumental values (modes of conduct) and second, 18 terminal values (end-states of existence) in terms of their importance as guiding principles in their lives. A *value* was defined 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". Sets of values formed *value systems*, defined as "enduring organization[s] of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of importance" (1973, p. 5).

These value systems were regarded as part of a functionally integrated cognitive system in which the basic units of analysis are beliefs. Clusters of beliefs form attitudes that are functionally and cognitively connected to the value systems. Rokeach further postulated classes of beliefs concerned with self-cognitions representing "the innermost core of the total belief system, and all remaining beliefs, attitudes and values can be

conceived of as functionally organized around this innermost core" (1973, p. 216). Like other beliefs, then, values serve to maintain and enhance the self-concept.

Rokeach capitalized on the emerging consensus of the 1960s by accepting values as general beliefs, as having a motivational function, as not merely evaluative but prescriptive and proscriptive, as guiding actions and attitudes, and as individual as well as social phenomena. (See Allport, 1961, Smith, 1963, and Kluckhohn, 1951, for a discussion of these issues.) As well as consolidating these themes, Rokeach integrated a number of other strands of thought and research from the values literature. A significant body of work has focused on the attitude-value relationship (Carlson, 1956; Constantinople, 1967; Nelson, 1968; Ostrom & Brock, 1969; Peak, 1955; Rosenberg, 1956, 1960; Smith, 1949; Woodruff & Di Vesta, 1948). According to this view, values were more central concepts than attitude, were determinants of attitude, and were more resistant to change, with favorable attitudes emerging toward objects instrumental in the attainment of important values.

Rokeach also incorporated the views of those claiming strong ties between an individual's self-esteem and values (Katz & Stotland, 1959; Kluckhohn, 1951; Smith, 1963). Kluckhohn noted how some values acted "as components of super-ego or ego-ideal: . . . if violated, there is guilt, shame, ego-deflation, intropunitive reaction" (cited in Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 398). Guilt arising from value violation was an important part of Scott's (1965) conceptualization. Smith (1963) extended this idea to include protection of self-esteem as well: "In the long pull of maintaining 'face' before others and self-esteem within, we all become thoroughly practiced in evoking values to justify ourselves." (p. 345).

A third feature of earlier work that Rokeach integrated into his model was the notion that values are hierarchically organized (Katz & Stotland, 1959; Kluckhohn, 1951; Mukerjee, 1965; Tanaka, 1972; Williams, 1970; Woodruff & Di Vesta, 1948). Although the exact form of the hierarchy (e.g., linear or otherwise) remained unresolved, the notion of "prioritizing" values had proven popular to explain and resolve value conflict according to some systematic, learned organization of rules.

Fourth, Rokeach's operationalization of the value construct identified values as both modes of conduct and end-states. These concepts are similar to Kluckhohn's (1951) modes, means and ends of action, although Kluckhohn saw them not as values but as behaviors selected *through* values. Scott (1965) had identified values, in part, through the fact that they are ultimate (final sufficient ends) and Fallding (1965) through their being associated with "satisfactions that are self-sufficient" (p. 223). Modes of conduct gained prominence through the work of Lovejoy (1950), who distinguished adjectival values (i.e., modes of conduct) and terminal values (i.e., end states of existence). By defining values as either modes of conduct or end-states, Rokeach was able to build on and move beyond the content covered by the existing value instruments.

## Rethinking Beliefs

While integrating much of contemporary thinking on values, Rokeach departed from the mainstream in three ways. First, his definition of belief served to differentiate more clearly the hitherto interrelated concepts of attitude and value. Traditionally, beliefs have been linked with information about an object, attitudes to evaluation of that object (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Kluckhohn, 1951). Beliefs are not just cognitions in Rokeach's conceptual schema, but predispositions to action capable of arousing affect around the object of the belief. Attitudes and values have been defined and differentiated by Rokeach in terms of the types of beliefs composing them. Value refers to a single proscriptive or prescriptive belief that transcends specific objects or situations, while attitude refers to an organization

of several beliefs focused on a specific object or situation. Together they constitute the value-attitude system, embedded in the wider belief system.

Rokeach's second departure from mainstream thought was in separating "instrumental" and "terminal" value systems. Apart from subsuming much of the empirical work that had already been conducted under the umbrella of values, identifying values as modes of conduct or end-states of existence clearly delimited the boundaries of the value domain. Rokeach's extension of this model, however, and proposal that modes of conduct are instrumental to the achievement of desirable ends cannot be readily justified. Many have argued convincingly against such thinking. Kluckhohn (1951) adopted the position that modes of conduct, the personal qualities or traits which individuals like to think of themselves as having, may serve as either means or ends. Lovejoy (1950) also strongly opposed linking modes with means in a means-end model. According to Lovejoy, the choice of a particular course of action may be influenced either by how one wishes to be perceived (adjectival values), or by the end-states one wishes to attain (terminal values), or by both. Although adjectival and terminal values are likely to affect and interact with each other, one is not in the service of the other.

Rokeach's third innovation was the notion that values can be conceptualized as two simple linear hierarchies. Criticisms of this proposition (Gorsuch, 1970; Kitwood & Smithers, 1975; Ng, 1982) have pointed to the likelihood that people have values that are *equally* important and that, in real life, some values are not likely to be compared with others. Thus, rank-ordering two sets of values is seen as a highly artificial task. Increasingly, however, research is supporting the feasibility of the rank-ordering approach, demonstrating that similar results emerge when fewer restrictions are placed on the respondent (Alwin & Krosnick, 1985; Feather, 1973; Moore, 1975; Munson & McIntyre, 1979; Rankin & Grube, 1980; Reynolds & Jolly, 1980).

Overall, Rokeach's (1968, 1973) departure from the mainstream at the conceptual level has offered clarity and order. At a methodological level, however, criticisms have been made of Rokeach's work that have far-reaching implications for the field of value measurement. In particular, item sampling and single-item measurement have been problematic issues for Rokeach, as they have been for others. Few measures in this chapter either provide justification for focusing on particular facets of the value domain or involve systematic sampling of items to represent these facets. With regard to single-item measurement, the practice continues to be a popular option for researchers who seek economy in their value measures (Christenson, Hougland, Gage, & Hoa, 1984; Hill & Stull, 1981; Kohn, 1969). These problems are endemic to as broad a field as values.

### **Item Sampling**

Rokeach's identification of the 36 most important terminal and instrumental values has been criticized as arbitrary and subjective (R. A. Jones, Sensenig, & Ashmore, 1978; Keats & Keats, 1974; Kitwood & Smithers, 1975; Lynn, 1974). Rokeach (1973) himself acknowledged the overall procedure to be "an intuitive one" (p. 30). In this case, however, the subsequent literature has uncovered few omissions. Braithwaite and Law (1985), using 115 semistructured interviews to obtain a more comprehensive coverage of the universe of content, concluded that Rokeach's item sampling was basically sound. The interviews identified 54 goals in life and 71 ways of behaving, which factor analysis reduced to 19 basic dimensions corresponding quite well with the Value Survey items. Of the four major omissions identified in this study, only physical well-being and individual

rights have been mentioned by other researchers. The omission of individual rights, more specifically justice, has been a cause of concern in cross-cultural contexts (Feather & Hutton, 1973; Ng, 1982). In examining the value correlates of preventive health behavior, Kristiansen (1985) noted the absence of "health" as a terminal value, an item which Rokeach added in a recent revision of his instrument.

The Value Survey has been examined closely for the adequacy of its item sampling and in the final analysis has fared well. Other instruments, however, have not been similarly scrutinized and there is often little in the development of these measures to reassure users of their adequacy on this criterion.

### Single-Item Measures

Concerns about single-item measurement arise with the Value Survey because each value is assessed only by one- or two-word items in a heading (e.g., FREEDOM) and then one or two phrases in brackets underneath (e.g., independence, free choice) (Braithwaite & Law, 1985; Gorsuch & McFarland, 1972; Mueller, 1974).

According to psychometric theory, no single item is a pure measure of the construct of interest, since each reflects error, some attributable to other irrelevant constructs and some to random fluctuations. Constructs are best measured, therefore, by a number of different items that converge on the theoretical meaning of the construct while diverging on the irrelevant aspects that are being unavoidably assessed. Such a strategy is the conventional approach to arriving at a reliable and valid measure of a construct. Rokeach (1967) departed from this tradition with abstract concepts that are highly ambiguous and open to a variety of interpretations. As Gorsuch and McFarland (1972) have suggested, Rokeach opted for single-item measures because of economy. The Value Survey offers a wide coverage of items using a simple rank-ordering procedure that facilitates its use in a variety of research contexts. For example, respondents have been asked to complete the Value Survey twice: to represent their own values in the first instance, and their perceptions of the values of others or of institutions in the second (Feather, 1979a, 1980; Rokeach, 1979). Multiple-items would lengthen and complicate the measurement procedure enormously and the flexibility of the instrument would be lost.

Overriding the issue of cost, however, is the more fundamental criterion of validity (Gorsuch & McFarland, 1972). Are single items as valid as multi-item scales? Gorsuch and McFarland's work suggests that there is no simple answer; it depends on the items and the research questions being asked. Findings based on the Value Survey's measures of "salvation" and "equality," for instance, are highly consistent (Billig & Cochrane, 1979; Bishop, Barclay, & Rokeach, 1972; Cochrane, Billig, & Hogg, 1979; Feather, 1970b, 1975b; Joe, Jones, & Miller, 1981; Rawls, Harrison, Rawls, Hayes, & Johnson, 1973; Rokeach, 1969a, 1973; Tate & Miller, 1971; Thomas, 1986). In contrast, studies relying on the measures of "helpful" and "freedom" have produced discrepant results (Braithwaite, 1982; Cochrane *et al.*, 1979; Feather, 1977, 1984a; Homant & Rokeach, 1970; Joe *et al.*, 1981; Penner, Summers, Brookmire, & Dertke, 1976; Shotland & Berger, 1970; Staub, 1974).

The seriousness of the problem for users of the Value Survey is demonstrated by Feather's (1971, 1975a) inconsistent findings across data collected in the same place but at different times. In examining the values of science and humanities students across 2 consecutive years, Feather (1971) reported 13 significant differences in his 1970 data and 7 in his 1969 data. Only four were common to both analyses. In a second paper relating

income level to values, Feather (1975a) reported 10 significant differences in 1972 and 11 in 1973, with four findings being replicated. In a third paper on the value correlates of dogmatism, Feather (1970a) was unable to replicate any from one year to the next.

Reliance on single-item measures becomes particularly problematic in cross-cultural comparisons of value systems, an area in which the Value Survey has attracted considerable attention (Feather, 1986; Furnham, 1984; Mahoney, 1977; Moore, 1976; Penner & Anh, 1977; Rokeach, 1973). The difficulties of transporting value constructs across cultures and of obtaining equivalent measures are legendary (Feather, 1986; Hofstede, 1980; Hui & Triandis, 1985; Triandis, Kilty, Shanmugam, Tanaka, & Vassiliou, 1972; Zavalloni, 1980). Translations are generally possible, but comparable interpretation is less easily assured.

As great as the problems of cross-cultural value inquiry are, the use of single-item measures is likely to magnify them further. Detracting from their advantage of efficiency is the danger of incorrectly inferring cultural similarity or dissimilarity because the data base was a single response to a highly abstract concept. In contrast, multi-item measurement provides a stronger basis for inferring group differences. Five items that tap different aspects of equality, for example, provide researchers with a clearer basis for interpretation than one item. Respondents have more than one chance to communicate their views and researchers have several sources of data on which to rely when interpreting the results.

### Measures Reviewed Here

This review has given priority to the work of Rokeach, a bias that reflects the sheer dominance of his contribution to integrating and clarifying the value concept. In view of the measurement shortcomings of the Value Survey, however, other multi-item scales offer useful alternatives. The instruments reviewed in this chapter are:

1. The Study of Values (Allport, *et al.*, 1960)
2. The Value Survey (Rokeach, 1967)
3. The Goal and Mode Values Inventories (Braithwaite & Law, 1985)
4. Ways to Live (Morris, 1956b)
5. Revised Ways to Live (Dempsey & Dukes, 1966)
6. Value Profile (Bales & Couch, 1969)
7. Life Role Inventory—Value Scales (Fitzsimmons, Macnab, & Casserly, 1985)
8. Conceptions of the Desirable (Lorr, Suziedelis, & Tonesk, 1973)
9. Empirically Derived Value Constructions (Gorlow & Noll, 1967)
10. The East-West Questionnaire (Gilgen & Cho, 1979a)
11. Value Orientations (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961)
12. Personal Value Scales (Scott, 1965)
13. Survey of Interpersonal Values (Gordon, 1960)
14. The Moral Behavior Scale (Crissman, 1942; Rettig & Pasamanick, 1959)
15. The Morally Debatable Behaviors Scales (Harding & Phillips, 1986)

These scales demonstrate that values have been measured by using abstract philosophical issues that transcend cultural boundaries (Nos. 4, 5, 10, and 11), by drawing upon a broad range of goals, ways of behaving, and states of affairs that are valued in Western societies (Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9), and by focusing more narrowly on personal, interpersonal or moral behavior held in high regard in Western cultures (Nos. 12, 13, 14, and 15).

There is considerable diversity as well in the dimensions used for item evaluation.

Judgments are made in terms of preference (1, 4), agreement (6, 10), importance (7, 13), goodness (14), justifiability (15), importance as guiding principles (2, 3), and consistent admiration (12). The semantic distinctiveness of these dimensions has been well documented (see Levitin, 1968), but less is understood about their empirical distinctiveness. Some work has addressed this issue showing equivalence of some (Bolt, 1978) and nonequivalence of others (Morris, 1956b).

In the midst of this variability, one can also detect some common threads. While few value researchers have empirically examined cross-instrument relationships, some recurring themes emerge in the dimensions identified through factor analytic studies of these instruments. Related scales falling under each category are as follows:

1. Concern for the welfare of others: Benevolence (13), Kindness (12), Social Orientation (1, 7), Equalitarianism (6), Humanistic Orientation (8), A Positive Orientation to Others (3), and Receptivity and Concern (4);
2. Status Desired or Respected: Recognition and Leadership (13), Status (12), Personal Achievement and Development (7), Philistine Orientation [identified in (1) by Duffy & Crissy, 1940, and Lurie, 1937], Acceptance of Authority (6), Status-Security Values (9), an Authoritarian Orientation (8), and Social Standing (3);
3. Self-control: Self-control (12) and Social Restraint and Self-control (4);
4. Unrestrained Pleasure: Self-Indulgence (4), Need-Determined Expression versus Value-Determined Restraint (6), and a Hedonistic Orientation (8);
5. Individualism: Independence (13, 12, 7), Withdrawal and Self-Sufficiency (4), Individualism (6), the Rugged Individualist (9), and the Work Ethic (8);
6. Social Adeptness: Social Skills (12) and Conformity (13); and
7. Religiosity: Religious Orientation (1), Traditional Religiosity (3), and Religiousness (12).

Selection from among the 15 scales reviewed must ultimately depend on the research question and the context in which values are to be assessed. The scales can be differentiated on the following decision-making criteria:

1. Conceptual breadth. Instruments 1-11 are based on a broad conceptualization of the value domain, while 12 and 13 are restricted in scope to interpersonal values and 14 and 15 more narrowly to moral values.
2. Representative sampling of items from the domain of inquiry. This issue has generally not been given much attention, although the relevance and comprehensiveness of items has been addressed with Instruments 2, 3, 6, and 12.
3. Representation of Western values rather than cross-culturally relevant values. Most value scales are biased toward Western values, but Instruments 4, 5, 10, and 11 are oriented to measuring values that transcend Western cultural boundaries.
4. Reliance on multi-item rather than single-item measurement. The scales reviewed in this chapter are strong on this criterion, but Instruments 2, 4, and 5 adopt a single-item approach.
5. Use in nonstudent populations. Most value scales have been developed and used with American college students, but there are some notable exceptions. Instruments 1, 2, 7, 13, and 15 have been used extensively in nonstudent populations, 2 and 15 with large probability samples from the general population.
6. Availability of basic data on instrument reliability and validity. Instruments 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, and 15 are weak on this criterion.
7. Compatibility with the dominant conceptualization of value. Instruments 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, and 13 do not measure conceptions of the desirable.

8. Relevance of items. Instruments 6 and 14 are older measures in which the language and content of some items have become dated.

### Omissions

At this point the limits imposed on the scales reviewed should be specified. Excluded are measures of specific values such as altruism (e.g., Rushton, Chrisjohn, & Fekken, 1981), equality (e.g., Bell & Robinson, 1978), and materialist-postmaterialist goals (Inglehart, 1971, 1977), measures of moral judgment ability (e.g., Rest, 1972), measures of broader concepts such as modernity (e.g., Kahl, 1968), measures that focus on values in work, family, or other specific contexts (e.g., England, 1967; Harding & Phillips, 1986; Hofstede, 1980; Kohn, 1969), children's measures (e.g., Lortie-Lussier, Fellers, & Kleinplatz, 1986; Smart & Smart, 1975), and projective measures (e.g., Kilmann, 1975; Rorer & Ziller, 1982). Four instruments from the previous edition of *Measures of Social-Psychological Attitudes* have also been excluded because of less frequent usage in the past decade: Ewell's (1954) Inventory of Values, Perloe's (1967) Social Values Questionnaire, Shorr's (1953) Test of Value Activities, and Withey's (1965) Dimensions of Values. Reference to the latter, however, is included under Bales and Couch's (1969) Value Profile.

While the above limitations restrict the scales that can be reviewed in detail, there are other interesting contributions to value measurement that warrant attention. Five have been singled out as illustrative of approaches to meeting the most pressing problems facing value researchers at this time: inadequate methodologies for cross-cultural comparisons (Zavalloni, 1980) and a dearth of theory to guide values research (Spates, 1983).

The first stems from the work of Schwartz and Bilsky (1987). Schwartz and co-workers are developing and testing a broadly based values instrument which seeks to provide multi-item and cross-culturally valid scales. Their work extends Rokeach's definition of values both conceptually and methodologically. Values are defined as trans-situational goals that serve as guiding principles in a person's life. The values are differentiated in terms of three criteria. First, they may be instrumental or terminal goals. Second, their focus may be individualistic, collectivist, or both. Third, they relate to 12 motivational domains. The domains are assumed to be present in every culture since they arise from three universal human requirements: the biological needs of individuals, the requisites of coordinated social interaction, and the survival and welfare needs of groups.

The second noteworthy contribution is the antecedent-consequent method of Triandis *et al.* (1972) for comparing values across cultures. These authors selected 20 abstract concepts that were expected to highlight cultural differences in values (e.g., anger, freedom, punishment, death, love). Respondents indicated what each of these concepts meant to them by selecting from a list of five words one that identified the cause of the concept. Respondents were presented with six such lists, allowing them to choose six antecedents for each concept. After selecting antecedents, the same procedure was followed to identify consequences or the results of the concept. The frequencies with which 30 antecedents and 30 consequents were endorsed by members of different cultures were then tabulated and compared (see Triandis *et al.*, 1972). Triandis *et al.* have argued that "common themes found among such As [antecedents] and Cs [consequents] reveal underlying values, that is, cultural patterns of preferences for certain outcomes" (p. 258). On the negative side, however, these value preferences constitute only a small part of the cognitions measured through Triandis's procedure, and the "themes" involve a considerable amount of inferential work.



An alternative cross-cultural methodology for values has been proposed by Triandis and his co-workers (1986) in relation to the specific value orientation of individualism-collectivism. A large item pool was generated by cooperating researchers in nine countries and only those items that half or more of the researchers found relevant and none found irrelevant were used. The resulting 21 items were then subjected to an item and factor analysis within each culture. The analyses ensured relevance to the collectivism construct within each culture and comparable interrelationships among items across cultures. On this basis, the assumption could be made that items were being given similar meanings by the different cultural groups. Finally, Triandis *et al.* (1986) factor-analyzed the 21 items across all respondents from the nine cultures. From this pancultural factor analysis, Triandis *et al.* were able to identify four etic factors for cross-cultural comparisons.

A fourth approach offering both conceptual and methodological insights for value researchers is that of Hofstede (1980) on work values. Four value dimensions were identified as "basic problems of humanity with which every society has to cope" (p. 313): Power Distance (social inequality and the authority of one person over another), Uncertainty Avoidance (the way societies deal with the uncertainty of the future), Individualism versus Collectivism (the individual's dependence on the group), and Masculinity versus Femininity [the endorsement of masculine (e.g., assertive) goals as opposed to feminine (e.g., nurturant) goals within the group]. These dimensions are not too dissimilar from the value orientations outlined by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) and Bales and Couch (1969) and may be modified for use outside the work context. Methodologically, Hofstede (1980) has emphasized the importance of analyzing data at the ecological level as distinct from the individual level. Hofstede derived his value measures through analyzing the scores of 40 countries rather than the scores of individuals.

The final contribution deserving mention is Inglehart's (1971, 1977) work on social values. Inglehart has focused on one major dimension representing desirable national goals. At one end are the materialist values that arise in response to needs for economic and physical security. The other pole is defined by postmaterialist values, that is, by values concerned with social and self-actualizing needs. Inglehart (1977) has measured the materialist-postmaterialist value dimension through the ranking of 12 national policy objectives, half of which represent materialist values (e.g., fighting rising prices), the remainder nonmaterialist values (e.g., giving people more say in important government decisions).

Inglehart's conceptualization is based on Maslow's (1962) need hierarchy. The materialist values representing sustenance and safety needs must be satisfied before the postmaterialist values tapping belongingness, esteem, intellectual and aesthetic needs are given priority. Inglehart argues that postmaterialist values are characteristic of younger generations, who have been the beneficiaries of an era of peace and economic prosperity.

Inglehart's (1977) work warrants special consideration because of its theoretical base in Maslow's (1962) theory of human needs. In contrast, so much of values research has not been guided by theory. The contrast in approaches can be well illustrated by a comparison of Inglehart's notion of materialism-postmaterialism and Rokeach's (1973) two-value model of political ideology. Conceptually they have much in common, although Inglehart's model is unidimensional and Rokeach's is two-dimensional. In terms of guiding future research, however, Inglehart's work has the advantage of being articulated with grand development themes, both in terms of human history and individual functioning. Rokeach's model, however, merely provides a means for differentiating political behavior. Values research could benefit considerably from theoretical developments of the kind offered by Inglehart.

To appraise values research and identify strengths and weaknesses is to make assumptions about how values should be studied. Before concluding this review, our assumptions will be delineated and alternative approaches acknowledged.

First, the assumption is made that the nature of values in a society can be understood by aggregating the values espoused by individuals. It is, of course, possible to adopt a methodologically holistic approach to the measurement of a society's values. Such an approach might involve an analysis of the language of a cultural group or a content analysis of the most widely consumed mass media or of seminal legislative enactments arising out of the political process. We have put all of these methods outside the scope of this review, but they nevertheless represent important alternative approaches.

At the opposite extreme we have neglected the ideographic approach, which seeks to redirect attention away from the group entirely and toward the individual. The practice of analyzing group data by aggregating scores across unique individuals is firmly rejected within the ideographic tradition (Caird, 1987; Lamiell, 1981). Clearly, the present review is at odds with this viewpoint. Our bias is toward nomothetic procedures. While ideographic techniques may well provide new insights into the nature of values, this review rests on the assumption that the more researchers refine, consolidate, and bridge available nomothetic measures, the sooner we will have a strong empirical base for understanding human values.

## Study of Values

(Allport, Vernon & Lindzey, 1960)

### Variable

The instrument measures "the relative prominence of six basic interests or motives in personality: the *theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious*" (Allport *et al.*, 1960, p. 3).

### Description

The six-way classification is based on Spranger's (1928) ideal *Types of Men*. The theoretical person has intellectual interests, his/her major pursuit being the discovery of truth. The economic person has a practical nature and is interested in that which is useful. The aesthetic person looks for form and harmony in the world, each experience being judged according to grace, symmetry, or fitness. The social person values others and is altruistic and philanthropic. The political person is one who seeks power, influence, and renown. The religious person values unity above all else and is mystical, seeking communion with the cosmos.

The 1931 edition of the Study of Values was revised in 1951 and again in 1960. The test content, however, has not changed since 1951. The 1960 version consists of two parts. Part I comprises 30 questions, each of which presents respondents with two alternative answers. Respondents are required to indicate the strength of their preference by distributing three points between the two alternatives (3 to one and 0 to the other or 2 to one and 1 to the other). In Part II, respondents are asked 15 questions and are required to rank the four alternative answers to each question from the most preferred (4) to the least preferred (1).

Respondents are given 20 opportunities to endorse each of the six value orientations, 10 in Part I and 10 in Part II. Scores for each value are obtained by summing item scores

and adding or subtracting correction figures provided on the last page of the test booklet. The corrections are made in order to equalize the popularity of the six values, giving each a mean of 40.

The test is self-administered, most respondents requiring about 20 minutes for completion. The test can also be self-scored, using instructions for both scoring and interpretation on the last page of the test booklet.

### Sample

This instrument has been developed for use with college students or with adults who have had some college education (or its equivalent). In the 1960 manual, norms are provided for 8369 male and female American college students. Norms are also provided for men and women representing 13 occupational groups.

### Reliability

#### *Internal Consistency*

Allport *et al.* (1960) report that split-half reliability coefficients ranged from .84 for theoretical values to .95 for religious values and that item-total correlations for each scale were all significant at the .01 level.

#### *Test-Retest*

With a 1-month interval, Allport *et al.* (1960) report coefficients ranging from .77 for social values to .92 for economic values ( $n = 34$ ). After a 2-month interval, test-retest reliabilities ranged from .84 for economic values to .93 for religious values ( $n = 53$ ). Test-retest reliabilities obtained by Hilton and Korn (1964) over seven occasions at 1-month intervals with a sample of 30 students ranged from .74 for political values to .89 for religious values, the mean being .82.

### Validity

#### *Convergent*

The Study of Values has successfully differentiated students in different fields of study, as well as individuals in different occupations and with different vocational interests. Reviews by Allport *et al.* (1960), Cantril and Allport (1933), Duffy (1940), Dukes (1955), and Hogan (1972) provide details of this early validation work.

The instrument has performed impressively in documenting value changes among college graduates over a span of 38 years (Hoge & Bender, 1974), including both social changes due to historical events and individual changes accompanying experiences of frustration and personal inadequacy. The Study of Values Scale has also contributed to identifying gender differences (Duffy, 1940), findings that have been largely confirmed in a study of male and female business students by Palmer (1982). Other work has shown the instrument to differentiate women who are homemakers from career women (Pirnot & Dustin, 1986; Wagman, 1966), and in a somewhat less "Middle American" context, to differentiate heavy marijuana users from nonusers (Weckowicz & Janssen, 1973; Weckowicz, Collier, & Spreng, 1977).

### Discriminant

The factorial structure of the scale has been examined in a variety of ways (Brogden, 1952; Duffy & Crissy, 1940; Gordon, 1972a; Lurie, 1937; Sciortino, 1970) and produces partial support for Spranger's (1928) conceptualization. Support was found in five studies for the social value orientation, in four for both the theoretical and religious orientations, and in two for the aesthetic orientation. The most consistent departure from Spranger's conceptualization is for the political and economic scales to correlate so highly as to be indistinguishable, forming a "philistine" orientation in the studies of Duffy and Crissy (1940), Gordon (1972a), and Lurie (1937).

### Location

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1960). *Study of Values. Manual and test booklet* (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

### Results and Comments

The Study of Values stands with the Value Survey as the most popular measures of human values, with much encouraging data available on its usefulness in a variety of contexts. Four notes of caution are appropriate for those considering its use:

1. The data produced by the instrument are ipsative, so that the researcher learns only of the relative and not absolute strength of each value. Ipsative data are also awkward to analyze statistically, with the zero-sum interdependence of the different scales creating problems for data analysis.
2. The Study of Values has been mainly used with college students or with those who are reasonably well educated.
3. This instrument measures preference, interest, beliefs, choice and behavioral intentions, with fewer than 20% of items tapping conceptions of the desirable.
4. The Study of Values is dated with sexist language appearing in several questions (e.g., "Assuming that you are a man with the necessary ability, . . . would you prefer to be a (a) mathematician, (b) sales manager, (c) clergyman, (d) politician").

## Study of Values

### Sample Items

Part I (30 questions—choose one answer and note strength of preference)

1. The main object of scientific research should be the discovery of truth rather than its practical application.  
(a) Yes  
(b) No
4. Assuming that you have sufficient ability, would you prefer to be:  
(a) a banker?  
(b) a politician?

15. At an exposition, do you chiefly like to go to the buildings where you can see:
- (a) new manufacturing products?
  - (b) scientific (e.g., chemical) apparatus?

*Part II* (15 questions—rank order highest preference with a 4, next highest with a 3, next with a 2, and least preferred with a 1)

3. If you could influence the educational policies of the public schools of some city, would you undertake
- \_\_\_\_\_ a. to promote the study and participation in music and fine arts?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ b. to stimulate the study of social problems?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ c. to provide additional laboratory facilities?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ d. to increase the practical value of courses?
12. Should one guide one's conduct according to, or develop one's chief loyalties toward
- \_\_\_\_\_ a. one's religious faith?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ b. ideals of beauty?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ c. one's occupational organization and associates?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ d. ideals of charity?

## The Value Survey

(Rokeach, 1967)

### Variable

The instrument assesses goals in life (terminal values) and modes of conduct (instrumental values) in terms of their relative importance as guiding principles in life: the goals and modes are restricted to those transcending specific objects and situations.

### Description

Rokeach's values were selected largely on an intuitive basis after reviewing the American literature on values and personality traits and interviewing individuals in Lansing, Michigan.

Several forms of this instrument are available. The most popular are Forms D (gummed labels) and E (rank orders are written alongside values). In Form D, respondents are presented with 18 alphabetically listed terminal values, each printed on a removable gummed label. Respondents rearrange these gummed labels to form a single rank order of values with the most important at the top and the least important at the bottom. On the following page, the procedure is repeated for 18 alphabetically listed instrumental values. In Form E of the Value Survey, gummed labels are not provided; instead, the values are ranked by placing 1 next to the value considered to be most important, 2 next to the value that is second most important, etc. All 18 values must be assigned a rank. A new version of the Value Survey has become available, Form G (gummed labels). Form G replaces the

terminal value "happiness" with "health" and the instrumental value "cheerful" with "loyal."

A number of options exist for analyzing data from the Value Survey: median ranks for individual items within a group, conversion of ranks to Z scores, similarity of value systems at the individual level (Spearman's  $\rho$ ), and similarity of value systems at the group level (Spearman's  $\rho$ ). Feather (1975b) has provided a detailed discussion of these procedures (pp. 23-27).

The Value Survey is self-administered with estimates of completion time ranging from 10 to 20 min for Form D and from 15 to 30 min for Form E.

### Sample

The Value Survey was developed and tested extensively on adult samples drawn from students and the general population in the United States. The instrument has also been tested extensively by Feather (1975b) in student and general population samples in Australia. It is of note that the Value Survey is one of the few value instruments that has been administered to random samples. In the United States, the National Opinion Research Center administered it to a national area probability sample of Americans over 21 in 1968 ( $n = 1409$ ) and 1971 ( $n = 1430$ ). Median rankings based on these samples have been reported by Rokeach (1974).

### Reliability

#### *Internal Consistency*

This is not relevant for single-item measures.

#### *Test-Retest*

The test-retest reliability for the terminal or instrumental value system is given by the median for the distribution of rank correlations calculated over 18 items for each respondent in the sample. The medians reported by Rokeach (1973) using Form D with adults for varying time intervals of 3-7 weeks range from .76 to .80 for the terminal value system and .65 to .72 for the instrumental value system. For longer time intervals of 14-16 months, the median test-retest reliability for the terminal value system was .69 and for the instrumental value system .61. Rokeach's data show that comparable statistics for Form E tend to be somewhat lower than Form D. For time intervals of 3-12 weeks with Form E, Rokeach reported median test-retest reliabilities of .74 for the terminal value system and .65-.70 for the instrumental value system. Feather (1975b) reported median test-retest reliabilities for Form E for a 5-week interval of .74 (terminal value system) and .70 (instrumental value system). For a 2.5-year interval, the median reliabilities were .60 and .51, respectively.

Rokeach (1973) reported individual item test-retest reliabilities for a 3-7-week interval using Form D of the Value Survey. For terminal values, the reliabilities ranged from .51 to .88 (median .65), for instrumental values from .45 to .70 (median .61). Feather (1975b) reported item reliabilities for a 5-week interval for Form E. For terminal values, reliabilities ranged from .40 to .87 (median .63) and for instrumental values from .37 to .76 (median .56).

Reliability data have been obtained primarily from student samples. Rokeach included a sample from the general population and obtained reliability data from children.

Reliabilities for children were lower than those for adults and have not been included in the above summary (see Rokeach, 1973, p. 32).

### Validity

#### *Convergent*

The Value Survey has been used successfully to differentiate religious (Brown & Lawson, 1980; Rokeach, 1969a), political (Billig & Cochrane, 1979; Bishop *et al.*, 1972; C. H. Jones, 1982; Rawls *et al.*, 1973; Rokeach, 1973), occupational (Mahoney & Pechura, 1980; Pedro, 1984; Rokeach, Miller, & Snyder, 1971; Vecchiotti & Korn, 1980), educational (Feather, 1970a, 1971), and cultural (Clare & Cooper, 1983; Feather & Hutton, 1973) groups. Deviants have also been distinguished from nondeviants in terms of their responses to the Value Survey (Cochrane, 1971; Feather & Cross, 1975; Toler, 1975). The construct validity of the Value Survey has been supported by studies that have linked values to conservatism (Feather, 1979b; Joe *et al.*, 1981), the Protestant ethic (Feather, 1984a), social compassion (Rokeach, 1969b), androgyny (Feather, 1984b), attributions (Feather, 1982, 1985), interpersonal perception and behavior (Feather, 1980; Walker & Campbell, 1982), and adjustment (Feather, 1975b). Predicted behavioral correlates of the Value Survey are also widely documented, including cheating (Homant & Rokeach, 1970), returning lost or borrowed property (Penner *et al.*, 1976; Shotland & Berger, 1970), volunteering (Raymond & King, 1973), social activism (Rokeach, 1973; Thomas, 1986), and preventive health (Kristiansen, 1985). In addition, the Value Survey has been shown to provide a relatively comprehensive coverage of the domain it aims to represent (V. A. Braithwaite & Law, 1985) and alternative assessment procedures have tended to converge on similar findings (Alwin & Krosnick, 1985; Bolt, 1978; Feather, 1973; Rankin & Grube, 1980; B. Thompson, Levitov, & Miederhoff, 1982).

#### *Discriminant*

Studies of order effects (Greenstein & Bennett, 1974) and social desirability (Kelly, Silverman, & Cochrane, 1972) have supported the validity of the instrument.

#### Location

Rokeach, M. (1967). *Value survey*. Sunnyvale, CA: Halgren Tests (873 Persimmon Ave., 94087).

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

#### Results and Comments

The factorial structure of the Value Survey has been examined on several occasions (Alker, Rao, & Hughes, 1972; Feather & Peay, 1975; Kilmann, 1975; Mahoney & Katz, 1976; Munson & Posner, 1980; Rokeach, 1973). Overall, the degree of overlap in the findings of these researchers is not impressive. All regard their solutions as interpretable, but salient item loadings on factors tend to be either too low or too few to give one confidence in the interpretations. A lack of enthusiasm about the meaningfulness of the solutions is apparent in the conclusions reached by Rokeach (1973): "the 36 terminal and instrumental values are not readily reducible" (p. 48) and Feather and Peay (1975): "the possibility of reducing the set of values to a smaller number did not seem apparent" (p. 161).

Feather (1975b) and Rokeach (1973) regard Form D gummed labels as the preferred research tool. The advantages of the new version, Form G, over Form D have yet to be established empirically, although the changes are in accord with inadequacies which have been identified in the Value Survey.

While there is much to be commended in the Value Survey, three notes of caution are warranted. First, because the data are ipsative, information is provided only on the relative and not the absolute importance of values, and statistical analysis can prove awkward. Second, users should look critically at inferences drawn from responses to single-item measures, since some are less psychometrically sound than others. Third, although the Value Survey has been used with children (Beech & Schoeppe, 1974; Brown & Lawson, 1980; Feather, 1975b), relatively little is known about the validity of the instrument with younger age groups.

## Value Survey

### Instructions

On the next page are 18 values listed in alphabetical order. Your task is to arrange them in order of their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life. Each value is printed on a gummed label which can be easily peeled off and pasted in the boxes on the left-hand side of the page.

Study the list carefully and pick out the one value which is the most important for you. Peel it off and paste it in Box 1 on the left.

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

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 (freedom 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)

WHEN YOU HAVE FINISHED, GO TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Below is another list of 18 values. Arrange them in order of importance, the same as before.

1		AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)
2		BROADMINDED (open-minded)
3		CAPABLE (competent, effective)
4		CHEERFUL (lighthearted, joyful)
5		CLEAN (neat, tidy)
6		COURAGEOUS (standing up for your beliefs)
7		FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
8		HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)

9	HONEST (sincere, truthful)
10	IMAGINATIVE (daring, creative)
11	INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
12	INTELLECTUAL (intelligent, reflective)
13	LOGICAL (consistent, rational)
14	LOVING (affectionate, tender)
15	OBEDIENT (dutiful, respectful)
16	POLITE (courteous, well-mannered)
17	RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
18	SELF-CONTROLLED (restrained, self-disciplined)

## The Goal and Mode Values Inventories

(Braithwaite & Law, 1985)

### Variable

Based on Rokeach's (1973) conceptualization of values, this instrument comprises an expanded set of goals and modes of conduct, measures absolute rather than relative importance, and separates social goals from personal goals.

### Description

Interviews with a community sample, selected randomly within a demographically heterogeneous geographical area in Brisbane, Australia, resulted in the representation of 36 personal goals, 18 social goals, and 71 modes of conduct in a values questionnaire. Rokeach's Value Survey had been used as a starting point to define the universe of content for respondents. Factor analyses of the data collected with this instrument led to the development of 14 multi-item scales. Of the original 125 items, 79 items clearly and consistently contributed to defining one of these factors and were included in the final inventories.

The instrument is self-administered in three parts: personal goals, followed by modes of conduct and finally social goals. Social goals are differentiated from personal goals through being directed toward the nature of society rather than the behavior of the individual. For personal goals and modes of conduct, respondents are asked to indicate how strongly they accept or reject each one "as a principle for you to live by." Ratings are made using an asymmetrical seven-point scale ranging from "I reject this" (1) through to "I accept this as of the greatest importance" (7). Because social goals are not part of everyday life, their instructions were modified to "principles that guide your judgments and actions." To avoid overuse of the positive end of the scale, respondents are encouraged to read quickly through the lists of values to get a feel for how they should use the response categories.

The Goal Value Scales are (1) International Harmony and Equality (10 items), (2) National Strength and Order (4 items), (3) Traditional Religiosity (4 items), (4) Personal Growth and Inner Harmony (6 items), (5) Physical Well-being (3 items), (6) Secure and Satisfying Interpersonal Relationships (5 items), (7) Social Standing (3 items), and (8) Social Stimulation (2 items). The Mode Value Scales are (1) A Positive Orientation to Others (13 items), (2) Competence and Effectiveness (13 items), (3) Propriety in Dress and Manners (7 items), (4) Religious Commitment (4 items), (5) Assertiveness (3 items), and (6) Getting Ahead (2 items). Scales are scored by summing across the relevant items with different maximum and minimum totals for each scale. All items are positively worded with two exceptions.

### Sample

The inventories were developed and tested using two community samples in Brisbane, Australia ( $n = 73, 483$ ) and two student samples from the University of Queensland, Australia ( $n = 208, 480$ ).

### Reliability

#### *Internal Consistency*

From the student and community samples, the  $\alpha$  reliability coefficients for the two-item scales (Social Stimulation and Getting Ahead) were barely adequate, .53 and .66, respectively. For the remaining scales,  $\alpha$  reliability coefficients ranged from .66 for Religious Commitment to .89 for A Positive Orientation to Others and for Competence and Effectiveness (median .74).

#### *Test-Retest*

Based on a sample of 208 students, reliability coefficients over a 4-week period ranged from .43 to .92 (median .62) for individual items. For the scales, the range was .58 for Social Stimulation to .93 for Traditional Religiosity (median .75).

### Validity

#### *Convergent*

All scales were successfully related to expected counterparts in the Value Survey with the exception of Physical Well-being, for which there was no counterpart at that time. Further

evidence of validity was obtained through correlating the scales with Scott's (1960) Measures of Foreign Policy Goals, Scott's (1965) Personal Value scales, and Wilson and Patterson's (1968) Conservatism Scale. Expected correlations varied in strength from a low .21 to a high .79, but all were significant and in the expected direction. In addition, the religiosity scales were found to correlate with church attendance and involvement in church organizations. The Personal Growth and Inner Harmony Scale was related to a preference among students for university courses that emphasized the development of self-awareness and for a liberal education in philosophy, history, and contemporary society.

### *Discriminant*

To ensure the factorial distinctiveness of the scales, items were included in a scale only if they clearly and consistently defined one factor and no other. Factors were accepted only if they were stable across analytical procedures and across samples of respondents.

### *Location*

Braithwaite, V. A., & Law, H. G. (1985). Structure of human values: Testing the adequacy of the Rokeach Value Survey. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 250-263.

### *Results and Comments*

The usefulness of these instruments has yet to be established, but the scales are expected to provide multi-item measures of the constructs represented by single items in Rokeach's Value Survey.

The major weakness of these scales is that the distributions of scores are likely to be skewed, in spite of the precautions taken to avoid overuse of the extreme positive categories. This result is not surprising since all the scales represent socially accepted value orientations. Skewed distributions, however, can place restrictions on choice of statistical analyses.

In developing these instruments, considerable emphasis was placed on representatively sampling items from the value domain. It is of note, therefore, that 12 items that represent important facets of the domain do not appear in the final scales because they were not highly correlated with other items (i.e., freedom, privacy, the protection of human life, a leisurely life, carefree enjoyment, comfort but not luxury, happiness, a sense of accomplishment, being thrifty, acting on impulse, being independent, being honest).

## **Goal and Mode Values Inventories**

### **Part One**

Instructions: Listed below are 23 goals\* that various people have used as guiding principles in their lives. By goal we mean any state of affairs that a person might strive for as well as any state of affairs that a person may wish to preserve or keep as is.

Please indicate the extent to which you accept or reject each of these goals *as a principle for you to live by*. Do this by circling one of the following numbers which you will find listed below each question.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I reject this	I am inclined to reject this	I neither reject nor accept this	I am inclined to accept this	I accept this as important	I accept this as very important	I accept this as of the greatest importance

You are to circle the one that is closest to your own feelings about that particular goal as a guiding principle in your life. Before you start, quickly read through the entire list of goals in Part 1 to get a feel for how to score your answers. Remember there are no right or wrong answers. When you have completed Part 1 go on to Part 2 and then Part 3.

### TRADITIONAL RELIGIOSITY

Salvation (being saved from your sins and at peace with God)

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7

Religious or Mystical Experience (being at one with God or the universe)

Upholding Traditional Sexual Moral Standards (opposing sexual permissiveness and pornography)

\* \* Sexual Intimacy (having a satisfying sexual relationship)

### PERSONAL GROWTH AND INNER HARMONY

✓ ~~Self-Knowledge~~ or Self-Insight (being more aware of what sort of person you are)

✓ ~~The Pursuit of Knowledge~~ (always trying to find out new things about the world we live in)

✓ ~~Inner Harmony~~ (feeling free of conflict within yourself)

✓ ~~Self-Improvement~~ (striving to be a better person)

✓ ~~Wisdom~~ (having a mature understanding of life)

✓ ~~Self-Respect~~ (believing in your own worth)

### PHYSICAL WELL-BEING

Physical Development (being physically fit)

Good Health (physical well-being)

Physical Exercise (taking part in energetic activity)

### SECURE AND SATISFYING INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

✓ ~~Mature Love~~ (having a relationship of deep and lasting affection)

True Friendship (having genuine and close friends)

Personal Support (knowing that there is someone to take care of you)

Security for Loved Ones (taking care of loved ones)

Acceptance by Others (feeling that you belong)

## SOCIAL STANDING

- ✓ Recognition by the Community (having high standing in the community)
- ✓ Economic Prosperity (being financially well off)
- ✓ Authority (having power to influence others and control decisions)

## SOCIAL STIMULATION

- An Active Social Life (mixing with other people)
- An Exciting Life (a life full of new experiences or adventures)

\* Only the items that belong to the scales are reproduced here.

\*\* Reverse-scored.

## Part Two

Instructions: Below are listed 42 ways of behaving. Please indicate the extent to which you accept or reject each way of behaving *as a guiding principle in your life*, in the same way as you did in Part 1. Again quickly read through the entire list before you start. Remember there are no right or wrong answers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I reject this	I am inclined to reject this	I neither reject nor accept this.	I am inclined to accept this	I accept this as important	I accept this as very important	I accept this as of the greatest importance

## A POSITIVE ORIENTATION TO OTHERS

- ✓ Tolerant (accepting others even though they may be different from you)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

- ✓ Helpful (always ready to assist others) †
- ✓ Forgiving (willing to pardon others) ✓ 13
- ✓ Giving Others a Fair Go (giving others a chance) 22
- ✓ Tactful (being able to deal with touchy situations without offending others)
- ✓ Considerate (being thoughtful of other people's feelings)
- ✓ Cooperative (being able to work in harmony with others) †
- ✓ Loving (showing genuine affection)
- ✓ Trusting (having faith in others) 20 ✓
- ✓ Grateful (being appreciative)
- ✓ Understanding (able to share another's feelings) ✓ 18
- Friendly (being neighborly)
- ✓ Generous (sharing what you have with others) ✓ 24

## COMPETENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS

- Bright (being quick thinking)

- Adaptable (adjusting to change easily)
- Competent (being capable)
- ✓ Resourceful (being clever at finding ways to achieve a goal)
- ✓ Self-Disciplined (being self-controlled)
- ✓ Efficient (always using the best method to get the best results)
- Realistic (seeing each situation as it really is)
- ✓ Knowledgeable (being well informed)
- Persevering (not giving up in spite of difficulties)
- Progressive (being prepared to accept and support new things)
- ✓ Conscientious (being hardworking)
- ✓ Logical (being rational)
- Showing Foresight (thinking and seeing ahead) +

#### PROPRIETY IN DRESS AND MANNERS

- ✓ Polite (being well-mannered)
- ✓ Patriotic (being loyal to your country)
- ✓ Prompt (being on time)
- ✓ Refined (never being coarse or vulgar)
- ✓ Clean (not having dirty habits)
- ✓ Neat (being tidy)
- ✓ Reliable (being dependable)

#### RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT

- Committed (being dedicated to a cause)
- Devout (following your religious faith conscientiously)
- Self-Sacrificing (putting the interest of others before your own)
- Idealistic (living according to how things should be rather than how things are)

#### ASSERTIVENESS

- Standing up for Your Beliefs (defending your beliefs no matter who opposes them)
- Having Your Say (confidently stating your opinions)
- Determined (standing by your decisions firmly)

#### GETTING AHEAD

- ✓ Ambitious (being eager to do well)
- ✓ Competitive (always trying to do better than others)

### Part Three

Instructions: Below are 14 goals that refer to our society, our nation, and to people in general. Although most of us do not directly affect the course of national affairs, we all have principles or standards we prize highly in our society. We use these standards to make judgments about national policies and about world and community events, and at times, we may even use them to guide our actions (e.g., when we join certain organizations or when we vote in elections).

Please indicate the extent to which you reject or accept each of the following as principles that guide your judgments and actions, in the same way as you did previously. Again, quickly read through the entire list before you start. Remember there are no right or wrong answers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I reject this	I am inclined to reject this	I neither reject nor accept this	I am inclined to accept this	I accept this as important	I accept this as very important	I accept this as of the greatest importance

**INTERNATIONAL HARMONY AND EQUALITY**

A Good Life for Others (improving the welfare of all people in need)

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
- Rule by the People (involvement by all citizens in making decisions that affect their community)
  - International Cooperation (having all nations working together to help each other)
  - Social Progress and Social Reform (readiness to change our way of life for the better)
  - A World at Peace (being free from war and conflict)
  - A World of Beauty (having the beauty of nature and the arts: music, literature, art, etc.)
  - Human Dignity (allowing each individual to be treated as someone of worth)
  - Equal Opportunity for All (giving everyone an equal chance in life)
  - Greater Economic Equality (lessening the gap between the rich and the poor)
  - Preserving the Natural Environment (preventing the destruction of nature's beauty and resources)

**NATIONAL STRENGTH AND ORDER**

- National Greatness (being a united, strong, independent, and powerful nation)
- National Economic Development (having greater economic progress and prosperity for the nation)
- The Rule of Law (punishing the guilty and protecting the innocent)
- National Security (protection of your nation from enemies)

32 + 16  
 (48)



## Ways to Live

(Morris, 1956b)

### Variable

Descriptions of 13 philosophies of life are evaluated by respondents in terms of the kind of life they personally would like to live. Morris' (1956b) operational definition of conceptions of the preferable (conceived values) was "conceptions of the good life" (p. 13).

### Description

The Ways to Live items were originally derived from combining three basic components of personality (Dionysian: tendency to release and indulge existing desires; Promethean: tendency to change and remake the world; and Buddhistic: tendency to regulate self by holding desires in check) that expressed themselves in major religious, ethical, and philosophical systems in the world (Morris, 1956a). Because a substantial number of college students did not find the original seven Ways to their liking, a further six were added over time, resulting in 13 Ways to Live for evaluation.

Each way is presented to respondents as a paragraph (between 100 and 150 words). The paragraphs are simply labeled as Way 1–Way 13.

After reading each paragraph, the respondent rates the way on a seven-point scale from 7 (liking it very much) through 1 (disliking it very much). After rating each of the 13 Ways to Live, respondents are asked to rank them according to how much they like them.

The test is self-administered and completion time is estimated to be 30 minutes–1 hour. Variation can be expected in view of the need for some to reread the complex paragraphs several times.

### Sample

Large samples of students have been involved in Morris' work. Data from 2015 male and 831 female students in the United States are reported in *Varieties of Human Values* (Morris, 1956b). In a replication study, Morris and Small (1971) collected data from 703 male and 514 female college students. In a more recent replication, K. S. Thompson (1981) administered the Ways to Live to 468 male and 538 female students in the United States. The instrument has also been used cross-culturally with Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Canadian, and Norwegian students, although American college students have made the major contribution to its development.

### Reliability

#### *Internal Consistency*

Because this is a single-item measure, internal consistency is not relevant.

#### *Test-Retest*

Morris (1956b) reported a test-retest correlation of .85 between two sets of ratings provided by 20 students 3 weeks apart. With a longer interval of 14 weeks, the average correlation was slightly lower, .78 ( $n = 30$ ), although Morris noted that during this time the Ways to Live instrument was discussed with the students and changes in their views

may have been a consequence. Morris also has provided some information on the test-retest reliabilities of each of the Ways. Their mean reliability based on 21 students tested over a 3-week interval was .67, with Ways 3, 8, and 13 showing the lowest reliabilities.

### Validity

#### *Convergent*

Morris (1956b) has presented a mass of data relating the Ways to Live to population and economic indicators, religious practice, and personality and biological characteristics with varying degrees of success. He has used his instrument extensively to compare cultural groups and to map value changes over time (Morris, 1956b; Morris & Small, 1971). Bhatt and Fairchild (1984) found the Ways to Live useful in showing that the length of time Indian students spent in America was related to endorsement of typically American values. Hofstede (1980) also has made use of the Ways to Live instrument to validate his own value measures.

#### *Discriminant*

The factorial structure of the Ways to Live has been examined by Morris and his co-workers (Morris, 1956b; Morris & Jones, 1955), by K. S. Thompson (1981), and by Hofstede (1980). Morris has reported a five-factor solution based on ratings from United States male students: (1) Social restraint and self-control, (2) Enjoyment and progress in action, (3) Withdrawal and self-sufficiency, (4) Receptivity and sympathetic concern, and (5) Self-indulgence. A similar solution was reported for Indian college students. Thompson, however, reported a two-factor solution, not only for his own data but for a reanalysis of L. Jones and Morris' (1956) data. Thompson attributed the difference to the factoring techniques used, but details of his factor solutions are not provided. Hofstede's (1980) reanalysis of Morris' Ways to Live data from six countries also pointed to a two-factor solution. He identified the first factor as "enjoyment" (Ways 4, 7, 8, and 12) versus "duty" (Ways 2, 3, 6, and 10). The second factor was labelled "engagement" (Ways 5 and 13) versus "withdrawal" (Ways 1, 9, and 11). Although Thompson and Hofstede both identified two bipolar factors, the solutions themselves differ considerably. Until these problems are resolved, the Ways to Live are probably best conceived as 13 separate, though clearly not independent, variables. L. Jones and Morris' (1956) intercorrelations of ratings among the Ways for 250 male students show variation from  $-.27$  to  $+.28$ . The Ways do not appear to be highly interrelated.

### Location

Morris, C. W. (1956b). *Varieties of human value*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

### Results and Comments

The Ways to Live has earned praise through its pioneering contribution to studying values across cultures. It covers a broad range of value concepts and has been designed to incorporate non-Western philosophies of life. Like many instruments of its era, the text of the Ways to Live needs minor revision to avoid sexist language (male personal pronouns and "man" appear throughout).

Other more fundamental criticisms have been made on psychometric grounds. First,

the paragraphs or ways have been regarded as overly complex; not only are too many ideas presented to the respondent, but they are expressed in a verbose style. Second, reliance is placed on a single response to indicate a value preference. In this regard, Triandis (1972) sees the paragraphs as a strength; at least the cross-cultural researcher is relying on the translations of several sentences rather than one. Nevertheless, the fact remains that it is impossible to know how respondents have weighted the various ideas to arrive at one number to indicate preference. Indeed, the work of Dempsey and Dukes (1966) and Gorlow and Barocas (1965) suggest that the ideas within each way do not form a coherent whole. Dempsey and Dukes have prepared a revised and shortened form of the Ways to Live that may overcome some of its problems. This instrument is reviewed next in this chapter.

A third warning for potential users is that the Ways to Live has more to do with the desired than the desirable. Morris (1956b) has reported some interesting data on the dimension of evaluation (liking for the way of life). Morris asked respondents to rate the ways in terms of "goodness" or "badness" and in terms of how they ought to live. On average, liking correlated .64 with goodness-badness and .68 with how one ought to live. For a detailed appraisal of the Ways to Live, the reader is referred to Winthrop (1959).

### Ways to Live

Instructions: Below are described thirteen ways to live which various persons at various times have advocated and followed.

Indicate by numbers, which you are to write in the margin, how much you yourself like or dislike each of them. Do them in order. Do not read ahead.

Remember that it is not a question of what kind of life you now lead, or the kind of life you think it prudent to live in our society, or the kind of life you think good for other persons, *but simply the kind of life you personally would like to live.*

Use the following scale of numbers, placing one of them in the margin alongside each of the ways to live:

- 7 I like it very much
- 6 I like it quite a lot
- 5 I like it slightly
- 4 I am indifferent to it
- 3 I dislike it slightly
- 2 I dislike it quite a lot
- 1 I dislike it very much

WAY 1: In this "design for living" the individual actively participates in the social life of his community, not to change it primarily, but to understand, appreciate, and preserve the best that man has attained. Excessive desires should be avoided and moderation sought. One wants the good things of life but in an orderly way. Life is to have clarity, balance, refinement, control. Vulgarity, great enthusiasm, irrational behavior, impatience, indulgence are to be avoided. Friendship is to be esteemed but not easy intimacy with many people. Life is to have discipline, intelligibility, good manners, predictability. Social changes are to be made slowly and carefully, so that what has been achieved in human culture is not lost. The individual should be active physically

and socially, but not in a hectic or radical way. Restraint and intelligence should give order to an active life.

WAY 2: The individual should for the most part "go it alone," assuring himself of privacy in living quarters, having much time to himself, attempting to control his own life. One should stress self-sufficiency, reflection and meditation, knowledge of himself. The direction of interest should be away from intimate associations with social groups, and away from the physical manipulation of objects or attempts at control of the physical environment. One should aim to simplify one's external life, to moderate those desires whose satisfaction is dependent upon physical and social forces outside of oneself, and to concentrate attention upon the refinement, clarification, and self-direction of oneself. Not much can be done or is to be gained by "living outwardly." One must avoid dependence upon persons or things; the center of life should be found within oneself.

WAY 3: This way of life makes central the sympathetic concern for other persons. Affection should be the main thing in life, affection that is free from all traces of the imposition of oneself upon others or of using others for one's own purposes. Greed in possessions, emphasis on sexual passion, the search for power over persons and things, excessive emphasis upon intellect, and undue concern for oneself are to be avoided, for these things hinder the sympathetic love among persons that alone gives significance to life. If we are aggressive we block our receptivity to the personal forces upon which we are dependent for genuine personal growth. One should accordingly purify oneself, restrain one's self-assertiveness, and become receptive, appreciative, and helpful with respect to other persons.

WAY 4: Life is something to be enjoyed—sensuously enjoyed, enjoyed with relish and abandonment. The aim in life should not be to control the course of the world or society or the lives of others, but to be open and receptive to things and persons, and to delight in them. Life is more a festival than a workshop or a school for moral discipline. To let oneself go, to let things and persons affect oneself, is more important than to do—or to do good. Such enjoyment, however, requires that one be self-centered enough to be keenly aware of what is happening and free for new happenings. So one should avoid entanglements, should not be too dependent on particular people or things, should not be self-sacrificing; one should be alone a lot, should have time for meditation and awareness of oneself. Solitude and sociality together are both necessary in the good life.

WAY 5: A person should not hold on to himself, withdraw from people, keep aloof and self-centered. Rather merge oneself with a social group, enjoy cooperation and companionship, join with others in resolute activity for the realization of common goals. Persons are social and persons are active; life should merge energetic group activity and cooperative group enjoyment. Meditation, restraint, concern for one's self-sufficiency, abstract intellectuality, solitude, stress on one's possessions all cut the roots that bind persons together. One should live outwardly with gusto, enjoying the good things of life, working with others to secure the things that make possible a pleasant and energetic social life. Those who oppose this ideal are not to be dealt with too tenderly. Life can't be too fastidious.

WAY 6: Life continuously tends to stagnate, to become "comfortable," to become sickled o'er with the pale cast of thought. Against these tendencies, a person must stress the need of constant activity—physical action, adventure, the realistic solution of specific problems as they appear, the improvement of techniques for controlling the world and society. Man's future depends primarily on what he does, not on what he feels or on his speculations. New problems constantly arise and always will arise. Improvements must always be made if man is to progress. We can't just follow the past or dream of what the future might be. We have to work resolutely and continually if control is to be gained over the forces which threaten us. Man should rely on technical advances made possible by scientific knowledge. He should find his goal in the solution of his problems. The good is the enemy of the better.

WAY 7: We should at various times and in various ways accept something from all other paths of life, but give no one our exclusive allegiance. At one moment one of them is the more appropriate; at another moment another is the most appropriate. Life should contain enjoyment and action and contemplation in about equal amounts. When either is carried to extremes we lose something important for our life. So we must cultivate flexibility, admit diversity in ourselves, accept the tension which this diversity produces, find a place for detachment in the midst of enjoyment and activity. The goal of life is found in the dynamic integration of enjoyment, action, and contemplation, and so in the dynamic interaction of the various paths of life. One should use all of them in building a life, and no one alone.

WAY 8: Enjoyment should be the keynote of life. Not the hectic search for intense and exciting pleasures, but the enjoyment of the simple and easily obtainable pleasures: the pleasures of just existing, of savory food, of comfortable surroundings, of talking with friends, of rest and relaxation. A home that is warm and comfortable, chairs and a bed that are soft, a kitchen well stocked with food, a door open to the entrance of friends—this is the place to live. Body at ease, relaxed, calm in its movements, not hurried, breath slow, willing to nod and rest, grateful to the world that is its food—so should the body be. Driving ambition and the fanaticism of ascetic ideals are the signs of discontented people who have lost the capacity to float in the stream of simple, carefree, wholesome enjoyment.

WAY 9: Receptivity should be the keynote of life. The good things come of their own accord, and come unsought. They cannot be found by resolute action. They cannot be found in the indulgence of the sensuous desires of the body. They cannot be gathered by participation in the turmoil of social life. They cannot be given to others by attempts to be helpful. They cannot be garnered by hard thinking. Rather do they come unsought when the bars of the self are down. When the self has ceased to make demands and waits in quiet receptivity, it becomes open to the powers which nourish it and work through it; and sustained by these powers it knows joy and peace. To sit alone under the trees and the sky, open to nature's voices, calm and receptive, then can the wisdom from without come within.

WAY 10: Self-control should be the keynote of life. Not the easy self-control that retreats from the world, but the vigilant, stern, manly control of a self that lives in the world, and knows the strength of the world and the limits of

human power. The good life is rationally directed and holds firm to high ideals. It is not bent by the seductive voices of comfort and desire. It does not expect social utopias. It is distrustful of final victories. Too much cannot be expected. Yet one can with vigilance hold firm the reins to his self, control his unruly impulses, understand his place in the world, guide his actions by reason, maintain his self-reliant independence. And in this way, though he finally perish, man can keep his human dignity and respect and die with cosmic good manners.

WAY 11: The contemplative life is the good life. The external world is no fit habitat for man. It is too big, too cold, too pressing. Rather it is the life turned inward that is rewarding. The rich internal world of ideals, of sensitive feelings, of reverie, of self-knowledge is man's true home. By the cultivation of the self within, man alone becomes human. Only then does there arise deep sympathy with all that lives, an understanding of the suffering inherent in life, a realization of the futility of aggressive action, the attainment of contemplative joy. Conceit then falls away and austerity is dissolved. In giving up the world one finds the larger and finer sea of the inner self.

WAY 12: The use of the body's energy is the secret of a rewarding life. The hands need material to make into something: lumber and stone for building, food to harvest, clay to mold. The muscles are alive to joy only in action, in climbing, running, skiing, and the like. Life finds its zest in overcoming, dominating, conquering some obstacle. It is the active deed that is satisfying, the deed adequate to the present, the daring and adventuresome deed. Not in cautious foresight, not in relaxed ease does life attain completion. Outward energetic action, the excitement of power in the tangible present—this is the way to live.

WAY 13: A person should let himself be used. Used by other persons in their growth, used by the great objective purposes in the universe that silently and irresistibly achieve their goal. For persons and the world's purposes are dependable at heart, and can be trusted. One should be humble, constant, faithful, unisistent. Grateful for the affection and protection that one needs, but undemanding. Close to persons and to nature, and secure because close. Nourishing the good by devotion and sustained by the good because of devotion. One should be a serene, confident, quiet vessel and instrument of the great dependable powers that move to their fulfillment.

Instructions for ranking your preferences: Rank the thirteen ways to live in the order you prefer them, putting first the number of the way to live you like the best, then the number of the way you like next best, and so on down to the number of the way to live you like the least.

Final Word: If you can formulate a way to live you would like better than any of the thirteen alternatives, please do so.

## **A Short Form Ways to Live**

*(Dempsey & Dukes, 1966)*

### **Variable**

This instrument is a shortened form of Morris' (1956b) Ways to Live, retaining those elements within each way that were most highly intercorrelated.

### Description

The instrument follows that of Morris closely except that the 13 Ways to Live have been cut back to less than 50 words each in almost all cases. The 13 Ways to Live were transformed into 110 statements or items. Through item analyses, discordant or poorly interrelated elements within each paragraph were eliminated. The result is an instrument that is much easier to read and considerably shorter. Like the Ways to Live instrument, it is self-administered.

### Sample

The shortened version was developed using 230 students in an undergraduate psychology class.

### Reliability

#### *Internal Consistency*

Data on internal consistency are not relevant for this single-item measure.

#### *Test-Retest*

The mean test-retest coefficient for a sample of 32 students was .80 with a time interval of 10 days.

### Validity

#### *Convergent*

The authors focused their attention on comparing the shortened form with another revised form and the original. The shortened and revised forms were developed from analyses of the same 110 items. Dempsey and Dukes (1966) reported the average intercorrelations for sets of items representing each Way in the original, the revised form, and the shortened form. They also reported the correlations between the average ratings of the items and the rating given to the original paragraph describing that way to live. The short form proved to be superior on both criteria, the exceptions being Way 7 and Way 9, which retained considerable heterogeneity. Dempsey and Dukes interpreted the findings as indicating that the short form expressed "the core conception of Morris' document more adequately than the original paragraphs themselves" (p. 879).

#### *Discriminant*

The average correlation of the shortened form with the original over a 10-day interval was .57 ( $n = 35$ ). The authors concluded that "while there is a substantial relationship between the original and short forms, there are also important differences between them" (p. 881). On comparing the content of the short form with the original Ways to Live, Dempsey and Dukes define their ways in the following manner (italics indicate Dempsey and Dukes' additions).

Way 1: *Appreciate and* preserve the best man has attained.

Way 2: Cultivate independence *and self-knowledge*.

- Way 3: Show sympathetic concern for others.  
 Way 4: Experience festivity *and sensuous enjoyment*.  
 Way 5: Act and enjoy life through group participation.  
 Way 6: Master *threatening* forces by constant *practical work*.  
 Way 7: *Admit diversity and accept something from all ways of life*.  
 Way 8: *Enjoy the simple, easily obtainable pleasures*.  
 Way 9: Wait in quiet receptivity *for joy and peace*.  
 Way 10: Control the self *and hold firm to high ideals*.  
 Way 11: Meditate on the inner life.  
 Way 12: *Use the body's energy* in daring and adventurous deeds.  
 Way 13: *Let oneself be used by* the great cosmic purposes.

#### Location

Dempsey, P., & Dukes, W. F. (1966). Judging complex value stimuli: An examination and revision of Morris's "Paths of Life." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 26, 871-882.

#### Results and Comments

The instrument looks as if it could be a promising substitute for the highly complex Ways to Live. It has not been used widely, however, although other shortened forms with no accompanying data to support reliability and validity have appeared in the literature (e.g., see Feifel & Nagy, 1981, and Sommers & Scioli, 1986). Increased usage would provide much needed validating data on the short form Ways to Live. As is the case for its parent instrument, minor adjustments to avoid male referents may be necessary.

### Short Form Ways to Live

Instructions: On the following page are described 13 ways to live, which various persons at various times have advocated and followed. In the left margin rank these ways in the order you prefer them, so that the number 1 is by the path you like best, the number 2 by that you like next best, and so on, with number 13 by the path you like least.

It is not a question of what kind of life you now lead, or the kind of life you think it prudent to live in our society, or the kind of life you think good for other persons, but simply the kind of life you personally would like to live.

WAY 1: An individual should actively participate in the social life of his community, not to change it primarily, but to understand, appreciate, and preserve the best that man has attained. Life should have clarity, balance, refinement, control.

WAY 2: The individual should for the most part "go it alone," having much time to himself, stressing self-sufficiency, reflection and meditation, knowledge of himself. The center of life should be found within the self.

WAY 3: This way of life makes central the sympathetic concern for other persons. Whatever hinders sympathetic love among persons should be avoided, for such love alone gives significance to life. One should become receptive, appreciative, and helpful with respect to others.



WAY 4: Life should be more a festival than a workshop, or a school for moral discipline; it should be enjoyed, sensuously enjoyed, enjoyed with relish and abandonment. To let oneself go, to let things and persons affect oneself, is more important than to do—or to do good.

WAY 5: A person should merge himself with a social group, enjoy cooperation and companionship, join with others in resolute activity for the realization of common goals. Life should merge energetic group activity and cooperative group enjoyment.

WAY 6: We should stress the realistic solution of specific problems as they appear and the improvement of techniques for controlling the world and society. We have to work resolutely and continually if control is to be gained over the forces that threaten us.

WAY 7: We should at various times and in various ways accept something from all other paths of life, but give no one our exclusive allegiance. We must cultivate flexibility, admit diversity in ourselves, accepting the tension which this diversity produces.

WAY 8: The enjoyment of simple, easily obtainable pleasures should be the keynote of life: the pleasures of just existing, of savory food, of comfortable surroundings, of talking with friends, of rest, relaxation.

WAY 9: The good things in life cannot be found by resolute action, or by participation in the turmoil of social life. One should cease to make demands, waiting in quiet receptivity, open to the powers that nourish the self and work through it. Sustained by these powers, one knows joy and peace.

WAY 10: Self-control should be the keynote of life, not the easy self-control that retreats from the world, but the vigilant, stern, manly control of a self that lives in the world. One should hold firm to high ideals and not be bent by the seductive voices of comfort and desire.

WAY 11: The contemplative life is the good life, the life that is rewarding. The rich internal world of ideals, of sensitive feelings, of reverie, of self-knowledge is man's true home.

WAY 12: The use of the body's energy is the secret of a rewarding life. Not in cautious foresight, not in relaxed ease does life attain fulfillment, for it is the active deed that is satisfying, the deed adequate to the present, the daring and adventurous deed.

WAY 13: One should let himself be used by other persons in their growth, and by the great objective purposes in the universe. One should be a serene, confident, quiet vessel, guided by the great dependable powers that silently and irresistibly achieve their goal.

### **The Value Profile**

*(Bales & Couch, 1969)*

#### Variable

Bales and Couch developed the Value Profile to measure agreement with a set of value statements considered relevant to interaction with others in laboratory group studies (see

Bales, 1970). They defined a value statement in the concrete interaction context as "a statement of an existing norm, or a proposal for a new norm" (p. 4).

### Description

An initial pool of 872 items was generated to represent as large and as varied a coverage of the domain as possible. Sources included listening to group discussions, other value instruments, personality scales, and the experiences of their co-workers. These items were then reduced to 252 by the researchers and were presented to respondents for rating on an agree-disagree continuum. Item analyses to exclude value statements that were not discriminating well led to a final set of 144 items to be rated on the agree-disagree dimension. These items were factor-analyzed and 40 items were selected to represent four value dimensions.

The four scales in the Value Profile assess (1) Acceptance of Authority, (2) Need-Determined Expression (vs. Value-Determined Restraint), (3) Equalitarianism, and (4) Individualism. Each is represented by 10 items, which respondents evaluate on a six-point rating scale from strongly disagree (1) through to strongly agree (6). A score of 4 is reserved for cases in which no response is made. The instrument is self-administered.

### Sample

The 144-item questionnaire was completed by 552 respondents, predominantly undergraduate college students but including some graduate students, faculty members, and officer candidates in the Air Force.

### Reliability

No reliability data were encountered.

### Validity

No validity data were encountered.

### Location

Bales, R., & Couch, A. (1969). The value profile: A factor analytic study of value statements. *Sociological Inquiry*, 39, 3-17.

### Results and Comments

The agree-disagree response continuum is not consistent with values as conceptions of the desirable, but it is of note that the notion of "oughtness" is incorporated into some of the value statements. Other items, however, can probably be more accurately described as related beliefs or attitudes than as values. A second weakness is that the language used in the scales has dated somewhat (e.g., the repeated reference to "man" in the Individualism Scale). As well as modernized scales, reliability and validity data are required before these measures can be used with confidence. In spite of these criticisms, the instrument has considerable strengths. Enormous effort was directed toward obtaining a broad coverage of the value domain. The item sampling procedure was an exhaustive one, and the dimensions identified from this firm basis should be given serious attention by value researchers.

A shortened 12-item version of the Value Profile was developed by Withey (1965), who adapted the three highest-loading items on each of Bales and Couch's four factors for use in a nationwide study of public civil defense practices. Respondents judged the statements on a five-point rating scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Many of the items used by Withey were reworded slightly, but their counterparts in the Value Profile are indicated by a W in the right hand margin. The reader is referred to Withey (1965) for further details or to the previous edition of *Measures of social psychological attitudes*.

### Value Profile

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to measure the extent to which you hold each of several general attitudes or values common in our society. On the following pages you will find a series of general statements expressing opinions of the kind you may have heard from other persons around you. After each statement there is a set of possible responses as follows:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

You are asked to read each of the statements and then to *circle* the response which best *represents* your immediate reaction to the opinion expressed. Respond to each opinion as a whole. If you have reservations about some part of a statement, circle the response that most clearly approximates your *general feeling*.

#### Acceptance of Authority

1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn. (W)
- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
2. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
  3. What youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
  4. You have to respect authority and when you stop respecting authority, your situation isn't worth much. (W)
  5. Patriotism and loyalty are the first and the most important requirements of a good citizen.
  6. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down. (W)
  7. A child should not be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them.
  8. The facts on crime and sexual immorality show that we will have to crack down harder on young people if we are going to save our moral standards.

9. Disobeying an order is one thing you can't excuse—if one can get away with disobedience, why can't everybody?
10. A well-raised child is one who doesn't have to be told twice to do something.

### **Need-Determined Expression (vs. Value-Determined Restraint)**

1. Since there are no values that can be eternal, the only real values are those that meet the needs of the given moment. (W)
2. Nothing is static, nothing is everlasting, at any moment one must be ready to meet the change in environment by a necessary change in one's moral views.
3. Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die. (W)
4. The solution to almost any human problem should be based on the situation at the time, not on some general moral rule. (W)
5. Life is something to be enjoyed to the full, sensuously enjoyed with relish and enthusiasm.
6. Life is more a festival than a workshop or a school for moral discipline.
7. The past is no more, the future may never be, the present is all that we can be certain of.
- \*8. Not to attain happiness, but to be worthy of it, is the purpose of our existence.
- \*9. No time is better spent than that devoted to thinking about the ultimate purposes of life.
- \*10. Tenderness is more important than passion in love.

### **Equalitarianism**

1. Everyone should have an equal chance and an equal say. (W)
2. There should be equality for everyone—because we are all human beings.
3. A group of equals will work a lot better than a group with a rigid hierarchy. (W)
4. Each one should get what he needs—the things we have belong to all of us. (W)
5. No matter what the circumstances, one should never arbitrarily tell people what they have to do.
6. It is the duty of every good citizen to correct antiminority remarks made in his presence.
7. Poverty could be almost entirely done away with if we made certain basic changes in our social and economic system.
8. There has been too much talk and not enough real action in doing away with racial discrimination.

9. In any group it is more important to keep a friendly atmosphere than to be efficient.
10. In a small group there should be no real leaders—everyone should have an equal say.

### Individualism

1. To be superior a man must stand alone.
2. In life an individual should for the most part "go it alone," assuring himself of privacy, having much time to himself, attempting to control his own life. (W)
3. It is the man who stands alone who excites our admiration. (W)
4. The rich internal world of ideals, of sensitive feelings, of reverie, of self knowledge, is man's true home.
5. One must avoid dependence upon persons or things; the center of life should be found within oneself. (W)
6. The most rewarding object of study any man can find is his own inner life.
7. Whoever would be a man, must be a nonconformist.
8. Contemplation is the highest form of human activity.
9. The individualist is the man who is most likely to discover the best road to a new future.
10. A man can learn better by striking out boldly on his own than he can by following the advice of others.

\* Reverse-scored.

## Life Roles Inventory—Value Scales

(Fitzsimmons, Macnab, & Casserly, 1985)

### Variable

The instrument measures the importance of 20 kinds of values considered relevant to assessing the relative importance of the work role in relation to other major life roles in different cultures.

### Description

Initially 22 values were derived from the literature: Ability Utilization, Achievement, Advancement, Aesthetics, Associates and Social Interaction, Authority, Autonomy, Creativity, Cultural Identity, Economic Rewards, Economic Security, Environment, Intellectual Stimulation, Life Style, Participation in Organizational Decision Making, Prestige, Physical Activity, Responsibility, Risk-Taking and Safety, Spiritual Values, Supervisory Relations, and Variety. Items were written to represent each of these facets of the value domain in English and in French, and as a consequence of a series of psychometric analyses, 20 multi-item scales were developed.

The 20 scales making up the LRI-VS are (1) Ability Utilization, (2) Achievement, (3) Advancement, (4) Aesthetics, (5) Altruism, (6) Authority, (7) Autonomy, (8) Creativity,

(9) Economics, (10) Life Style, (11) Personal Development, (12) Physical Activity, (13) Prestige, (14) Risk, (15) Social Interaction, (16) Social Relations, (17) Variety, (18) Working Conditions, (19) Cultural Identity, and (20) Physical Prowess. Each scale comprises five items, three of which are common to all countries (Australia, Canada, Portugal, Spain, United States) and two of which are unique to each national project. The items are preceded by the stem "It is now or will be important for me to . . ." and respondents are required to rate each item on a four-point scale: Little or no importance (1), Of some importance (2), Important (3), and Very important (4). Originally, the authors developed a general values instrument and a work-related values instrument. In the final version, both general and work-related items are brought together in one single instrument.

### Sample

The scales were developed with English- and French-speaking samples of Canadian adult workers ( $n = 6382$ ) and high school students ( $n = 3115$ ), and an English-speaking sample of postsecondary education students ( $n = 623$ ). Although the samples are not random, the authors did attempt to obtain a broad cross section. Norms are provided for males and females in each group and for the French and English forms where appropriate, and breakdowns are provided for adults by type of work.

### Reliability

#### *Internal Consistency*

Alpha reliability coefficients have been reported for each scale in each of the three major samples. For the English form, reliabilities ranged from .67 (Achievement) to .88 (Altruism) (median .80) for adults, .68 (Achievement) to .91 (Altruism) (median .83) for postsecondary students, and .65 (Cultural Identity) to .90 (Altruism) (median .78) for the high school students. Reliabilities for the French form are comparable to the English in the adult samples but somewhat lower in the high school sample.

#### *Test-Retest*

Reliability coefficients over a 4-6-week interval with the high school student sample ranged from .63 (Ability Utilization) to .82 (Physical Prowess, Physical Activity) (median .69) in the English version. For the French form, coefficients ranged from .53 (Cultural Identity) to .83 (Physical Prowess) (median .65). Again, using high school students, the authors examined the correlation between the French and English forms with a short time interval. The correlation coefficients ranged from .62 (Achievement) to .88 (Physical Prowess) (median .74).

### Validity

#### *Convergent*

The scales have been used to differentiate students enrolled in business, education and rehabilitation medicine and have been successfully related to measures from the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (Gay, Weiss, Hendel, Dawis, & Lofquist, 1971), the

Work Aspect Preference Scale (Pryor, 1979), and the Work Values Inventory (Super, 1970). Eight value scales were postulated as having counterparts in these instruments: Authority, Social Relations, Creativity, Autonomy, Economics, Altruism, Work Conditions, and Prestige. The patterns of intercorrelations and confirmatory factor analysis supported not only the convergent but the discriminant validity of these scales (Macnab & Fitzsimmons, 1987).

### *Discriminant*

In examining the relationship between the LRI-VS and the Vocational Preference Inventory (Fitzsimmons *et al.*, 1985), only 49 of the possible 120 correlations were significant, leading the authors to conclude that their value domain cannot be subsumed under that of interests.

### *Location*

Fitzsimmons, G. W., Macnab, D., & Casserly, C. (1985). *Technical Manual for the Life Roles Inventory Values Scale and the Salience Inventory*. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: PsiCan Consulting Limited.

### *Results and Comments*

The factorial structure of the instrument has been examined for each of the norm samples (Fitzsimmons *et al.*, 1985), suggesting higher-order factors underlying the scales. Principal components analyses and varimax rotations on intercorrelations between the 20 scales consistently have revealed five factors emerging across samples: (1) Personal Achievement and Development, (2) Social Orientation, (3) Independence, (4) Economic Conditions, and (5) Physical Activity and Risk.

The LRI-VS is relatively new but it is currently being used internationally and further examples of its use should appear soon in the literature. Data provided on reliability and validity are impressive and its applicability to the work role as well as to other roles gives it special status. Previous instruments have focused primarily on work values or general values, rarely on both.

The major criticism that can be made of the LRI-VS at this point is its lack of consistency with the dominant definition of values. Respondents are asked to indicate what is important to them without any reference to desirability. Although the value scales have been empirically differentiated from interests, they have not been differentiated from needs. Importance is an appropriate dimension on which to assess needs and is relevant to values only when the instructions make it clear that respondents are considering the desirable, that is, guiding principles in life.

## **Life Roles Inventory—Value Scales**

Instructions: Once you have completed the personal information on the answer sheet please start answering the questions below. Please answer every question. Work rapidly. If you are not sure, guess; your first thought is most likely to be the right answer for you.

For each of the following statements, indicate how important it is to you. Use the following scale:

- 1 Means of little or no importance
- 2 Means of some importance
- 3 Means important
- 4 Means very important

Use a pencil to fill in the circle of the number on the answer sheet that shows how important the statement is to you. For example:

Enjoy myself while working      1      2      ●      4

Now please respond to all the questions, using the answer sheet.

**Sample items:**

It is now or will be important for me to . . .

- 1. use all my skills and knowledge    1    2    3    4
- 2. do things that involve some risk
- 3. have a good income

## Conceptions of the Desirable

(Lorr, Suziedelis, & Tonesk, 1973)

### Variable

Values are conceptualized as personal goals, social goals, and modes of conduct deemed personally or socially preferable, and assessed in terms of their importance in the respondent's life.

### Description

The initial pool of items (235) represented 10 bipolar constructs derived from the work of Morris (1956b), F. R. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), Scott (1965), and Bales and Couch (1969). The constructs for item selection were (1) authoritarian versus rule-free, (2) equalitarian versus elitist, (3) achieving versus hedonistic, (4) altruistic versus self-interested, (5) controlled versus spontaneous, (6) adventurous versus cautious, (7) religious versus secular, (8) stoic versus comfort-seeking, (9) intellectual versus pragmatic, and (10) principled versus opportunistic.

The final form of the inventory is self-administered and comprises 139 items that respondents must rate on a five-point scale according to how desirable they think the goal is or how they think they ought to behave. The rating scale is defined by labels reflecting five levels of importance from Not at all (1) through to Extremely (5). On the basis of first-order and second-order factor analyses, the authors claim that four ethical orientations can be measured through 12 value scales: Acceptance of authority by the (1) Authoritarian, (2) Religious, and (3) Elitist scales, the work ethic by the (4) Self-reliant, (5) Stoic, (6) Achieving, and (7) Adventurous scales, the humanitarian orientation by the (8) Socially Concerned, (9) Intellectual, and (10) Conscientious scales, and the hedonistic orientation by the (11) Hedonistic and (12) Self-Interested scales. Unfortunately, details are not available to relate particular items to each of the scales.



**Sample**

The instrument was developed using two samples of adult men and women ( $n = 365, 300$ ) who varied widely in educational level and social class.

**Reliability**

Neither internal consistency nor test-retest coefficients are provided.

**Validity***Convergent*

Limited information is provided on the religious and authoritarian subscales with both correlating with an attitudinal measure of liberalism-conservatism.

*Discriminant*

No data are provided.

**Location**

Lorr, M., Suziedelis, A., & Tonesk, X. (1973). The structure of values. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 7, 139-147.

**Results and Comments**

The inventory has not received widespread use; there is neither sufficient information for scoring nor adequate data on reliability and validity. Further psychometric work is clearly needed to make this a useful instrument and language needs to be modernized. The inventory has two major strengths, however. First, a broad range of values is represented (personal and social goals and modes of conduct are included). Second, the authors have operationalized values in a manner that is consistent with the dominant conceptualization of values as conceptions of the desirable.

### Conceptions of the Desirable

Directions: The purpose of this inventory is to find out what goals you regard as *desirable* and ways you believe you *ought* to behave. Please read each value statement and indicate how *important* it is in your life.

Indicate the degree of importance of each value to you by recording the number of the appropriate answer on the line. If the value is not at all important record a 1. If the value is quite important record a 4, and so on, using numbers as follows:

1. Not at all
2. Somewhat
3. Moderately
4. Quite
5. Extremely

Be sure to select an answer for each statement.

- | 1   | 2        | 3          | 4     | 5         |
|---|----------|------------|-------|-----------|
| NOT AT ALL  | SOMEWHAT | MODERATELY | QUITE | EXTREMELY |
| 1. Do something for others without expecting any reward                 |          |            |       |           |
| 2. Recognize that some people are born superior                         |          |            |       |           |
| 3. Make the best use of time  |          |            |       |           |
| 4. Respect and obey the laws of the land                                |          |            |       |           |
| 5. Trust in the providence of God                                       |          |            |       |           |
| 6. Try out new ideas  |          |            |       |           |
| 7. Bear my burdens without complaining                                  |          |            |       |           |
| 8. Avoid the stereotyped and the traditional                            |          |            |       |           |
| 9. Look out for myself first  |          |            |       |           |
| 10. Promise nothing I can't fulfill                                     |          |            |       |           |
| 11. Make allowances for the peculiarities of gifted people              |          |            |       |           |
| 12. Challenge authority when I disagree with it                         |          |            |       |           |
| 13. Give help to the hungry and poor                                    |          |            |       |           |
| 14. Be practical and efficient in whatever I do                         |          |            |       |           |
| 15. Show respect for my parents   |          |            |       |           |
| 16. Strengthen and toughen myself for any hardships                     |          |            |       |           |
| 17. Follow the rule "every man for himself"                             |          |            |       |           |
| 18. Be guided by my conscience  |          |            |       |           |
| 19. Understand the reasons for things                                   |          |            |       |           |
| 20. Have a plan for whatever I do and stick to it                       |          |            |       |           |
| 21. Solve my problems by myself   |          |            |       |           |
| 22. Recognize that some people deserve special privileges               |          |            |       |           |
| 23. Be an innovator   |          |            |       |           |
| 24. Honor my commitments  |          |            |       |           |
| 25. Be free from any religious constraints                              |          |            |       |           |
| 26. Always be active and busy   |          |            |       |           |
| 27. Have fun and a good time  |          |            |       |           |
| 28. Appreciate great men and great minds                                |          |            |       |           |
| 29. Face risks boldly   |          |            |       |           |
| 30. Keep my word no matter what   |          |            |       |           |
| 31. See that all men are guaranteed the same rights and privileges      |          |            |       |           |
| 32. Not be bound by any religious beliefs                               |          |            |       |           |
| 33. Take advantage of opportunities even though it violates a few rules |          |            |       |           |
| 34. Avoid obedience to authority  |          |            |       |           |
| 35. Use my intellectual powers to the fullest                           |          |            |       |           |
| 36. Act responsibly when I take on a commitment                         |          |            |       |           |
| 37. Strive to get ahead in some line of work                            |          |            |       |           |

38. Seek the adventure of the unexpected
39. Take care of myself before helping others
40. Get as much pleasure out of living as I can
41. Never lie to anyone
42. Recognize that others have the same rights as I do
43. Strike down laws that don't make sense anymore
44. Enjoy the beauty of nature
45. Promote cooperation among peoples of different countries
46. Avoid sticking my neck out for anyone
47. Be self-sufficient
48. Obey lawful authority
49. Be loyal to my friends
50. Bring back religious values to our society
51. Understand the meaning and purpose of things
52. Show love for my country
53. Take time to enjoy myself without care
54. Make decisions on my own
55. Be honest and truthful
56. Acknowledge that rulers of countries are different from common people
57. Be always ready to meet my Creator
58. Show sympathy for others
59. Feel free to break any law I consider wrong
60. Enjoy music and the arts
61. Just take it easy; not push myself too hard
62. Stand apart from the crowd
63. Worship God
64. Not be governed by society's rules
65. Live in a world where nations are at peace with one another
66. Enjoy the here and now instead of worrying about tomorrow
67. Show respect for those in authority
68. Recognize that some people deserve a higher standing in society than others
69. Keep my promises
70. Never obey any law blindly
71. Maintain law and public order
72. Plan things ahead of time and carry them out
73. Do the will of God
74. Be able to appreciate the best in art, music, and literature
75. Enjoy the present and let the future take care of itself
76. Leave the problems of the world in the hands of the specially gifted

77. Eliminate traditions that are kept for tradition's sake
78. Keep cool and collected in the face of panic or disaster
79. Set clear goals to work for
80. Treat fellow human beings as equals
81. Trust God to save mankind
82. Respect the traditions of our society
83. Enjoy life to the fullest
84. Seek explanations for the way things are
85. Give leadership to the most intelligent people
86. Avoid doing favors for anybody
87. Take pride in my work
88. Reduce the number of useless rules in our society
89. Let no one influence me against my better judgment
90. Make God the final purpose of life
91. Endure problems and difficulties with courage
92. Satisfy my immediate needs and impulses
93. Defend my national heritage
94. Enjoy giving to others
95. Always do my best
96. Get all the pleasures of life
97. Maintain emotional control over myself at all times
98. Follow my belief, even if contrary to law
99. Be free from sin
100. Work for mutual acceptance and understanding between nations
101. Finish jobs that I start
102. Study the workings of the universe
103. Follow the social customs of my country
104. Keep my head no matter what is happening around me
105. Be my own man
106. Seek new roads to travel
107. Show respect for my elders
108. Give to those who are in need of help
109. Be able to take pressures and stress
110. When things get rough, go it alone
111. Seek out life's little comforts
112. Complete what I set out to do
113. Make sure to get my fair share of rewards and benefits
114. Seek out new experiences
115. Enjoy great cultural achievements
116. Keep myself physically fit

117. Be able to determine my own future
118. Recognize the common brotherhood of man
119. Know ahead of time what I will do
120. Protect our country's way of life
121. Accept the fact that some people are born leaders
122. Enjoy the challenge of danger
123. Avoid relying on others
124. Enjoy all of life's pleasures
125. Take the hard knocks of life without complaining
126. Follow a definite schedule
127. Do exciting things even if they involve some risk or danger
128. Accept the fact that some people are more important than others to our society
129. Indulge myself
130. Preserve our system of government
131. Help others less fortunate than myself
132. Strive to get ahead
133. Endure pain without flinching
134. Not be dependent on anyone
135. Get what is coming to me
136. Try daring things
137. See that all men are treated equally
138. Leave as little to chance as possible
139. Follow the conventions of our society

### **Empirically Derived Value Constructions**

*(Gorlow & Noll, 1967)*

#### **Variable**

A set of empirically derived values representing sources of meaning in life, sources of pleasure in life, and goals in life are sorted in terms of their value to respondents.

#### **Description**

The first stage in the development of the instrument was the generation of 1500 statements by a group of respondents. Another group of respondents reduced this list to 75 non-overlapping clearly stated values. The final 75 value statements are expressed in infinitive form (e.g., to accept others, to excel generally) and are administered to respondents as a 13-pile Q-sort task. The first pile represents statements "of lowest value to you" while the 13th pile represents statements "of highest value to you."

Gorlow and Noll used the Q-sorts to generate a correlation matrix among persons that

was subjected to a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation. Eight factors accounting for 64% of the variance were extracted and interpreted. The clusters of individuals identified were (1) the affiliative-romantic, (2) the status-security valuer, (3) the intellectual humanist, (4) the family valuer, (5) the rugged individualist, (6) the undemanding-passive group, (7) the Boy Scout, and (8) the Don Juan. Correlations were computed between loadings on the factors that emerged and the Q-sort placements of the value statements in order to identify which statements were related to each of the factors. No procedures were explored for scoring statements, however. The basic unit of analysis was the individual's factor score on each dimension.

### Sample

The statements were generated by 75 introductory psychology students but the Q-sort data were obtained from 105 persons of varying backgrounds in the university community (approximately half were undergraduates, the others were graduate students, faculty members, and persons in the surrounding community).

### Reliability

No information on reliability was encountered.

### Validity

#### *Convergent*

The loadings for individuals on each factor were correlated with demographic and social variables. Affiliative-romantics were more likely to be women, status-security valuers were less likely to be actively religious, intellectual humanists tended to be politically active, family valuers tended to be women and married, rugged individualists tended not to have strong political feelings, and the Don Juans were more likely to be single and young.

#### *Discriminant*

No data were presented.

### Location

Gorlow, L., & Noll, G. A. (1967). A study of empirically derived values. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 73, 261-269.

### Results and Comments

This instrument provides a set of empirically derived statements that overlap considerably with the dominant definition of value. They are not as broad and abstract as the concepts of Rokeach (1973), but at the same time they are not as specific as attitude statements. They represent behaviors that transcend specific objects and situations.

Unlike other scales reviewed in this chapter, the item set has been used to identify types of individuals. Developing scales of value statements (or types of items) is quite a different task. All Gorlow and Noll have provided are correlations between each of their

statements and the factors representing types of people. Most statements correlate significantly with more than one type. It is not at all clear how these items might group if the factor analysis had been performed on items averaging across respondents.

The major drawback of this questionnaire is that it is not one that can be used "off the shelf." Gorlow and Noll (1967) emphasize that they are proposing a methodology rather than reporting generalizable findings, concluding with the point that "different constructions of values might be expected to emerge when groups different from college sophomore populations are studied" (p. 269). Thus different factor structures should emerge in other groups and need to be identified in each new study. Modifications to the item set may also be required.

### **Empirically Derived Value Constructions**

*Items:* (To be sorted into 13 piles from 1—of lowest value to you—through 13—of highest value to you.)

1. To be respected
2. To be wealthy
3. To be politically wise
4. To have formal higher education
5. To be financially secure
6. To like yourself
7. To be on affectionate terms with family
8. To have sexual prowess
9. To love all mankind
10. To know that you are the best at something
11. To excel generally
12. To solve difficult problems
13. To succeed in your work
14. To be strong physically
15. To be physically attractive
16. To be well-known
17. To have close friendships
18. To be remembered after death
19. To be married
20. To have sexual relations
21. To have children
22. To make others happy
23. To have self-control
24. To be artistically creative
25. To be religious
26. To seek truth

27. To be accepted by others
28. To accept others
29. To relax and feel content
30. To feel you own what you want
31. To be an individual
32. To confide in others
33. To have help when you want it
34. To be unafraid
35. To go to Heaven
36. To have recreations
37. To work hard
38. To prevail in intellectual give and take
39. To be alone
40. To own things
41. To direct others
42. To be useful
43. To be in love
44. To be active
45. To pray
46. To appreciate nature
47. To remember your past
48. To have status
49. To be loyal to friends
50. To be loyal to your country
51. To stand by your beliefs
52. To be optimistic
53. To share what you have
54. To be a part of social groups
55. To affiliate with humanitarian efforts
56. To be involved in politics
57. To have a tradition
58. To make decisions
59. To be in charge
60. To respect your parents
61. To provide for relatives
62. To be unselfish
63. To teach
64. To live up to others' expectations for you
65. To be your own boss
66. To be part of a productive organization



67. To be loved
68. To not be in physical pain
69. To be free of wrongdoing
70. To appreciate beauty
71. To have high moral and ethical standards
72. To be sober and clearheaded
73. To be sensitive to others' feelings
74. To be able to respond emotionally
75. To contribute to society

### **East-West Questionnaire**

(Gilgen & Cho, 1979a)

#### Variable

The instrument is designed to measure Eastern versus Western orientations in belief systems. The Eastern perspective is conceptualized as a monistic (nondualistic) view of existence expressed in the four major Eastern religious traditions of Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism. Nondualistic beliefs emphasize wholeness: "Man should recognize his basic oneness with nature, the spiritual, and the mental rather than attempt to analyze, label, categorize, manipulate, control, or consume the things of the world" (p. 836).

The Western perspective, with Judeo-Christian and Greek foundations, is dualistic such that reality is divided into two parts with one part being set off against the other. From this perspective, "man has characteristics which set him apart from nature and the spiritual." "man is divided into a body, a spirit, and a mind," "there is a personal God who is over man," and "man must control and manipulate nature to ensure his survival" (p. 836).

#### Description

The questionnaire is self-administered and comprises 68 items, half representing the Eastern world view while the other half represent the corresponding Western world view. Each item is rated on a five-point scale from "agree strongly" (1) through to "disagree strongly" (5). The authors recommend using the questionnaire to derive an Eastern Thought Score. This score is obtained by assigning a weight of 2 to "strongly agree" responses and a weight of 1 to "agree, but with some reservations" responses. All other responses are ignored. The agreement scores are summed first across the Eastern world view items and second across all items. The Eastern agreement score is then divided by the total agreement score and multiplied by 100. Eastern Thought scores range maximally from 0 to 100. Cho and Gilgen (1980) also report five subscales within the questionnaire: Spiritual, Nature, Society, Man, and Rational Thought.

#### Sample

The questionnaire has been used with United States college students ( $n = 210$  in the largest study), transpersonal psychologists ( $n = 69$ ), and business people ( $n = 46$ ), and in Korea with medical and nursing students ( $n = 87$ ).

## Reliability

### *Internal Consistency*

Compton (1983) reported an  $\alpha$  reliability coefficient for the instrument of .70, although this coefficient may be more a function of the large number of items in the scale than the cohesiveness of the items. No reliability data were encountered for the subscales.

### *Test-Retest*

Over a 2-week period, Gilgen and Cho (1979a) report a test-retest reliability for the scale of .76.

## Validity

### *Convergent*

Gilgen and Cho (1979a) contrasted the Eastern Thought Scores of business majors and executives, students majoring in art, philosophy, and religion, transpersonal psychologists, and Buddhists in a preliminary investigation of the validity of the instrument. Cho and Gilgen (1980) subsequently showed Korean students to be more Eastern in their orientation than American students, and Compton (1983) has used the scale to differentiate practitioners of Zen meditation from nonpractitioners. Gilgen and Cho (1979b) examined the construct validity of the instrument by relating it to scores on Rokeach's Value Survey (1967) and Morris' Ways to Live (1956b). The results generally are in the direction expected, but they are not consistent across males and females.

## Location

Gilgen, A. R., & Cho, J. H. (1979a). Questionnaire to measure eastern and western thought. *Psychological Reports*, 44, 835-841.

## Results and Comments

The instrument has the attraction of being specifically designed to compare Eastern and Western world views. Further research is needed, however, to examine issues of reliability and validity, particularly in relation to the five subscales. In addition, the degree of internal consistency of the scale as a whole needs clarification. Users may also wish to alter the wording of some items (e.g., Man should strive to free himself. . .) to ensure acceptability for both male and female respondents.

### **The East-West Questionnaire**

*Instructions:* We are interested in finding out how much you agree or disagree with each of the statements which follow. Please read each statement carefully and then decide whether you:

- 1—AGREE strongly
- 2—AGREE, but with some reservations
- 3—Have no opinion
- 4—DISAGREE, but only moderately
- 5—DISAGREE strongly

When you have made your decision, note the number that corresponds to it and blacken in the proper space on your answer sheet using the pencil provided.  
 At the bottom of each page you will find a KEY that presents the five response alternatives. Refer to this KEY in order to avoid errors.

**Man and the Spiritual**

**Eastern World View**

**Western World View**

I do not believe in a personal god.  
 1      2      3      4      5

I believe in a personal god to whom I must account after death.  
 1      2      3      4      5

If there is a soul, I believe that after I die it will lose its individuality and become one with the overall spirituality of the universe.

I believe in a personal soul which will continue to exist after death.

**Man and Nature**

**Eastern World View**

**Western World View**

Man should try to harmonize with nature rather than manipulate and control it.

Man's progress has resulted primarily from his ability, through science and technology, to control and modify the natural world.

Man should strive to return to nature.

Man should strive to free himself from the uncompromising forces of nature.

I feel a real sense of kinship with most plants and animals.

While plants and animals are essential to human existence, I have no personal bond with most of them.

I hate to kill anything, even insects.

I cannot honestly say that it bothers me very much to step on an ant or bee deliberately.

I love to sit quietly just watching the clouds or a wild flower.

Inaction makes me very nervous and uncomfortable.

I like to travel alone sometimes to new places.

I feel ill at ease by myself in strange places.

I enjoy being by myself in the dark.

I am usually afraid when I find myself alone in a dark place.

We should only consume what we actually need.

A high level of consumption, even if it means some waste, is essential to a strong economy and a high standard of living.

### Man and Society

#### Eastern World View

The world keeps passing through cycles, over and over again, never really changing.

The ideal society is one in which each person subordinates his or her own desires and works consciously for the good of the community.

People should accept the role in life they are given by their parents' status in society.

A meaningful life depends more on learning to cooperate than learning to compete.

Money tends to enslave people.

I get very little pleasure from material possessions.

I find most strangers interesting and easy to get to know.

I enjoy eating by myself in a restaurant.

#### Western World View

Man is moving by some grand plan toward an historical goal.

The ideal society is one in which each person by working individually for his own goals benefits everyone.

People should have the opportunity to work themselves out of the situation in life they are born into.

One of the most important things you can teach your children is how to compete successfully in the world.

Money frees us from drudgery and meaningless work.

Material possessions are for me a deep source of satisfaction.

I feel awkward and self-conscious with most strangers.

I cannot stand eating by myself.

### Man and Himself

#### Eastern World View

Meditation properly practiced can be a rich source of personal enlightenment; even when practiced by amateurs it may offer a way to relax.

It is within his deep inner self that man will find true enlightenment.

True learning is directed toward self-understanding.

I feel that my dreams are an integral part of me.

Knowing that we shall die gives meaning to life.

Suicide is sometimes a noble and natural choice.

#### Western World View

Meditation is at best a form of relaxation and at worst a dangerous escape from reality and our responsibilities.

The deep inner realm of man is basically primitive and evil.

The main purpose of learning is to be able to get a good job.

My dreams seem like an alien part of me.

Death really doesn't make much sense to me.

Suicide is just plain wrong.

Suffering, while painful and unpleasant, is basically a positive experience.

Anxiety usually results in personal growth.

Suffering should be avoided at all cost because it destroys the meaning of life.

Anxiety usually leads to unproductive and even self-destructive behavior.

### The Rationality of Man

#### Eastern World View

Thoughts tend to isolate us from our feelings.

Complex problems cannot be understood by breaking them into smaller components and then analyzing each component.

Language tends to interfere with our ability to experience things naturally and fully.

A new idea should be treasured whether it is useful or not.

Science and technology have provided man with an illusion of progress, an illusion he will later pay for dearly.

Science is a destructive force in the long run.

The use of artificial kidneys and plastic hearts is going too far; it is unnatural.

Administering questionnaires is not a very effective way to find out about people.

#### Western World View

It is primarily through thinking and classifying that our experiences take on meaning.

The best way to understand something is to subdivide it into smaller components and analyze each component carefully.

Language gives form and meaning to our experiences.

Only ideas that help us do something better have much value.

The only real progress man has achieved has been through science and technology.

Science is our main hope for the future.

Heart and kidney transplants are natural and wonderful medical advances.

Probably some useful information about people can be acquired through questionnaires.

## Value Orientations

(Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961)

### Variable

The instrument measures the orientations of respondents toward four dilemmas, representing "common human problems for which all peoples at all times must find some solution" (p. 10).

## Description

The statements are considered to be "value orientations," conceived as

principles, resulting from the transactional interplay of three analytically distinguishable elements of the evaluative process—the cognitive, the affective, and the directive elements—which give order and direction to the ever-flowing stream of human acts and thoughts as these relate to the solution of "common human" problems. (p. 4)

For each dilemma, two or three alternative orientations are postulated: the relation to other humans may be faced in individual, lineal (rank-defined), or collateral (group-related) terms; the relation to nature may be seen as one of submission, subjugation, or harmonious adaptation; the time perspective may be focused predominantly on the past, present, or future; and self-expression may appear predominantly as either activity or passive "being."

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck assessed these orientations through an individual interview in which 22 questions were asked, posing 23 choices for the interviewees. Preferred solutions were indicated by rank-ordering the alternative responses for each of the postulated dilemmas. The "relational orientation" (to other humans) is represented by seven questions, and the "man-nature orientation," the "time orientation" and the "activity" orientation each by five questions.

Thus, within each question, items pertaining to a single "orientation" are ipsatively administered, yielding total scores on choices within each orientation that are ipsative. (It is impossible, for instance, to score high simultaneously on individual, lineal, and collateral orientations.) This scoring procedure follows from theoretical postulates, rather than from empirical evidence concerning mutual exclusiveness of the alternatives. Between orientations, item responses and their sums within a type are independent, and can be compared via standardized scores (e.g., an individual relational orientation against a subjugative orientation to nature).

## Sample

The instrument was developed in the 1950s for use with 23 Spanish-Americans, 20 Texans, 20 Mormons, 22 off-reservation Navajo, and 21 Zuni in a comparative ethnology of five neighboring communities in the southwest United States.

## Reliability

No conventional reliability coefficients have been encountered. Some inferences regarding reliability can be made, however, through cross-community comparisons of items and scale totals (i.e., summed scores over responses reflecting a particular solution to the type of dilemma posed). The intercultural differences observed with the scales of collateral relations, past and future time orientations, and harmonious orientation to nature tend to be clearer than those obtained with their constituent items, suggesting positive reliabilities for these scales at least.

## Validity

### *Convergent*

A group-differences analysis provided the sole basis for ascertaining scale validity; no independent measures from the communities were reported to substantiate the investiga-

tors' predicted rank-ordering of the five samples. Interpretation of the results as demonstrating validity of the measures depends, therefore, on two assumptions: uncontaminated criteria and intercommunity differences that reflect only the postulated underlying orientations, rather than extraneous characteristics. Although the effects of extraneous determinants might be considered random over large, representative samples of cultures, irrelevant variables cannot be effectively controlled when the number of cultures is small. Despite this limitation (which applies to virtually all cross-cultural studies), the statistical analyses (by A. K. Romney) provide a useful model of intercultural validation.

Each orientation (mean of similarly classified replies to a given dilemma) was subject to an analysis of variance over the five samples; in addition, clusters of items (two or three responses to each question) were similarly analyzed to ascertain the consistency of intercultural differences that emerged within sets representing a common orientation. (Both procedures were complicated by the ipsative scoring.) Consistent intercultural differences were noted (e.g., Texans tended to score higher than others on four of the seven "individual" and on three of the five "subjugation" items; Spanish-Americans on three of the five "past" and three of the six "being" items).

It is such interitem consistencies that lend confidence to the interpretation of intercultural differences in total scale scores, because they imply that cultural differences do not depend on a particular way of measuring the variable. Although results from this study do not speak to the general question of scale validity, they do pertain to the validity of the scales for the authors' purpose (i.e., distinguishing among the five cultures studied) under the assumption that their judgment provides a sufficiently valid criterion.

#### Location

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

#### Results and Comments

Given the cultural specificity of the measure, its continued use in the original form is unlikely. However, the theory underlying it may be regarded by some as sufficiently universal to generate other specific measures of the same attributes. For example, derived instruments in written questionnaire form have been used by Platt (1985) and by Triandis, Leung, Villareal, and Clark (1985).

### Value Orientations

#### 1. Job Choice (Activity: Items A1 and A2)

A man needed a job and had a chance to work for two men. The two bosses were different. Listen to what they were like and say which you think would be the best one to work for.

- A  
(Doing) One boss was a fair enough man, and he gave somewhat higher pay than most men, but he was the kind of boss who insisted that men work hard, stick on the job. He did not like it at all when a worker sometimes just knocked off work for a while to go on a trip or to have a day or so of fun, and he thought it was right not to take such a worker back on the job.

- B  
(Being) The other paid just average wages but he was not so firm. He understood that a worker would sometimes just not turn up—would be off on a trip or having a little fun for a day or two. When \_\_\_\_\_ his men did this he would take them back without saying too much.

(Part One)

Which of these men do you believe that it would be better to work for in most cases?

Which of these men would most other \_\_\_\_\_ think it better to work for?

(Part Two)

Which kind of boss do you believe that it is better to be in most cases?

Which kind of boss would most other \_\_\_\_\_ think it better to be?

## 2. Well Arrangements (Relational: Item R1)

When a community has to make arrangements for water, such as drill a well, there are three different ways they can decide to arrange things like location and who is going to do the work.

- A  
(Lin) There are some communities where it is mainly the older or recognized leaders of the important families who decide the plans. Everyone usually accepts what they say without much discussion since they are the ones who are used to deciding such things and are the ones who have had the most experience.
- B  
(Coll) There are some communities where most people in the group have a part in making the plans. Lots of different people talk, but nothing is done until almost everyone comes to agree as to what is best to be done.
- C  
(Ind) There are some communities where everyone holds to his own opinion, and they decide the matter by vote. They do what the largest number want even though there are still a very great many people who disagree and object to the action.

Which way do you think is usually best in such cases?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which way of all three ways do you think most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ would usually think is best?

## 3. Child Training (Time: Item T1)

Some people were talking about the way children should be brought up. Here are three different ideas.

- A  
(Past) Some people say that children should be taught well the traditions of the past (the ways of the old people). They believe the old ways are best, and that it is when children do not follow them too much that things go wrong.



B  
(Pres) Some people say that children should be taught some of the old traditions (ways of the old people), but it is wrong to insist that they stick to these ways. These people believe that it is necessary for children always to learn about and take on whatever of the new ways will best help them get along in the world of today.

C  
(Fut) Some people do not believe children should be taught much about past traditions (the ways of the old people) at all except as an interesting story of what has gone before. These people believe that the world goes along best when children are taught the things that will make them want to find out for themselves new ways of doing things to replace the old.

Which of these people had the best idea about how children should be taught?

Which of the other two people had the better idea?

Considering again all three ideas, which would most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ say had the better idea?

#### 4. Livestock Dying (Man–Nature: Item MN1)

One time a man had a lot of livestock. Most of them died off in different ways. People talked about this and said different things.

A  
(Subj) Some people said you just can't blame a man when things like this happen. There are so many things that can and do happen, and a man can do almost nothing to prevent such losses when they come. We all have to learn to take the bad with the good.

B  
(Over) Some people said that it was probably the man's own fault that he lost so many. He probably didn't use his head to prevent the losses. They said that it is usually the case that men who keep up on new ways of doing things, and really set themselves to it, almost always find a way to keep out of such trouble.

C  
(With) Some people said that it was probably because the man had not lived his life right—had not done things in the right way to keep harmony between himself and the forces of nature (i.e., the ways of nature like the rain, winds, snow, etc.).

Which of these reasons do you think is most usually true?

Which of the other two reasons do you think is more true?

Which of all three reasons would most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ think is usually true?

#### 5. Expectations about Change (Time: Item T2)

(20–40 Age Group)

Three young people were talking about what they thought their families would have one day as compared with their fathers and mothers. They each said different things.

- C  
(Fut) The first said: I expect my family to be better off in the future than the family of my father and mother or relatives if we work hard and plan right. Things in this country usually get better for people who really try.
- B  
(Pres) The second one said: I don't know whether my family will be better off, the same, or worse off than the family of my father and mother or relatives. Things always go up and down even if people do work hard. So one can never really tell how things will be.
- A  
(Past) The third one said: I expect my family to be about the same as the family of my father and mother or relatives. The best way is to work hard and plan ways to keep up things as they have been in the past.

Which of these people do you think had the best idea?

Which of the other two persons had the better idea?

Which of these three people would most other \_\_\_\_\_ your age think had the best idea?

(40-Up Age Group)

Three older people were talking about what they thought their children would have when they were grown. Here is what each one said.

- C  
(Fut) One said: I really expect my children to have more than I have had if they work hard and plan right. There are always good chances for people who try.
- B  
(Pres) The second one said: I don't know whether my children will be better off, worse off, or just the same. Things always go up and down even if one works hard, so we can't really tell.
- A  
(Past) The third one said: I expect my children to have just about the same as I have had or bring things back as they once were. It is their job to work hard and find ways to keep things going as they have been in the past.

Which of these people do you think had the best idea?

Which of the other two persons had the better idea?

Which of these three people would most other \_\_\_\_\_ your age think had the best idea?

**6. Facing Conditions (Man-Nature: Item MN2)**

There are different ways of thinking about how God (the gods) is (are) related to man and to weather and all other natural conditions which make the crops and animals live or die. Here are three possible ways.

- C  
(With) God (the gods) and people all work together all the time; whether the conditions that make the crops and animals grow are good or bad depends upon whether people themselves do all the proper things to keep themselves in harmony with their God (gods) and with the forces of nature.

- B  
(Over) God (the gods) does (do) not directly use his (their) power to control all the conditions which affect the growth of crops or animals. It is up to the people themselves to figure out the ways conditions change and to try hard to find the ways of controlling them.
- A  
(Subj) Just how God (the gods) will use his (their) power over all the conditions which affect the growth of crops and animals cannot be known by man. But it is useless for people to think they can change conditions very much for very long. The best way is to take conditions as they come and do as well as one can.

Which of these ways of looking at things do you think is best?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of the three ways of looking at things would most other people in \_\_\_\_\_ think is best?

### 7. Help in Misfortune (Relational: Item R2)

A man had a crop failure, or, let us say, had lost most of his sheep or cattle. He and his family had to have help from someone if they were going to get through the winter. There are different ways of getting help. Which of these three ways would be best?

- B  
(Coll) Would it be best if he depended mostly on his brothers and sisters or other relatives all to help him out as much as each one could?
- C  
(Ind) Would it be best for him to try to raise the money on his own outside the community (his own people) from people who are neither relatives nor employers?
- A  
(Lin) Would it be best for him to go to a boss or to an older important relative who is used to managing things in his group, and ask him to help out until things get better?

Which way of getting the help do you think would usually be best?

Which way of getting the help do you think is next best?

Which way do you think you yourself would really follow?

Which way do you think most other people in \_\_\_\_\_ would think best?

### 8. Family Work Relations (Relational: Item R3)

I'm going to tell you about three different ways families can arrange work. These families are related and they live close together.

- C  
(Ind) In some groups (or communities) it is usually expected that each of the separate families (by which we mean just husband, wife, and children) will look after its own business separate from all others and not be responsible for the others.
- B  
(Coll) In some groups (or communities) it is usually expected that the close relatives in the families will work together and talk over among themselves the way to take care of whatever problems come up.

When a boss is needed they usually choose (get) one person, not necessarily the oldest able person, to manage things.

- A  
(Lin) In some groups (or communities) it is usually expected that the families which are closely related to each other will work together and have the oldest able person (*hermano mayor* or father) be responsible for and take charge of most important things.

Which of these ways do you think is usually best in most cases?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of all the ways do you think most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ would think is usually best?

### 9. Choice of Delegate (Relational: Item R4)

A group like yours (community like yours) is to send a delegate—a representative—to a meeting away from here (this can be any sort of meeting). How will this delegate be chosen?

- B  
(Coll) Is it best that a meeting be called and everyone discuss things until almost everyone agrees so that when a vote is taken almost all people would be agreed on the same person?
- A  
(Lin) Is it best that the older, important, leaders take the main responsibility for deciding who should represent the people since they are the ones who have had the long experience in such matters?
- C  
(Ind) Is it best that a meeting be called, names be put up, a vote be taken, then send the man who gets the majority of votes even if there are many people who are still against this man?

Which of these ways of choosing is usually best in cases like this?

Which of the other two ways is usually better?

Which would most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ say is usually best?

### 10. Use of Fields (Man-Nature: Item MN3)

There were three men who had fields with crops (were farmers). The three men had quite different ways of planting and taking care of crops.

- C  
(With) One man put in his crops, worked hard, and also set himself to living in right and proper ways. He felt that it is the way a man works and tries to keep himself in harmony with the forces of nature that has the most effect on conditions and the way crops turn out.
- A  
(Subj) One man put in his crops. Afterwards he worked on them sufficiently but did not do more than was necessary to keep them going along. He felt that it mainly depended on weather conditions how they would turn out, and that nothing extra that people do could change things much.
- B One man put in his crops and then worked on them a lot of time

(Over) and made use of all the new scientific ideas he could find out about. He felt that by doing this he would in most years prevent many of the effects of bad conditions.

Which of these ways do you believe is usually best?

Which of the other two ways do you believe is better?

Which of the three ways would most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ think is best?

### 11. Philosophy of Life (Time: Item T3)

People often have very different ideas about what has gone before and what we can expect in life. Here are three ways of thinking about these things.

B  
(Pres) Some people believe it best to give most attention to what is happening now in the present. They say that the past has gone and the future is much too uncertain to count on. Things do change, but it is sometimes for the better and sometimes for the worse, so in the long run it is about the same. These people believe the best way to live is to keep those of the old ways that one can—or that one likes—but to be ready to accept the new ways that will help to make life easier and better as we live from year to year.

A  
(Past) Some people think that the ways of the past (ways of the old people or traditional ways) were the most right and the best, and as changes come things get worse. These people think the best way to live is to work hard to keep up the old ways and try to bring them back when they are lost.

C  
(Fut) Some people believe that it is almost always the ways of the future—the ways that are still to come—that will be best, and they say that even though there are sometimes small setbacks, change brings improvements in the long run. These people think the best way to live is to look a long time ahead, work hard, and give up many things now so that the future will be better.

Which of these ways of looking at life do you think is best?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of the three ways of looking at life do you think most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ would think is best?

### 12. Wage Work (Relational: Item R5)

There are three ways in which men who do not themselves hire others may work.

C  
(Ind) One way is working on one's own as an individual. In this case a man is pretty much his own boss. He decides most things himself, and how he gets along is his own business. He only has to take care of himself and he doesn't expect others to look out for him.

- B  
(Coll) One way is working in a group of men where all the men work together without there being one main boss. Every man has something to say in the decisions that are made, and all the men can count on each other.
- A  
(Lin) One way is working for an owner, a big boss, or a man who has been running things for a long time (a *patrón*). In this case, the men do not take part in deciding how the business will be run, but they know they can depend on the boss to help them out in many ways.

Which of these ways is usually best for a man who does not hire others?

Which of the other two ways is better for a man who does not hire others?

Which of the three ways do you think most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ would think is best?

### 13. Belief in Control (Man–Nature: Item MN4)

Three men from different areas were talking about the things that control the weather and other conditions. Here is what they each said.

- A  
(Subj) One man said: My people have never controlled the rain, wind, and other natural conditions and probably never will. There have always been good years and bad years. That is the way it is, and if you are wise you will take it as it comes and do the best you can.
- B  
(Over) The second man said: My people believe that it is man's job to find ways to overcome weather and other conditions just as they have overcome so many things. They believe they will one day succeed in doing this and may even overcome drought and floods.
- C  
(With) The third man said: My people help conditions and keep things going by working to keep in close touch with all the forces which make the rain, the snow, and other conditions. It is when we do the right things—live in the proper way—and keep all that we have—the land, the stock, and the water—in good condition, that all goes along well.

Which of these men do you think had the best idea?

Which of the other two men do you think had the better idea?

Which of the three men do you think most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ would think had the best idea?

### 14. Ceremonial Innovation (Time: Item T4)

Some people in a community like your own saw that the religious ceremonies (the church services) were changing from what they used to be.

- C  
(Fut) Some people were really pleased because of the changes in religious ceremonies. They felt that new ways are usually better than old ones, and they like to keep everything—even ceremonies—moving ahead.

A (Past) Some people were unhappy because of the change. They felt that religious ceremonies should be kept exactly—in every way—as they had been in the past.

B (Pres) Some people felt that the old ways for religious ceremonies were best but you just can't hang on to them. It makes life easier just to accept some changes as they come along.

Which of these three said most nearly what you would believe is right?

Which of the other two ways do you think is more right?

Which of the three would most other \_\_\_\_\_ say was most right?

### 15. Ways of Living (Activity: Item A3)

There were two people talking about how they liked to live. They had different ideas.

A (Doing) One said: What I care about most is accomplishing things—getting things done just as well or better than other people do them. I like to see results and think they are worth working for.

B (Being) The other said: What I care most about is to be left alone to think and act in the ways that best suit the way I really am. If I don't always get much done but can enjoy life as I go along, that is the best way.

Which of these two persons do you think has the better way of thinking?

Which of the two do you think you are more like?

Which do you think most other \_\_\_\_\_ would say had the better way of living?

### 16. Livestock Inheritance (Relational: Item R6)

Some sons and daughters have been left some livestock (sheep or cattle) by a father or mother who has died. All these sons and daughters are grown up, and they live near each other. There are three different ways they can run the livestock.

A (Lin) In some groups of people it is usually expected that the oldest able person (son or daughter, *hermano mayor*) will take charge of, or manage, all the stock held by himself and the other sons and daughters.

C (Ind) In some groups of people it is usually expected that each of the sons and daughters will prefer to take his or her own share of the stock and run his or her own business completely separate from all the others.

B (Coll) In some groups of people it is usually expected that all the sons and daughters will keep all their cattle and sheep together and work together and decide among themselves who is best able to take charge of things, not necessarily the oldest, when a boss is needed.

Which way do you think is usually best in most cases?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of all three ways do you think most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ would think is usually best?

### 17. Land Inheritance (Relational: Item R7)

Now I want to ask a similar question concerning farm and grazing land instead of livestock.

Some sons and daughters have been left some farm and grazing land by a father or mother who has died. All these sons and daughters are grown and live near each other. There are three ways they can handle the property.

- A  
(Lin) In some groups of people it is usually expected that the oldest able person (*hermano mayor*) will take charge of or manage the land for himself and all the other sons and daughters, even if they all share it.
- C  
(Ind) In some groups of people it is usually expected that each son and daughter will take his own share of the land and do with it what he wants—separate from all the others.
- B  
(Coll) In some groups of people it is usually expected that all the sons and daughters will make use of the land together. When a boss is needed, they all get together and agree to choose someone of the group, not necessarily the oldest, to take charge of things.

Which of these ways do you think is usually best in most cases?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of all three ways do you think most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ would think is usually best?

### 18. Care of Fields (Activity: Item A4)

There were two men, both farmers (men with fields). They lived differently.

- B  
(Being) One man kept the crops growing all right but didn't work on them more than he had to. He wanted to have extra time to visit with friends, go on trips, and enjoy life. This was the way he liked best.
- A  
(Doing) One man liked to work with his fields and was always putting in extra time keeping them clean of weeds and in fine condition. Because he did this extra work, he did not have much time left to be with friends, to go on trips, or to enjoy himself in other ways. But this was the way he really liked best.

Which kind of man do you believe it is better to be?

(For men only): Which kind of man are you really most like?

Which kind of man would most other \_\_\_\_\_ think it better to be?



### 19. Length of Life (Man–Nature: Item MN5)

Three men were talking about whether people themselves can do anything to make the lives of men and women longer. Here is what each said.

B  
(Over) One said: It is already true that people like doctors and others are finding the way to add many years to the lives of most men by discovering (finding) new medicines, by studying foods, and doing other such things as vaccinations. If people will pay attention to all these new things they will almost always live longer.

A  
(Subj) The second one said: I really do not believe that there is much human beings themselves can do to make the lives of men and women longer. It is my belief that every person has a set time to live, and when that time comes it just comes.

C  
(With) The third one said: I believe that there is a plan to life which works to keep all living things moving together, and if a man will learn to live his whole life in accord with that plan, he will live longer than other men.

Which of these three said most nearly what you would think is right? ...

Which of the other two ways is more right?

Which of the three would most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ say was most right?

### 20. Water Allocation (Time: Item T5)

The government is going to help a community like yours to get more water by redrilling and cleaning out a community well. The government officials suggest that the community should have a plan for dividing the extra water, but don't say what kind of plan. Since the amount of extra water that may come in is not known, people feel differently about planning.

A  
(Past) Some say that whatever water comes in should be divided just about like water in the past was always divided.

C  
(Fut) Others want to work out a really good plan ahead of time for dividing whatever water comes in.

B  
(Pres) Still others want to just wait until the water comes in before deciding on how it will be divided.

Which of these ways do you think is usually best in cases like this?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of the three ways do you think most other persons in \_\_\_\_\_ would think best?

### 21. Housework (Activity: Item A5)

There were two women talking about the way they liked to live.

B  
(Being) One said that she was willing to work as hard as the average, but that she didn't like to spend a lot of time doing the kind of extra

things in her house or taking up extra things outside like \_\_\_\_\_.  
Instead she liked to have time free to enjoy visiting with people—  
to go on trips—or to just talk with whoever was around.

- A (Doing) The other woman said she liked best of all to find extra things to  
work on which would interest her—for example, \_\_\_\_\_. She said  
she was happiest when kept busy and was getting lots done.

Which of these ways do you think it is usually better for women to live?

(For women only): Which woman are you really more like?

Which way of life would most other \_\_\_\_\_ think is best?

## 22. Nonworking Time (Activity: Item A6)

Two men spend their time in different ways when they have no work to do.  
(This means when they are not actually on the job.)

- A (Doing) One man spends most of this time learning or trying out things that  
will help him in his work.
- B (Being) One man spends most of this time talking, telling stories, singing,  
and so on with his friends.

Which of these men has the better way of living?

Which of these men do you think you are more like?

Which of these men would most other \_\_\_\_\_ think had the better way of living?

## Personal Value Scales

(Scott, 1965)

### Variable

A value is defined as a moral ideal, an "individual's concept of an ideal relationship (or state of affairs) . . . [used] to assess the "goodness" or "badness," the "rightness" or "wrongness," of actual relationships . . . [which are observed or contemplated]" (p. 3).

### Description

"A person may be said to entertain a value to the extent that he [or she] conceives a particular state of affairs as an ultimate end, an absolute good under all circumstances, and a universal 'ought' toward which all people should strive" (p. 15).

Values were identified through an open-question survey of college students and a consideration of the values relevant to Greek student organizations.

On this basis, a self-administered instrument was developed comprising 12 scales: (1) Intellectualism, (2) Kindness, (3) Social Skills, (4) Loyalty, (5) Academic Achievement, (6) Physical Development, (7) Status, (8) Honesty, (9) Religiousness, (10) Self-Control, (11) Creativity, and (12) Independence. Each scale is represented by a set of items that are

rated on a three-point scale: "always dislike," "depends on situation," and "always admire." "Always" captures the absolute nature of values, while "admire" was initially regarded by Scott as a more socially acceptable way of assessing goodness or badness, rightness or wrongness. Subsequent analyses suggested that "admired," "right," and "good" were equivalent dimensions for evaluation.

Short and long versions of the scales are available, the short version having 4–6 items per scale, the long version 20 items per scale. The items in the short version are positively worded with three exceptions. The long version is balanced with positively and negatively worded items. For scoring purposes, responses are collapsed so that "depends on situation" is scored as nonacceptance of the value. This means that for positively worded items "always dislike" and "depends on situation" will be scored 0 and "always admire" 1. For negatively worded items, "always admire" and "depends on situation" will be scored 0 and "always dislike" 1. Scale scores are obtained by summing across items.

### Sample

The scales were developed and used with samples of college students, selected from fraternities and sororities, the undergraduate population, and psychology classes. For the reliability and validity studies, sample sizes tended to be around 200, although they were smaller in cases in which known groups validation procedures were used.

### Reliability

#### *Internal Consistency*

The  $\alpha$  reliability coefficients for the short form ranged from .55 for Independence to .78 for Religiousness, leading Scott to conclude that the scales, while adequate for distinguishing between large groups, were not sufficiently reliable to permit accurate measurement of individual subjects. Thus, the long form was developed. Alpha reliability coefficients for the long forms ranged from .80 (Honesty) to .89 (Physical Development). Among a sample of Australian university students, V. A. Braithwaite (1979) reported comparable  $\alpha$  reliability coefficients, ranging from .78 for Independence and Status to .92 for Religiousness.

#### *Test-Retest*

Reliabilities over a 2-week interval using the short form ranged from .58 for Loyalty to .77 for Religiousness.

### Validity

#### *Convergent*

Correlations between the short and long forms of each value are reasonably high, ranging from .66 for Intellectualism to .81 for Physical Development and Religiousness. The construct validity of the scales was further investigated by examining the correlations among traits which people "personally admire," consider "the right thing to do," and prescribe as traits that "other people should admire." Correlations between admiration and rightness ranged from .52 for Academic Achievement to .78 for Religiousness (median .69). Correlations between admiring the value oneself and prescribing the value for

others were a little lower, ranging from .44 for Intellectualism to .63 for Physical Development (median .54). These lower correlations are consistent with the finding of a sizeable minority of "moral relativists" in the sample: people who indicated acceptance of divergent values in others. Another test of construct validity involved correlating value strength with expected guilt over hypothetical transgressions. Significant correlations (median  $r = .26$ ) were obtained with 9 of the 12 scales. The exceptions were Loyalty, Status, and Creativity.

Known groups validation hypotheses were tested and supported in the case of seven scales: Religiousness (Jesuit seminarians vs. male college students), Independence (college club of nonconformists vs. college students), Physical Development (women's physical education club vs. female college students), Creativity (art majors vs. college students), Academic Achievement (college students with high grades vs. college students with low grades), and Loyalty and Social Skills (students belonging to Greek organizations vs. independent students). Scott also developed 12 behavioral indices representing activities that were relevant to each of the 12 values measured. Eleven of the 12 correlations were significant (median  $r = .20$ ), the exception being Independence.

### *Discriminant*

Intercorrelations among the short form scales ranged from  $-.27$  to  $.51$ , but Scott noted that in all cases these correlations were less than the internal consistency reliability coefficients of the scales concerned. The scales appeared to be measuring distinct, though correlated, values.

### *Location*

Scott, W. A. (1965). *Values and organizations: A study of fraternities and sororities*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

### *Results and Comments*

The Personal Value Scales have been relatively well validated for use with American college students. Using the scales, Scott (1965) confirmed several hypotheses concerning the importance of value similarity in seeking membership in organizations, in recruitment of potential members, in satisfaction with the group, in popularity within a group, and in friendship patterns. Scott (1960) has also demonstrated that the kinds of interpersonal relations that students advocate bear some correspondence to the kinds of interpersonal relations which they admire. The scales have been used more recently with American military cadets (Priest, Fullerton, & Bridge, 1982) to look at changes in values over time, changes interpreted as reflecting the growth of moral relativism (i.e., a pragmatic situation-dependent mode of judgment).

The long form of the Personal Value Scales is clearly the more sophisticated measure. Not only are these scales more reliable, but they are balanced to control for an acquiescence response bias. Assessing values through ratings on 240 items, however, is not economical and is likely to be impossible in many research contexts. Under such circumstances, a choice may have to be made between the 12 short-form scales or a subset of the long-form scales that hold special interest. Further analyses that seek to reduce the 12 scales to a smaller subset may provide a solution to the current dilemma facing researchers interested in their use.

### Personal Value Scales

Instructions: Please read over the following statements, and for each one indicate (by a check in the appropriate space) whether it is something you *always admire* in other people, or something you *always dislike*, or something that *depends on the situation* whether you admire it or not.

Examples:

	Always Admire	Depends on Situation	Always Dislike	
1.	_____	_____	_____	Having a strong intellectual curiosity.
2.	_____	_____	_____	Creating beautiful things for the enjoyment of other people.

### Intellectualism

Having a keen interest in international, national, and local affairs. (SL)

Having a strong intellectual curiosity. (SL)

Developing an appreciation of the fine arts—music, drama, literature, and ballet. (SL)

Having an active interest in all things scholarly. (SL)

Having cultural interests.

Striving to gain new knowledge about the world.

Enjoying books, music, art, philosophy, and sciences.

Keeping abreast of current events.

Knowing what's going on in the world of politics.

Keeping up with world news through regular reading or by watching informative programs.

Being an intellectual. (S)

\* Having restricted and narrow interests.

\* Having no knowledge of current events.

\* Being interested only in one's work.

\* Having no opinions about the world situation.

\* Knowing only one's specialty.

\* Having little interest in arts, theater, music, and other cultural activities.

\* Being uninterested in national and world affairs.

\* Showing little interest in the finer things of life.

\* Ignoring what goes on in the world around one.

\* Reading only things that don't pose any intellectual challenge.

### Kindness

- Being kind to people, even if they do things contrary to one's beliefs. (SL)
- Helping another person feel more secure, even if one doesn't like him. (SL)
- Helping another achieve his own goals, even if it might interfere with your own. (SL)
- Turning the other cheek, and forgiving others when they harm you. (SL)
- Being considerate of others' feelings.
- Finding ways to help others less fortunate than oneself.
- Being utterly selfless in all one's actions.
- Having a deep love of all people, whoever they are.
- Going out of one's way to help someone new feel at home.
- Being concerned about the happiness of other people.
- \* Looking out for one's own interests first.
  - \* Ridiculing other people.
  - \* Being selfish.
  - \* Ignoring the needs of other people.
  - \* Revenging wrongs that other people have done to one.
  - \* Being unable to empathize with other people.
  - \* Hurting other people's feelings.
  - \* Making jokes at the expense of other people.
  - \* Letting each person go it alone, without offering help.
  - \* Refusing any aid to people who don't deserve it.

### Social Skills

- Being well mannered and behaving properly in social situations. (SL)
- Dressing and acting in a way that is appropriate to the occasion. (SL)
- Being able to get people to cooperate with one. (SL)
- Being poised, gracious, and charming under all circumstances. (SL)
- Always doing the right thing at the right time.
- Being informed in proper etiquette.
- Being able to plan social functions smoothly.
- Being popular with everyone.
- Always behaving properly in public.
- Being concerned about what kind of impression one makes on others.
- Being able to get along with all kinds of people, whether or not they are worthwhile. (S)
- Being the person in the group who is the most popular with the opposite sex. (S)
- \* Being a social isolate.
  - \* Dressing sloppily.
  - \* Displaying unpleasant personal habits in public.

- \* Interrupting others while they are talking.
- \* Constantly making social blunders.
- \* Talking constantly and attracting attention to oneself.
- \* Having bad manners.
- \* Being discourteous.
- \* Being unable to act in a way that will please others.
- \* Being ignorant of the rules of proper behavior.

### Loyalty

- Defending the honor of one's group whenever it is unfairly criticized. (SL)
- Working hard to improve the prestige and status of one's groups. (SL)
- Helping organize group activities. (SL)
- Attending all meetings of one's groups.
- Upholding the honor of one's group.
- Supporting all activities of one's organizations.
- Doing more than one's share of the group task.
- Performing unpleasant tasks, if these are required by one's group.
- Remembering one's group loyalties at all times.
- Taking an active part in all group affairs.
- Treating an attack on one's group like an attack on oneself. (S)
- Concealing from outsiders most of one's dislikes and disagreements with fellow members of the group. (S)
- Doing all one can to build up the prestige of the group. (S)
- \* Betraying one's group to outsiders.
- \* Letting other people do all the work for the group, and not getting involved oneself.
- \* Letting people get away with unfair criticism of one's group.
- \* Being unconcerned with what other people think about one's group.
- \* Being uncooperative.
- \* Failing to support group functions.
- \* Paying little attention to what the members of one's group think.
- \* Criticizing one's own group in public.
- \* Getting by with as little involvement in organizations as possible.
- \* Not taking one's group memberships seriously.

### Academic Achievement (Grades)

- Studying hard to get good grades in school. (SL)
- Working hard to achieve academic honors. (SL)
- Trying hard to understand difficult lectures and textbooks.
- Striving to get the top grade-point average in the group. (SL)
- Studying constantly in order to become a well-educated person. (SL)
- Being studious.

- Getting the top grade on a test.
- Treating one's studies as the most important thing in college life.
- Doing well in school.
- Priding oneself on good grades.
- \*Being content with a "gentlemanly C" grade.
- \*Making fun of academic grinds.
- \*Being satisfied with poor grades.
- \*Priding oneself on being able to get by in school with little work.
- \*Not doing well in one's coursework.
- \*Not letting studies interfere with one's college life.
- \*Doing one's best to avoid working hard in a course.
- \*Being proud of poor grades.
- \*Paying no attention to lectures and textbooks that are difficult.
- \*Taking snap courses that don't require any work.

### Physical Development

- Being graceful and well coordinated in physical movements. (SL)
- Taking good care of one's physical self, so that one is always healthy. (SL)
- Being good in some form of sport. (SL)
- Developing physical strength and agility. (SL)
- Developing an attractive body that others will admire. (SL)
- Having a good figure or physique.
- Having good muscular coordination.
- Being a well-developed, outdoors type who enjoys physical activity.
- Keeping in good physical shape.
- Exercising regularly.
- \*Being physically weak and puny.
- \*Being an indoor type, and avoiding outdoor activities.
- \*Being poorly proportioned physically.
- \*Being uninterested in sports.
- \*Being listless and uninterested in strenuous activity.
- \*Being awkward in bearing and walk.
- \*Being unable to do anything that requires physical effort.
- \*Being unskilled in any form of athletics.
- \*Ignoring one's own physical condition.
- \*Avoiding any form of exercise.

### Status

- Being respected by people who are themselves worthwhile. (SL)
- Gaining recognition for one's achievements. (SL)



- Being in a position to direct and mold others' lives. (SL)
- Making sure that one is respected.
- Doing what one is told.
- Being in a position to command respect from others.
- Having all the respect that one is entitled to.
- Being dignified in bearing and manner.
- Being looked up to by others.
- Enjoying great prestige in the community.
- Having the ability to lead others. (S)
- Showing great leadership qualities. (S)
- \* Acting beneath one's dignity.
  - \* Not being able to do anything better than other people.
  - \* Not being recognized for one's true worth.
  - \* Being in a subordinate position.
  - \* Having little effect on other people's actions.
  - \* Being unable to exert any influence on things around one.
  - \* Failing to develop contacts that could improve one's position.
  - \* Being content with an inferior position all one's life.
  - \* Associating with worthless people.
  - \* Not taking pride in one's achievements.

### Honesty

- Never cheating or having anything to do with cheating situations, even for a friend. (SL)
- Always telling the truth, even though it may hurt oneself or others. (SL)
- Never telling a lie, even though to do so would make the situation more comfortable. (SL)
- Sticking up for the truth under all circumstances.
- Always representing one's own true thoughts and feelings honestly.
- Speaking one's mind truthfully, without regard for the consequences.
- Testifying against friends, if need be, in order that the truth be known.
- Presenting oneself completely and honestly, even if it is unnecessary to do so.
- Going out of one's way to bring dishonest people to justice.
- Volunteering information concerning wrongdoing, even if friends are involved.
- \* Helping a close friend get by a tight situation, even though one may have to stretch the truth a bit to do it. (SL)
  - \* Taking things that don't belong to one.
  - \* Telling white lies.
  - \* Deceiving others.

- \*Using others' property without asking permission.
- \*Telling falsehoods in order to help other people.
- \*Helping a friend through an examination.
- \*Using a false ID card to get into restricted places.
- \*Stealing when necessary.
- \*Being dishonest in harmless ways.

### Religiousness

- Being devout in one's religious faith. (SL)
- Always living one's religion in his daily life. (SL)
- Always attending religious services regularly and faithfully. (SL)
- Avoiding the physical pleasures that are prohibited in the Bible. (SL)
- Encouraging others to attend services and lead religious lives. (SL)
- Saying one's prayers regularly.
- Seeking comfort in the Bible in time of need.
- Adhering to the doctrines of one's religion.
- Having an inner communication with the Supreme Being.
- Having faith in a Being greater than man.
- \*Being an atheist.
- \*Denying the existence of God.
- \*Paying little attention to religious matters.
- \*Treating man, rather than God, as the measure of all things.
- \*Abstaining from trivial religious rituals.
- \*Not falling for religious mythology.
- \*Taking a skeptical attitude toward religious teachings.
- \*Seeking scientific explanations of religious miracles.
- \*Treating the Bible only as an historical or literary work.
- \*Regarding religions as crutches for the primitive peoples of the world.

### Self-Control

- Practicing self-control. (SL)
- Replying to anger with gentleness. (SL)
- Never losing one's temper, no matter what the reason. (SL)
- Not expressing anger, even when one has a reason for doing so. (SL)
- Suppressing hostility.
- Keeping one's feelings hidden from others.
- Suppressing the urge to speak hastily in anger.
- Hiding one's feelings of frustration from other people.
- Keeping one's hostile feelings to himself.
- Not getting upset when things go wrong.

- Always being patient with people. (S)
- \* Losing one's temper easily.
  - \* Showing one's feelings readily.
  - \* Telling people off when they offend one.
  - \* Expressing one's anger openly and directly when provoked.
  - \* Getting upset when things don't go well.
  - \* Letting others see how one really feels.
  - \* Letting off steam when one is frustrated.
  - \* Swearing when one is angry.
  - \* Becoming so angry that other people know about it.
  - \* Letting people know when one is annoyed with them.

### **Creativity (Originality)**

- Being able to create beautiful and artistic objects. (SL)
- Developing new and different ways of doing things. (SL)
- Constantly developing new ways of approaching life. (SL)
- Inventing gadgets for the fun of it. (SL)
- Trying out new ideas.
- Being original in one's thoughts and ways of looking at things.
- Always looking for new roads to travel.
- Doing unusual things.
- Creating unusual works of art.
- Being an innovator.
- Creating beautiful things for the enjoyment of other people. (S)
- Devoting one's entire energy to the development of new theories. (S)
- \* Doing routine things all the time.
  - \* Not having any new ideas.
  - \* Always doing things in the same way.
  - \* Enjoying a routine, patterned life.
  - \* Doing things the same way that other people do them.
  - \* Abiding by traditional ways of doing things.
  - \* Repeating the ideas of others, without any innovation.
  - \* Working according to a set schedule that doesn't vary from day to day.
  - \* Painting or composing or writing in a traditional style.
  - \* Keeping one's life from changing very much.

### **Independence**

- Being a freethinking person, who doesn't care what others think of his opinions.
- Being outspoken and frank in expressing one's likes and dislikes. (SL)

- Being independent.  
 Standing up for what one thinks right, regardless of what others think.  
 Going one's own way as he pleases.  
 Being a nonconformist.  
 Being different from other people.  
 Encouraging other people to act as they please.  
 Thinking and acting freely, without social restraints. (SL)  
 Living one's own life, independent of others.  
 Being independent, original, nonconformist, different from other people. (S)  
 \*Conforming to the requirements of any situation and doing what is expected of one. (SL)  
 \*Going along with the crowd.  
 \*Acting in such a way as to gain the approval of others.  
 \*Keeping one's opinions to himself when they differ from the group's.  
 \*Being careful not to express an idea that might be contrary to what other people believe.  
 \*Always basing one's behavior on the recognition that he is dependent on other people.  
 \*Acting so as to fit in with other people's way of doing things.  
 \*Always checking on whether or not one's intended actions would be acceptable to other people.  
 \*Never acting so as to violate social conventions.  
 \*Suppressing one's desire to be unique and different.  
 \*Working and living in harmony with other people. (S)

\*, Reverse-scored. Note: Items with SL in the right margin were included in both short and long versions of the instrument. Items with S were included in the short but not the long version. All other items appeared only in the long version.

## Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV)

(Gordon, 1960)

### Variable

This instrument measures the relative importance of six values (support, conformity, recognition, independence, benevolence, and leadership) associated with the way in which people relate to one another.

### Description

A factor analysis of 210 items representing 10 constructs selected from the needs, interests, and values literature led to the identification of seven interpersonal values. One of these constructs, aggression, was eliminated in the development of the final instrument because of the relative unpopularity of its items.

tures were consistently positively correlated. Interscale correlations, however, were notably lower than the internal consistency coefficients, suggesting that the scales were measuring distinct constructs. Gordon also correlated the SIV with a battery of ability measures and reported little overlap in these domains. Four of the six scales, however, were found to have low but significant correlations with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.

#### Location

Gordon, L. V. (1960). *Survey of interpersonal values*. Chicago: Science Research Associates (155 North Wacker Drive, 60606-1780).

#### Results and Comments

The SIV has been used by the author as well as other researchers in a wide variety of contexts: in the workplace (e.g., Matsui, 1978; Morrison, 1977), with prisoners (e.g., Bassett, Schellman, Kohaut, & Gayton, 1977), in non-Western cultures (e.g., Finlay, Simon, & Wilson, 1974; Matsui, 1978), in the educational domain (e.g., Knight, White, & Taff, 1972; McAvin & Gordon, 1981; Rootman, 1972), and in the analysis of social attitudes and political behavior (e.g., Finlay *et al.*, 1974; Gordon, 1972b, 1972c). Furthermore, data provided on the reliability and validity of the instrument is extensive (see SIV Manual).

Nevertheless, the instrument is not without weaknesses. Apart from the ipsative nature of the data, the SIV suffers from ambiguity in what is being measured. It is not clear that the SIV measures conceptions of the desirable. Strong correlations of the value scales with measures of needs suggest that Gordon may not be differentiating these two concepts adequately. Values should refer to what one ought to do and not to what one needs or wants to do.

Gordon (1967) has developed another instrument called the Survey of Personal Values. Once again six values are measured, using the same procedure as in the SIV. The values are (1) practical mindedness, (2) achievement, (3) variety, (4) decisiveness, (5) orderliness, and (6) goal orientation. These scales have not been reviewed in this chapter, however, because they bear a stronger resemblance to personality traits than to values.

### Survey of Interpersonal Values

Instructions: In this booklet are statements representing things that people consider to be important to their way of life. These statements are grouped into sets of three. This is what you are asked to do: Examine each set. Within each set, find the ONE STATEMENT of the three which represents what you consider to be *most important* to you. Blacken the space beside that statement in the column headed M (for *most*). Next, examine the remaining two statements in the set. Decide which *one* of these statements represents what you consider to be *least important* to you. Blacken the space beside that statement in the column headed L (for *least*).

For every set you will mark *one statement* as representing what is *most important* to you, one statement as representing what is *least important* to you, and you will leave *one statement unmarked*.

Sample Items	<u>M</u>	<u>L</u>
1. a. To be in a position of not having to follow orders	[ ]	[ ]
b. To follow rules and regulations closely	[ ]	[ ]
c. To have people notice what I do	[ ]	[ ]
2. a. To be able to do pretty much as I please	[ ]	[ ]
b. To be in charge of some important project	[ ]	[ ]
c. To work for the good of other people	[ ]	[ ]

### **Moral Behavior Scale**

(Crissman, 1942; Rettig & Pasamanick, 1959)

#### Variable

A list of ethically disputable or "morally prohibited" activities are rated by respondents in terms of their rightness or wrongness.

#### Description

Fifty behaviors are presented in a self-administered questionnaire, the vast majority of items being expressed in a proscriptive form (i.e., ought not to). Each statement is rated in terms of its rightness or wrongness from 1 ("least wrong" or "not wrong at all") to 10 ("most wrong" or "wrongest possible"). "In-between numbers" are used for "in-between degrees of wrongness."

The scale has been scored in a variety of ways. Individual items have been used for the purposes of data analysis, as has the mean over all 50 items and the means for a number of subscales. The subscales vary across populations (cf. Gorsuch & Smith, 1972; Rettig, 1966; Rettig & Pasamanick, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963).

#### Sample

The scale has been used with large samples of male and female college students, alumni, blue collar and white collar workers, three generations of the Kibbutz and the Moshava, Korean college students, and priests and teachers of moral theology.

#### Reliability

##### *Internal Consistency*

Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients have been reported by Rettig and Pasamanick (1959) across a number of samples. The total scale produced a coefficient of .93 among college students, .95 among alumni, .96 among blue collar workers, and .93 among white collar workers. The modified Hebrew translation had somewhat lower reliabilities ranging from .84 to .89. Such coefficients, however, do not necessarily imply a notable degree of internal consistency. High reliabilities may result from the large number of items (50) in the scale.

##### *Test-Retest*

No reliability coefficients were encountered.

## Validity

*Convergent*

Rettig (1966) cited validation for the religious items in the scale through a comparison of various groups (e.g., priests and teachers of moral theology at the Vatican, nonbelieving Korean students)-but did not provide further details.

*Discriminant*

Most attention has been directed to the factorial structure of the scale across samples of students, alumni, different socioeconomic groups, and different cultural groups. Both similarities and differences are observed in these solutions. Questions about the scoring of the instrument have been raised by Gorsuch and Smith (1972), who identified a different factor structure by using new rotational procedures on the data collected by Rettig and Pasamanick (1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963).

## Location

Rettig, S., & Pasamanick, B. (1959). Changes in moral values among college students: A factorial study. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 856-863.

## Results and Comments

The subscales proposed by Gorsuch and Smith (1972) have been examined for their convergent and discriminant validity in a sample of students and their parents ( $n = 585$ ). Internal consistency reliabilities across three data sets were reported for five subscales that were not highly correlated with each other.

1. Misrepresentation (Coefficient  $\alpha = .88-.90$ )  
(Items 24, 27, 34, 41, 42, 43, 45)
2. Irreligious Hedonism (Coefficient  $\alpha = .76-.80$ )  
(Items 23, 25, 31, 39, 49)
3. Sexual Misbehavior (Coefficient  $\alpha = .59-.65$ )  
(Items 3, 16, 48)
4. Nonphilanthropic Behavior (Coefficient  $\alpha = .62-.70$ )  
(Items 20, 21, 35)
5. Nonconservative Marriage Pattern (Coefficient  $\alpha = .69-.70$ )  
(Items 32, 33)

Gorsuch and Smith also considered two single items to be worthy of consideration along with these scales: Item 40 and Item 46.

The scale has proven most popular among researchers who wish to document and analyze changes in moral values across time and across generations. For this purpose, stability in the item set is important. Nevertheless, sexist language and references to "bootleg liquor under prohibition law" and "girls smoking cigarettes" date the instrument and possibly reduce the seriousness with which respondents complete the task. In addition, Gorsuch and Smith (1972) note an important omission in the instrument: No items are included concerned with either drugs or prejudice.

### Moral Behavior Scale

This questionnaire presents fifty acts or situations which you are to evaluate in terms of 'rightness' or 'wrongness' ranging from one to ten. Circle the one if the item seems least wrong or not wrong at all, and the ten if the item is judged most wrong or 'wrongest' possible. Use the in-between numbers for in-between degrees of wrongness; the higher the number, the more wrong it becomes.

1. Killing a person in defense of one's own life.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
LEAST									MOST
WRONG									WRONG

2. Kidnapping and holding a child for ransom.
3. Having sex relations while unmarried.
4. Forging a check.
5. Habitually failing to keep promises.
6. Girls smoking cigarettes.
7. An industry maintaining working conditions for its workers known to be detrimental to their health.
8. A doctor allowing a badly deformed baby to die when he could save its life but not cure its deformity.
9. A legislator, for a financial consideration, using his influence to secure the passage of a law known to be contrary to public interest.
10. Testifying falsely in court when under oath.
11. Betting on horse races.
12. A nation dealing unjustly with a weaker nation over which it has power.
13. A jury freeing a father who has killed a man for rape against his young daughter.
14. Living beyond one's means in order to possess luxuries enjoyed by friends and associates.
15. Bootlegging under prohibition law.
16. Having illicit sex relations after marriage.
17. Driving an automobile while drunk but without accident.
18. A prosperous industry paying workers less than a living wage.
19. Holding up and robbing a person.
20. Not giving to charity when able.
21. Not taking the trouble to vote at primaries and elections.
22. A strong commercial concern selling below cost to crowd out a weaker competitor.
23. Falsifying about a child's age to secure reduced fare.
24. A student who is allowed to grade his own paper reporting a higher grade than the one earned.



25. Not giving to support religion when able.
26. Keeping over-change given by a clerk in mistake.
27. Copying from another's paper in a school examination.
28. Speeding away after one's car knocks down a pedestrian.
29. Charging interest above a fair rate when lending money.
30. Falsifying a federal income tax return.
31. Buying bootleg liquor under prohibition law.
32. Married persons using birth-control devices.
33. Seeking divorce because of incompatibility when both parties agree to separate (assuming no children).
34. Depositing more than one ballot in an election in order to aid a favorite candidate.
35. Living on inherited wealth without attempting to render service to others.
36. Taking one's own life (assuming no near relatives or dependents).
37. Using profane or blasphemous speech.
38. Being habitually cross or disagreeable to members of one's own family.
39. Seeking amusement on Sunday instead of going to church.
40. Refusing to bear arms in a war one believes to be unjust.
41. Advertising a medicine to cure a disease known to be incurable by such a remedy.
42. Misrepresenting the value of an investment in order to induce credulous persons to invest.
43. Taking money for one's vote in an election.
44. Newspapers treating crime news so as to make hoodlums and gangsters appear heroic.
45. A man having a vacant building he cannot rent sets it on fire to collect insurance.
46. Nations at war using poison gas on the homes and cities of its enemy behind the lines.
47. Slipping out secretly and going among people when one's home is under quarantine for a contagious disease.
48. A man deserting a girl whom he has got into trouble without himself taking responsibility.
49. Disbelieving in God.
50. A man not marrying a girl he loves because she is markedly his inferior socially and in education.

### **The Morally Debatable Behaviors Scales**

*(Harding & Phillips, 1986)*

#### **Variable**

This instrument assesses the justifiability of behaviors reflecting contemporary moral issues which adults confront in their lives or have an opinion about.

### Description

Twenty-two morally-debatable behaviors make up this inventory, but the authors do not provide details of how they sampled either behaviors or issues from the domain of enquiry. Each item is rated on a 10-point scale ranging from 1, meaning the behavior is "never justified," to 10, meaning the behavior is "always justified." Harding and Phillips included the questions as part of a lengthy interview, and the morally debatable behaviors were reverse-ordered for alternate interviewers to overcome order effects.

The inventory measures three aspects of moral behavior: (1) personal-sexual morality (nine items) focusing on matters of life and death as well as sexual relations, (2) self-interest morality (eight items), which brings together items concerned with personal integrity and honesty, and (3) legal-illegal morality (eight items), which is defined by behaviors which are formally proscribed by law. Three items are common to self-interest and legal-illegal morality. The authors also calculate an average score over all 22 items for each respondent.

### Sample

The instrument has been administered to very large random and quota samples in 10 European countries. Norms are available for item and scale scores in Denmark, Holland, Eire, Northern Ireland, Great Britain, Belgium, West Germany, France, Italy, and Spain.

### Reliability

Neither test-retest nor internal consistency coefficients were encountered.

### Validity

#### *Convergent*

Harding and Phillips examined the relationship of the scales to other value measures that they constructed and to the social demographic characteristics of the population under investigation. Those who showed greatest tolerance in moral outlook were the young, the more highly educated, those who were more left-wing politically, and those who described themselves as either nonreligious or atheist. While these were not direct tests of the validity of the scales, the findings are consistent and interpretable, and in this sense supportive of the validity of the measure.

#### *Discriminant*

The three morality scales emerged repeatedly in factor analyses of data sets from different countries. Furthermore, the scales showed different patterns of relationships with the social demographic variables. Higher levels of education and income were associated with greater tolerance of issues represented in the personal-sexual dimension, but this pattern was not reflected so clearly with items making up the other two dimensions.

### Location

Harding, B., & Phillips, D. (1986). *Contrasting values in Western Europe: Unity, diversity and change*. London: Macmillan.

### Results and Comments

The instrument is relatively new and was developed specifically for use in the European Value Systems Study. Although sufficient time has not elapsed for it to be used in a variety of research contexts, the authors have collected a considerable amount of data on the scale in different countries and the normative data presented are superior to those provided for most other scales reviewed in this chapter.

Harding and Phillips tap moral issues that are relevant to the 1980s, providing a more updated list of value-related behaviors than Crissman (1942). Users should be sensitive, however, to possible omissions depending on the social context in which the scales are to be administered. Further research providing information on reliability and validity should enhance the attractiveness of this instrument.

Of note in relation to the issue of scale validity is the work of Truhon, McKinney, and Hotch (1980), who suggest that moral behaviors are structured differently for women and men, with greater differentiation in the former than the latter. Obtaining comparable measures of moral values for men and women may be more difficult than has been assumed previously.

### Morally Debatable Behaviors Scale

Please tell me for each of the following statements whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between. (Show respondent card with justification scale on it. Read out statements, reversing order for alternate respondents. Mark an answer for each statement.)

1. Claiming state benefits that you are not entitled to

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NEVER									ALWAYS

2. Avoiding a fare on public transport
3. Cheating on tax if you have the chance
4. Buying something you knew was stolen
5. Taking and driving away a car belonging to someone else (Joyriding)
6. Taking the drug marijuana or hashish
7. Keeping money that you have found
8. Lying in your own interest
9. Married men or women having an affair
10. Sex under the legal age of consent
11. Someone accepting a bribe in the course of their duties
12. Homosexuality
13. Prostitution
14. Abortion
15. Divorce
16. Fighting with the police

17. Euthanasia (terminating the life of the incurably sick)
18. Suicide
19. Failing to report damage you've done accidentally to a parked vehicle
20. Threatening workers who refuse to join a strike
21. Killing in self-defence
22. Political assassination

### **Future Research Directions**

Rokeach's conceptualization of values has done much to bridge the gap between studies that in the past have appeared to have little in common. Progress in conceptual clarity, however, has not always been accompanied by methodological sophistication. The assumption that single items are adequate measures when the concepts being assessed are as abstract as values is likely to create serious problems both for the population being studied and the researcher interpreting the results. The findings emerging from single-item measures could be regarded with greater confidence if they were buttressed by multi-item scales.

Diverse specific multi-item measures are available to be used in conjunction with broad based single-item indices. Less satisfactory is the diversity of criteria incorporated into the instructions given to those responding to value scales. The value construct has too frequently been operationalized in a way that is not consistent with conceptions of the desirable. Response criteria that have been used include agreement, importance and liking. In practice, responses on these dimensions may correlate so highly with conceptions of the desirable that they can be considered synonymous. This is an empirical question, however, to which we do not have a satisfactory answer.

A third theme that runs through this review is that instruments cannot be translated and assumed appropriate in other cultures. None of the reviewed measures of values can be regarded truly as cross-cultural instruments. This problem stems not from ignorance of the ideal, but rather from difficulty in achieving or even approximating the ideal. The recent emergence of multinational research teams, each striving to develop measures that are both appropriate within their own culture and comparable across cultures, offers the greatest hope for the future.

Finally, values have always been regarded as important because they are assumed to play a major role in explaining behavior. While the literature provides some support for this assumption (see Rokeach and Feather's work in particular), behavioral prediction from values has often proved disappointing (Braithwaite & Braithwaite, 1981; Hughes, Rao, & Alker, 1976; Pitts & Woodside, 1983). Behavioral prediction may be hindered by reliance on abstract single-item measures. Highly abstract measures run the risk of being too far removed from behavior while single-item measures may lack reliability and validity.

Alternatively, closer scrutiny of our theoretical formulations may be warranted. Little attention has been directed either to the situations in which values are most likely to influence behavior or to the individuals for whom value-behavior consistency is most likely to occur. Like traits, values may at best explain what some of the people do some of the time. Our knowledge of the contexts in which principles conflict with needs, desires, and environmental demands is limited, as is our appreciation of how different individuals

resolve such conflicts. Therefore, it may be timely for value researchers to change tack, take stock of research findings, and propose a set of parameters to define the circumstances in which values are useful in explaining human behavior.

## Bibliography

- Adler, F. (1956). The value concept in sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, *62*, 272-279.
- Alker, H. A., Rao, V. R., & Hughes, G. D. (1972). Value consistent and expedient decision making. *Proceedings of the 80th Annual Convention*, American Psychological Association, pp. 149-150.
- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. (1960). *Study of values. Manual and test booklet* (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1985). The measurement of values in surveys: A comparison of ratings and rankings. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *49*, 535-552.
- Bales, R. F. (1970). *Personality and interpersonal behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Bales, R., & Couch, A. (1969). The value profile: A factor analytic study of value statements. *Sociological Inquiry*, *39*, 3-17.
- Bassett, J. E., Schellman, G. C., Kohaut, S. M., & Gayton, W. F. (1977). Norms for prisoners and reliability of two value surveys. *Psychological Reports*, *41*, 383-386.
- Beech, R. P., & Schoeppe, A. (1974). Development of value systems in adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, *10*, 644-656.
- Bell, W., & Robinson, R. V. (1978). An index of evaluated equality: Measuring conceptions of social justice in England and the United States. In R. F. Tomason (Ed.), *Comparative studies in sociology: An annual compilation of research* (Vol. 1, pp. 235-270). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Bem, D. J. (1970). *Beliefs, attitudes and human affairs*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Bhatt, A. K., & Fairchild, H. H. (1984). Values of convergence of Indian students in the United States. *Psychological Reports*, *55*, 446.
- Billig, M., & Cochrane, R. (1979). Values of British political extremists and potential extremists: A discriminant analysis. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *9*, 205-222.
- Bishop, G. F., Barclay, A. M., & Rokeach, M. (1972). Presidential preferences and freedom—equality value patterns in the 1968 American campaign. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *88*, 207-212.
- Bolt, M. (1978). The Rokeach Value Survey: Preferred or preferable. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *47*, 322.
- Braithwaite, J. B., & Braithwaite, V. A. (1981). Delinquency and the question of values. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *23*, 129-134.
- Braithwaite, V. A. (1979). *Exploring value structure: An empirical investigation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Queensland.
- Braithwaite, V. A. (1982). The structure of social values: Validation of Rokeach's two value model. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *21*, 203-211.
- Braithwaite, V. A., & Law, H. G. (1985). Structure of human values: Testing the adequacy of the Rokeach Value Survey. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*, 250-263.
- Brogden, H. E. (1952). The primary personal values measured by the Allport-Vernon test. A Study of Values. *Psychological Monographs*, *66*, No. 348.
- Brown, N. W., & Lawson, R. (1980). Values in parochial and public schools: Alike or different? *Psychological Reports*, *47*, 279-282.
- Caird, H. D. (1987). *Measuring personal values: An approach to the study of individuals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Queensland.
- Cantril, H., & Allport, G. W. (1933). Recent applications of the Study of Values. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *28*, 259-273.

- Carlson, E. R. (1956). Attitude change through modification of attitude structure. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 52, 256-261.
- Cho, J. H., & Gilgen, A. R. (1980). Performance of Korean medical and nursing students on the East-West Questionnaire. *Psychological Reports*, 47, 1093-1094.
- Christenson, J. A., Houglund, J. G., Gage, B. A., & Hoa, L. V. (1984). Value orientations of organized religious groups. *Sociology and Social Research*, 68, 194-207.
- Clare, D. A., & Cooper, D. R. (1983). Ethnicity and personal values among Nigerian business students. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 119, 137-138.
- Cochrane, R. (1971). Research and methodology: The structure of value systems in male and female prisoners. *British Journal of Criminology*, 11, 73-79.
- Cochrane, R., Billig, M., & Hogg, M. (1979). Politics and values in Britain: A test of Rokeach's two-value model. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18, 159-167.
- Compton, W. C. (1983). On the validity of the East-West Questionnaire. *Psychological Reports*, 52, 117-118.
- Constantinople, A. (1967). Perceived instrumentality of the college as a measure of attitudes toward college. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 196-201.
- Crissman, P. (1942). Temporal changes and sexual difference in moral judgments. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 16, 29-38.
- Dempsey, P., & Dukes, W. (1966). Judging complex value stimuli: An examination and revision of Morris's "Paths of Life." *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 26, 871-882.
- Duffy, E. (1940). A critical review of investigations employing the Allport-Vernon Study of Values and other tests of evaluative attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 37, 597-612.
- Duffy, E., & Crissy, W. J. E. (1940). Evaluative attitudes as related to vocational interests and academic achievement. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 35, 226-245.
- Dukes, W. F. (1955). Psychological studies of values. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 24-50.
- England, G. W. (1967). Personal value systems of American managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 10, 53-68.
- Ewell, A. H., Jr. (1954). *The relationship between the rigidity of moral values and the severity of functional psychological illness: A study with war veterans of one religious group*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Fallding, H. (1965). A proposal for the empirical study of values. *American Sociological Review*, 30, 223-233.
- Feather, N. T. (1970a). Educational choice and student attitudes in relation to terminal and instrumental values. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 22, 127-144.
- Feather, N. T. (1970b). Value systems in state and church schools. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 22, 299-313.
- Feather, N. T. (1971). Similarity of value systems as a determinant of educational choice at university level. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 23, 201-211.
- Feather, N. T. (1973). The measurement of values: Effects of different assessment procedures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 25, 221-231.
- Feather, N. T. (1975a). Values and income level. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 27, 23-29.
- Feather, N. T. (1975b). *Values in education and society*. New York: Free Press.
- Feather, N. T. (1977). Value importance, conservatism and age. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 241-245.
- Feather, N. T. (1979a). Human values and the work situation: Two studies. *Australian Psychologist*, 14, 131-141.
- Feather, N. T. (1979b). Value correlates of conservatism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1617-1630.
- Feather, N. T. (1980). Value systems and social interaction: A field study in a newly independent nation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 10, 1-19.
- Feather, N. T. (1982). Reasons for entering medical school in relation to value priorities and sex of student. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 55, 119-128.
- Feather, N. T. (1984a). Protestant ethic, conservatism, and values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1132-1141.

- Feather, N. T. (1984b). Masculinity, femininity, psychological androgyny, and the structure of values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 604-620.
- Feather, N. T. (1985). Attitudes, values, and attributions: Explanations of unemployment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 876-889.
- Feather, N. T. (1986). Cross-cultural studies with the Rokeach Value Survey: The Flinders program of research on values. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 269-283.
- Feather, N. T., & Cross, D. G. (1975). Value systems and delinquency: Parental and generational discrepancies in value systems for delinquent and non-delinquent boys. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 14, 117-129.
- Feather, N. T., & Hutton, M. A. (1973). Value systems of students in Papua New Guinea and Australia. *International Journal of Psychology*, 9, 91-104.
- Feather, N. T., & Peay, E. R. (1975). The structure of terminal and instrumental values: Dimensions and clusters. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 27, 151-164.
- Feifel, H., & Nagy, V. T. (1981). Another look at fear of death. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 49, 278-286.
- Finlay, D. J., Simon, D. W., & Wilson, L. A., II (1974). The concept of left and right in cross-national research. *Comparative Political Studies*, 7, 209-221.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fitzsimmons, G. W., Macnab, D., & Casserly, C. (1985). *Technical Manual for the Life Roles Inventory Values Scale and the Salience Inventory*. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: PsiCan Consulting Limited.
- Furnham, A. F. (1984). Value systems and anomie in three cultures. *International Journal of Psychology*, 19, 565-579.
- Gay, E. G., Weiss, D. J., Hendel, D. D., Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1971). *Manual for the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire*. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, 28.
- Gilgen, A. R., & Cho, J. H. (1979a). Questionnaire to measure eastern and western thought. *Psychological Reports*, 44, 835-841.
- Gilgen, A. R., & Cho, J. H. (1979b). Performance of Eastern- and Western-oriented college students on the Value Survey and Ways of Life Scale. *Psychological Reports*, 45, 263-268.
- Gordon, L. V. (1960). *Survey of interpersonal values*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Gordon, L. V. (1967). *Survey of personal values*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Gordon, L. V. (1972a). A typological assessment of "A Study of Values" by Q-methodology. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 86, 55-67.
- Gordon, L. V. (1972b). Value correlates of student attitudes on social issues: A multinational study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56, 305-311.
- Gordon, L. V. (1972c). The image of political candidates: Values and voter preferences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56, 382-387.
- Gorlow, L., & Barocas, R. (1965). Value preferences and interpersonal behavior. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 66, 271-80.
- Gorlow, L., & Noll, G. A. (1967). A study of empirically derived values. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 73, 261-269.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1970). Rokeach's approach to value systems and social compassion. *Review of Religious Research*, 11, 139-143.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & McFarland, S. G. (1972). Single vs. multiple-item scales for measuring religious values. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 11, 53-64.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & Smith, R. A. (1972). Changes in college students' evaluations of moral behavior: 1969 versus 1939, 1949, and 1958. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24, 381-391.
- Greenstein, T., & Bennett, R. R. (1974). Order effects in Rokeach's Value Survey. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 8, 393-396.
- Handy, R. (1970). *The measurement of values*. St. Louis, MO: Warren H. Green.
- Harding, S., & Phillips, D. (1986). *Contrasting values in Western Europe: Unity, diversity and change*. London: Macmillan.

- Hill, C. T., & Stull, D. E. (1981). Sex-differences in effects of social and value similarity in same-sex friendship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 488-502.
- Hilton, T., & Korn, J. (1964). Measured change in personal values. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 24, 609-622.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hogan, R. (1972). Characterological and personality nonprojectives. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), *The seventh mental measurement yearbook* (Vol. 1, pp. 68-389). Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon Press.
- Hoge, D. R., & Bender, I. E. (1974). Factors influencing value change among college graduates in adult life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29, 572-585.
- Homant, R., & Rokeach, M. (1970). Value for honesty and cheating behavior. *Personality*, 1, 153-162.
- Hughes, G. D., Rao, V. R., & Alker, H. A. (1976). The influence of values, information, and decision orders on a public policy decision. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 6, 145-158.
- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1985). Measurement in cross-cultural psychology. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 16, 131-152.
- Inglehart, R. (1971). The silent revolution in Europe: Intergenerational change in post-industrial societies. *American Political Science Review*, 65, 991-1017.
- Inglehart, R. (1977). *The silent revolution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Joe, V. C., Jones, R. N., & Miller, P. M. (1981). Value pattern of a conservative. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 2, 25-29.
- Jones, C. H. (1982). College students' values and presidential preference in the 1980 election. *Psychological Reports*, 50, 886.
- Jones, L., & Morris, C. (1956). Relations of temperament to the choice of values. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 53, 346-349.
- Jones, R. A., Sensenig, J., & Ashmore, R. D. (1978). Systems of values and their multidimensional representations. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 13, 255-270.
- Kahl, J. A. (1968). *The measurement of modernism: A study of values in Brazil and Mexico*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Katz, D., & Stotland, E. (1959). A preliminary statement to a theory of attitude structure and change. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science* (pp. 423-475). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Keats, D. M., & Keats, J. A. (1974). Review of "The nature of human values" by M. Rokeach. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 26, 164-165.
- Kelly, K., Silverman, B. I., & Cochrane, R. (1972). Social desirability and the Rokeach Value Survey. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*, 6, 84-87.
- Kilmann, R. H. (1975). A scaled-projective measure of interpersonal values. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 39, 34-40.
- Kitwood, T. M., & Smithers, A. G. (1975). Measurement of human values: An appraisal of the work of Milton Rokeach. *Educational Research*, 17, 175-179.
- Kluckhohn, C. K. M. (1951). Values and value orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E. Shiels (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 388-433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Knight, J. H., White, K. P., & Taff, L. K. (1972). The effect of school desegregation, sex of student, and socioeconomic status on the interpersonal values of southern Negro students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 41, 4-11.
- Kohn, M. (1969). *Class and conformity: A study in values*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Kristiansen, C. M. (1985). Value correlates of preventative health behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 748-758.
- Lamiell, J. T. (1981). Towards an idiographic psychology of personality. *American Psychologist*, 36, 276-289.



- Levitin, T. (1968). Values. In J. P. Robinson & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Measures of social psychological attitudes* (pp. 405-501). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research.
- Lorr, M., Suziedelis, A., & Tonesk, X. (1973). The structure of values: Conceptions of the desirable. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *7*, 137-147.
- Lortie-Lussier, M., Fellers, G. L., & Kleinplatz, P. J. (1986). Value orientations of English, French, and Italian Canadian children: Continuity of the ethnic mosaic? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *17*, 283-299.
- Lovejoy, A. O. (1950). Terminal and adjectival values. *Journal of Philosophy*, *47*, 593-608.
- Lurie, W. A. (1937). A study of Spranger's value-types by the method of factor analysis. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *8*, 17-37.
- Lynn, R. (1974). Review of "The nature of human values" by M. Rokeach. *British Journal of Psychology*, *65*, 453.
- Macnab, D., & Fitzsimmons, G. W. (1987). A multitrait-multimethod study of work-related needs, values, and preferences. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, *30*, 1-15.
- Mahoney, J. (1977). Values and neurosis: A comparison of American and Israeli college students. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *102*, 311-312.
- Mahoney, J., & Katz, G. M. (1976). Value structures and orientations to social institutions. *Journal of Psychology*, *93*, 203-211.
- Mahoney, J., & Pechura, C. M. (1980). Values and volunteers: Axiology of altruism in a crisis center. *Psychological Reports*, *47*, 1007-1012.
- Maslow, A. H. (1962). *Toward a psychology of being*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Matsui, T. (1978). Impacts of management styles on the relations between supervisor needs and leadership patterns. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *63*, 658-661.
- McAvin, M. W., & Gordon, L. V. (1981). Attributions of interpersonal values and teaching effectiveness. *Psychological Reports*, *49*, 539-542.
- Moore, M. (1975). Rating versus ranking in the Rokeach Value Survey: An Israeli comparison. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *5*, 405-408.
- Moore, M. (1976). A cross-cultural comparison of value systems. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *6*, 249-254.
- Morris, C. W. (1956a). *Paths of life*. New York: Braziller.
- Morris, C. W. (1956b). *Varieties of human value*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Morris, C. W., & Jones, L. (1955). Value scales and dimensions. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *51*, 523-535.
- Morris, C. W., & Small, L. (1971). Changes in the conceptions of the good life by American college students from 1950 to 1970. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *20*, 254-260.
- Morrison, R. F. (1977). Career adaptivity: The effective adaptation of managers to changing role demands. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *62*, 549-558.
- Mueller, D. J. (1974). A test of the validity of two scales on Rokeach's Value Survey. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *94*, 289-290.
- Mukerjee, R. (1965). *The social structure of values*. New Delhi: Chand.
- Munson, J. M., & McIntyre, S. H. (1979). Developing practical procedures for the measurement of personal values in cross-cultural marketing. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *16*, 48-52.
- Munson, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1980). The factorial validity of a modified Rokeach Value Survey for four diverse samples. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *40*, 1073-1079.
- Nelson, C. (1968). Anchoring to accepted values as a technique for immunizing beliefs against persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *9*, 329-334.
- Newcomb, T. M., Turner, R. H., & Converse, P. E. (1965). *Social Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ng, S. H. (1982). Choosing between the ranking and rating procedures for the comparison of values across cultures. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *12*, 169-172.
- Ostrom, T. M., & Brock, T. C. (1969). Cognitive bonding to central values and resistance to a communication advocating change in policy orientation. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*, *4*, 42-50.

- Palmer, D. D. (1982). Personal values and priorities of organizational goals. *Psychological Reports*, *51*, 55-62.
- Peak, H. (1955). Attitude and motivation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation*. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press.
- Pedro, J. D. (1984). Induction into the workplace: The impact of internships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *25*, 80-95.
- Penner, L. A., & Anh, T. (1977). A comparison of American and Vietnamese value systems. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *101*, 187-204.
- Penner, L. A., Summers, L. S., Brookmire, D. A., & Dertke, M. C. (1976). The lost dollar: Situational and personality determinants of a pro- and antisocial behavior. *Journal of Personality*, *44*, 274-293.
- Perloe, S. I. (1967). *The factorial structure of the social values questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Pirnot, K., & Dustin, R. (1986). A new look at value priorities for homemakers and career women. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *64*, 432-436.
- Pitts, R. E., & Woodside, A. G. (1983). Personal value influences on consumer product class and brand preferences. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *119*, 37-53.
- Platt, S. D. (1985). A subculture of parasuicide? *Human Relations*, *38*, 257-297.
- Priest, R., Fullerton, T., & Bridge, S. C. (1982). Personality and value changes in West Point cadets. *Armed Forces and Society*, *8*, 629-642.
- Pryor, R. G. L. (1979). In search of a concept: Work values. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, *27*, 250-258.
- Rankin, W. L., & Grube, J. W. (1980). A comparison of ranking and rating procedures for value system measurement. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *10*, 233-246.
- Rawls, J., Harrison, C. W., Rawls, D. J., Hayes, R. L., & Johnson, A. W. (1973). Comparison of Wallace, Nixon and Humphrey supporters along certain demographic, attitudinal, and value-system dimensions. *Psychological Reports*, *32*, 35-39.
- Raymond, B., & King, S. (1973). Value systems of volunteer and nonvolunteer subjects. *Psychological Reports*, *32*, 1303-1306.
- Rest, J. R. (1972). *Defining Issues Test*. Minneapolis: Moral Research Projects. (Available from 330 Burton Hall, 178 Pillsbury Avenue, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis 55455)
- Rettig, S. (1966). Relation of social systems to intergenerational changes in moral attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *4*, 409-414.
- Rettig, S., & Pasamanick, B. (1959). Changes in moral values among college students: A factorial study. *American Sociological Review*, *24*, 856-863.
- Rettig, S., & Pasamanick, B. (1960). Differences in the structure of moral values of students and alumni. *American Sociological Review*, *25*, 550-555.
- Rettig, S., & Pasamanick, B. (1961). Moral value structure and social class. *Sociometry*, *24*, 21-35.
- Rettig, S., & Pasamanick, B. (1962). Invariance in factor structure of moral value judgments from American and Korean college students. *Sociometry*, *25*, 73-84.
- Rettig, S., & Pasamanick, B. (1963). Some observations on the moral ideology of first and second generation collective and non-collective settlers in Israel. *Social Problems*, *11*, 165-178.
- Reynolds, T. J., & Jolly, J. P. (1980). Measuring personal values: An evaluation of alternative methods. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *17*, 531-536.
- Rokeach, M. (1967). *Value survey*. Sunnyvale, CA: Harcourt Tests (873 Persimmon Ave., 94087).
- Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes and values*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rokeach, M. (1969a). Value systems in religion. *Review of Religious Research*, *11*, 3-23.
- Rokeach, M. (1969b). Religious values and social compassion. *Review of Religious Research*, *11*, 24-38.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1974). Change and stability in American value systems, 1968-1971. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *38*, 222-238.
- Rokeach, M. (1979). From individual to institutional values: With special reference to the values of

- science. In M. Rokeach (Ed.), *Understanding human values: Individual and societal* (pp. 47-70). New York: Free Press.
- Rokeach, M., Miller, M. G., & Snyder, J. A. (1971). The value gap between police and policed. *Journal of Social Issues, 27*, 155-171.
- Rootman, I. (1972). Voluntary withdrawal from a total adult socializing organization: A model. *Sociology of Education, 45*, 258-270.
- Rorer, B. A., & Ziller, R. C. (1982). Iconic communication of values among American and Polish students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 13*, 352-361.
- Rosenberg, M. J. (1956). Cognitive structure and attitudinal affect. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53*, 367-372.
- Rosenberg, M. J. (1960). An analysis of affective-cognitive consistency. In M. J. Rosenberg, C. I. Hovland, W. J. McGuire, R. P. Abelson, & J. W. Brehm (Eds.), *Attitude organization and change: An analysis of consistency among attitude components* (pp. 15-64). New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.
- Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R. D., & Fekken, G. C. (1981). The altruistic personality and the Self-Report Altruism Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 2*, 293-302.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 550-562.
- Sciortino, R. (1970). Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values: I. Factor structure for a combined sample of male and female college students. *Psychological Reports, 27*, 955-958.
- Scott, W. A. (1960). International ideology and interpersonal ideology. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*, 419-435.
- Scott, W. A. (1965). *Values and organizations: A study of fraternities and sororities*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Shorr, J. (1953). The development of a test to measure the intensity of values. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 44*, 266-274.
- Shotland, R. L., & Berger, W. G. (1970). Behavioral validation of several values from the Rokeach Value Scale as an index of honesty. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 54*, 433-435.
- Smart, R. C., & Smart, M. S. (1975). Group values shown in preadolescents' drawings in five English speaking countries. *Journal of Social Psychology, 97*, 23-37.
- Smith, M. B. (1949). Personal values as determinants of a political attitude. *Journal of Psychology, 28*, 477-486.
- Smith, M. B. (1963). Personal values in the study of lives. In R. W. White (Ed.), *The study of lives* (pp. 324-347). New York: Atherton Press.
- Smith, M. B. (1969). *Social psychology and human values*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Sommers, S., & Scioli, A. (1986). Emotional range and value orientation: Toward a cognitive view of emotionality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 417-422.
- Spates, J. L. (1983). The sociology of values. *Annual Review of Sociology, 9*, 27-49.
- Spranger, E. (1928). *Types of men*. New York: Stechert-Hafner.
- Staub, E. (1974). Helping a distressed person: Social, personality and stimulus determinants. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 7, pp. 293-341). New York: Academic Press.
- Super, D. E. (1970). *Work Values Inventory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Tanaka, Y. (1972). Values in the subjective culture: A social psychological view. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 3*, 57-69.
- Tate, E. D., & Miller, G. R. (1971). Differences in value systems of persons with varying religious orientations. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 10*, 357-365.
- Thomas, C. B. (1986). Values as predictors of social activist behavior. *Human Relations, 39*, 179-193.
- Thompson, B., Levitov, J. E., & Miederhoff, P. A. (1982). Validity of the Rokeach Value Survey. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 42*, 899-905.
- Thompson, K. S. (1981). Changes in the values and life-style preferences of university students. *Journal of Higher Education, 52*, 506-518.

- Toler, C. (1975). The personal values of alcoholics and addicts. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *31*, 554-557.
- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: Wiley.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, C. H., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. B. P., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, H., & de Montmollin, G. (1986). The measurement of the etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *38*, 257-267.
- Triandis, H. C., Kilty, K. M., Shanmugam, A. V., Tanaka, Y., & Vassiliou, V. (1972). Cognitive structures and the analysis of values. In H. C. Triandis (Ed.), *The analysis of subjective culture* (pp. 181-263). New York: Wiley.
- Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clark, F. L. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *19*, 395-415.
- Truhon, S. A., McKinney, J. P., & Hotch, D. F. (1980). The structure of values among college students: An examination of sex differences. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *9*, 289-297.
- Vecchiotti, D. I., & Korn, J. H. (1980). Comparison of student and recruiter values. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *16*, 43-50.
- Wagman, M. (1966). Interests and values of career and homemaking oriented women. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, *44*, 794-801.
- Walker, W. V., & Campbell, J. B. (1982). Similarity of values and interpersonal attraction of whites toward blacks. *Psychological Reports*, *50*, 1199-1205.
- Weckowicz, T. E., & Janssen, D. V. (1973). Cognitive functions, personality traits, and social values in heavy marijuana smokers and nonsmoker controls. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *81*, 264-269.
- Weckowicz, T. E., Collier, G., & Spreng, L. (1977). Field dependence, cognitive functions, personality traits, and social values in heavy cannabis users and nonuser controls. *Psychological Reports*, *41*, 291-302.
- Williams, R. M. (1968). Values. In E. Sills (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* (pp. 283-287). New York: Macmillan.
- Williams, R. M. (1970). *American society: A sociological interpretation* (rev. ed.). New York: Knopf.
- Wilson, G. D., & Patterson, J. R. (1968). A new measure of conservatism. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *7*, 264-269.
- Winthrop, H. (1959). Psychology and value: A critique of Morris' approach to evaluation as behavior. *Journal of General Psychology*, *61*, 13-37.
- Withey, S. (1965). The U.S. and the U.S.S.R.: A report of the public's perspective on United States-Russian relations in late 1961. In D. Bobrow (Ed.), *Components of defense policy* (pp. 164-174). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Woodruff, A. D., & Di Vesta, F. J. (1948). The relationship between values, concepts and attitudes. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *8*, 645-659.
- Zavalloni, M. (1980). Values. In H. C. Triandis & R. W. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Social psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 73-120). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.