

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 151

UD 013 187

**AUTHOR** Malpass, Roy S.; Symonds, John D.  
**TITLE** Value Preferences are More Strongly Associated With Social Class Than With Sex or Race. Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged, Technical Report Number 17.  
**INSTITUTION** Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Psychology.  
**SPONS AGENCY** Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.  
**REPORT NO** ISED-TR-17  
**PUB DATE** Nov 72  
**NOTE** 32p.  
**EDRS PRICE** MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
**DESCRIPTORS** College Students; Goal Orientation; High School Students; Middle Class Values; Physical Environment; Questioning Techniques; \*Racial Differences; \*Sex Differences; \*Social Differences; \*Socioeconomic Status; Unemployed; Urban Population; \*Values; Work Attitudes  
**IDENTIFIERS** Illinois

**ABSTRACT**

Preferences for 92 values, obtained from a survey of cross-cultural studies of values, were obtained from two separate and geographically distant sets of groups consisting of black and white males and females of lower- and middle-Class status. The middle-class black population was of insufficient size to include, however. Value preferences were factor analyzed separately for the two sets of groups. Five composites of values were found to be shared by these two sets of groups. These were interpreted as: (1) the good life; (2) pleasant working companions; (3) balance and adjustment; (4) artistic creativity; and, (5) religiousness. The two sets of groups were then considered together and their mean preferences for these value composites compared. When the ten groups of subjects were combined according to criteria of either race, sex, or class, class was found to differentiate groups more than race or sex on all but the religiousness composite. Middle-class groups showed significantly higher preferences for the first three composite values, and black groups showed significantly higher preference for the fifth. The fourth (artistic creativity) did not show significant differentiation. Discriminant function analysis showed that when the optimal combination of the value composites is considered, the greatest differentiation of the groups on the discriminant function is obtained when groups are combined on the basis of class.  
(Author/JM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-  
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-  
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY  
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 072151

---

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN  
CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS 61820

---

Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged

VALUE PREFERENCES ARE MORE STRONGLY ASSOCIATED WITH  
SOCIAL CLASS THAN WITH SEX OR RACE

Roy S. Malpass

and

John D. Symonds

University of Illinois

Technical Report No. 17

November, 1972

This investigation was supported, in part, by Research Grant No. 15-P-55175/5

from the Social and Rehabilitation Service

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Washington, D. C., 20201

UD 013187

Harry C. Triandis  
Principal Investigator

## Preface

This report is part of a series which is concerned with the economically disadvantaged. We have shown in previous reports, and we show again in this one, that economic disadvantages are associated with and presumably create characteristic ways of perceiving and thinking about the social environment. These ways of perceiving and thinking are in sharp contrast to the ways of perceiving and thinking which characterize the middle class and other non-disadvantaged groups. Such differences create barriers in communication between a disadvantaged employee and his supervisor, his fellow employees and his subordinates. Such barriers make it more difficult for such an employee to hold a job. If we are to rehabilitate such an employee we must train both the employee and the people in his job environment in ways which will reduce such barriers.

The present study explores differences in the perception of values in samples of black and white males and females. No important differences were found. This has implications for the construction of cultural training materials. One of the findings in our previous work is that when a person disagrees with another concerning a value, this provides the largest stimulus for negative interaction relative to other kinds of disagreements. On the other hand, value agreements lead to positive findings. The findings of this report suggest then that emphasis on the common values found in samples of blacks and whites would be one way in which to increase positive affect. Of course, while agreement on values gives hope for the future of interracial interrelationships in this country, we must remember that there are disagreements on roles and on methods for achieving certain values which lead to negative interpersonal relationships. Our hope is that the "Culture Assimilators" which we have developed will overcome some of the above mentioned negative interpersonal relationships and thus increase the possibility of disadvantaged workers to stay on their jobs.

VALUE PREFERENCES ARE MORE STRONGLY ASSOCIATED WITH  
SOCIAL CLASS THAN WITH SEX OR RACE

Roy S. Malpass and John D. Symonds

University of Illinois

Abstract

Preferences for 92 values obtained from a survey of cross-cultural studies of values were obtained from two separate and geographically distinct sets of groups consisting of black and white males and females of lower- and middle-class status. The middle-class black population was of insufficient size to include, however. Value preferences were factor analyzed separately for the two sets of groups. Five composites of values were found to be shared by these two sets of groups. These were interpreted as (1) the good life, (2) pleasant working companions, (3) balance and adjustment, (4) artistic creativity, and (5) religiousness. The two sets of groups were then considered together, and their mean preferences for these value composites compared. When the 10 groups of subjects were combined according to criteria of either race, sex or class, class was found to differentiate groups more than race or sex on all but the religiousness composite. Middle-class groups showed significantly higher preferences for the first three composite values, and black groups showed significantly higher preference for the fifth. The fourth (artistic creativity) did not show significant differentiation. Discriminant function analysis showed that when the optimal combination of the value composites is considered the greatest differentiation of the groups on the discriminant function is obtained when groups are combined on the basis of class.

VALUE PREFERENCES ARE MORE STRONGLY ASSOCIATED WITH  
SOCIAL CLASS THAN WITH SEX OR RACE<sup>1</sup>

Roy S. Malpass and John D. Symonds<sup>2</sup>

University of Illinois

There is considerable literature dealing with similarities and differences in values and aspirations between blacks and whites and between members of different class levels. At one time or another researchers have found that (1) there are virtually no differences in educational goals (Bowerman & Campbell, 1965) or in achievement motivation as measured projectively (Smith & Abramson, 1962) between blacks and whites; (2) blacks place more emphasis on education and are more achievement oriented than whites (Reiss & Rhodes, 1959); (3) blacks are less achievement oriented than whites (Lott & Lott, 1963); (4) there are no differences in occupational aspirations but blacks have higher educational aspirations than whites (Gist & Bennett, 1963); (5) black and white occupational goals are similar (Lott & Lott, 1963); (6) black males are more interested in professional occupations than white males (Dreger & Miller, 1960); and (7) blacks are more thrifty than whites (Myrdal, 1964; Simon & Simon, 1968).

There are a number of reasons for apparent contradictions. There may be confounding effects of age, sex and social class as mediators of aspirations and goals. Furthermore, the "black power" movement has had relatively undocumented but undoubtedly great effects upon changing aspiration levels of young blacks. Even before the movement, researchers found the differential effects of age to be important in accounting for values of black persons

(e.g., Marx, 1967). There is considerable evidence of sex-related value differences. In their review, Dreger and Miller (1968) concluded that the "Negro female's achievement motivation exceed(ed) that of the Negro male" (p. 39). Myrdal (1964) went so far as to suggest that "the black woman stands in much the same relation to black men as white society does." Regarding class differences, Frazier (1968) and others have commented on the gulf that separates the low-class, poverty stricken black from his middle-class counterpart. The use of different measurements or different subject populations may also cause variation in apparent findings.

To a large degree changes in value preferences are undocumented. There is a strong concern about the viability of research findings that predate the recent rapid changes among the young, both black and white. While they may not be faulty, research findings of the past must be held in doubt until verified or rejected by further research. The present study was undertaken to examine the association of race, class and sex with differences in value preferences, in a relatively heterogeneous set of value statements, and to examine the relative importance of these classifications in differentiating groups on value preferences.

#### Method

##### Value Questionnaire

The value questionnaire used consisted of 92 separate items gathered from an extensive review by H. C. Triandis (1972) of the major topics covered in existing value inventories. In particular, he employed the work of Barton (1961), Berrien (1965), Dawson (1969), Dennis (1957), England (1967), Gillespie and Allport (1955), Gorlow and Noll (1967), Jacob, Teune and

Watts (1968), Klett and Yaukey (1959), Morris (1956), Scott (1963), Stewart (1966), Wickert (1940) and Zurcher et al. (1965) for suggestions concerning the kinds of items which appear to have discriminated across cultural and subcultural groups. The format was adapted from Bühler's (1962a, b) method. Items are included at both specific and abstract levels of values. The work of Rokeach (1968) and Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) is also represented. The 92 values break down broadly into four categories including values relevant to work, personal characteristics, physical conditions, and ultimate goals. Each item was to be scored on a five-point scale represented by the following five categories: "I reject this," "Not my concern," "Desirable," "Important," and "Essential."

In research dealing with the subject populations we were using there is reason to assume that the stimulus items are not understood in the same way by all subjects (e.g., "achieving Nirvana" could cause severe problems in understanding for some subjects). In addition, some of our subjects were reading at a fairly low level relative to their age and educational status. We, therefore, translated the items to more generally understood forms of English. Four black undergraduate students at the University of Illinois who had had direct and extensive experience with ghetto life re-wrote each item into a form which they felt would be appropriately comprehended by the subject population. Each translator worked separately, and their translations were then compared. A large degree of agreement was found about which items would cause problems and there was considerable similarity in the translations offered. In the few cases where there were differences, the four together arrived at a consensual translation. Some representative translations follow:

1. "to be able to integrate action, enjoyment and reflection"  
became  
"to be able to mix together action, fun and thought in life"
2. "being initiating"  
became  
"being able to start things off or make changes in things"
3. "being conservative"  
became  
"wanting to keep old habits and ways of doing things"

A further consideration of the questionnaire was that the items show reasonably good reliability. To obtain measures of reliability, four forms of the questionnaire were developed, with 23 (25%) of the items repeated throughout the questionnaire. Each of the four forms had a different set of the 23 items repeated so that taken together all 92 items were repeated once. The four forms were randomly distributed in each of the subject groups.

### Subjects

There were two separate sets of subjects. The first set was comprised of 142 students from a high school in a small town (population approximately 25,000) in central Illinois. All were juniors and seniors. The high school graded the students into one of three classifications (A, B or C) according to their reading ability. Our sample contained 78 "C" group and 68 "A" group students. Of the "C" group 28 were black (16 male and 12 female) and 50 were white (23 male and 27 female). In the "A" group there were only 3 black students (all females); the remaining "A" group students consisted of 23 males and 42 females. The subjects tested comprised 6 intact classes,



3 "A" and 3 "C". Due to the small number of black "A" group students, this subsample was dropped from analysis. Also one of the black males questionnaire was not usable. The eventual subject composition then was as follows:

"C" black male.....15  
"C" black female.....12  
"C" white male.....23  
"C" white female.....27  
"A" white male.....23  
"A" white female.....42

142

The Value Questionnaire was administered in two simultaneous sessions in two different rooms (The "A" students in one room and the "C" students in another). One white and two black testors administered the questionnaire to the "C" sample and one white and one black tester performed the administration to the "A" group. The testers were introduced by a teacher who remained in the room for the first few minutes of the administration, then left. Both groups took almost identical time (30 minutes) to finish.

The "A" and "C" groups were initially indicative of classroom reading performance. There is prior evidence that such classification also relates to socioeconomic status. To check this point, we asked the subjects to respond to two questions. The first was to indicate by self-report the social class level in which they felt they belonged ("upper," "middle," "lower," or "poverty" class). The second question asked for an indication of relative income was "When you were growing up, your family's income was..."

- 5) higher than average for the country
- 4) about average for the country
- 3) less than average for the country
- 2) very much below average for the country
- 1) so low we were mostly on welfare.

As expected, the "A" subjects rated themselves higher on both social class and family income (2.95 and 4.20, respectively) as compared to the "C" groups (2.59 and 3.86, respectively). By this indication the "C" group described themselves in the middle of the lower-class and their family income as somewhat less than average for the country, while the "A" group described themselves as between lower and middle class with family income as about average for the country. While these differences are not extremely great, they clearly indicate that the "A" and "C" grouping is related to socioeconomic status. We shall interpret these groups as class-differentiated. Note, however, that we were unable to obtain a group of black middle-class students of sufficient size to be useful.

The second set of subjects was obtained in order to examine the generality of results obtained with the first sample, and to extend the geographical area as well as the degree of urban concentration from which samples were drawn. It was possible to obtain four geographically and demographically distinct samples:

- (1) White female college students, who filled out the questionnaires as part of a course requirement in an introductory psychology course. (White females were used because the investigators felt that they are the best examples of carriers of white middle-class culture, and thus would provide an "extreme-groups" comparison to the black samples.)

(2) Black working-class and lower-class high school boys from the Chicago Heights area (a suburb of Chicago). They were selected to be within the normal intellectual performance range, from special classes having academic problems.

(3) White high school boys from the Chicago Heights area, working-class and lower-class, also selected from within the normal intellectual performance range from classes having academic problems.

(4) Black adult subjects, classified as "hardcore unemployed," from St. Louis, Missouri.

The white girls were approximately 19 years old, practically all of them unmarried, most from various parts of Illinois, including farms and other rural areas, with family backgrounds characteristic of the middle class. The pool from which we drew had 83 girls.

The white boys were on the average a year younger than the white girls. The high school considered them socially maladjusted, but their I.Q.s were in the normal range. The maladjustment may have been related to cultural factors such as educational retardation, inadequate school opportunities, or parental mobility which did not allow the young men to stay in school for sufficiently long periods of time.

The black high school subjects were drawn from a pool of 60 males, who were in the same program at the same high school as the white boys described in the previous paragraph. Their ages ranged from 15-21, with a mean of about 16 and a half. The subjects were quite heterogeneous, although apparently typical of the blacks found in "suburban ghettos," in the outskirts of large cities. Some of the parents were middle-class, but most

came from homes in which the mother was the major income-maker, and where the income levels were very low. The students were classified as maladjusted because of gambling, drinking, sexual problems or drug abuse. Most of these subjects had police records. All were in the normal I.Q. range, and some aspired to go to college. The training they received in the special programs was apparently identical to that of the white boys described in the previous paragraph.

The black hardcore came from a pool of males, from the inner city of St. Louis, Missouri. They were on the average 26 years old, had a history of unemployment, drug abuse and most of them had police records.

These samples are discussed in some detail in Triandis, Feldman and Harvey (1970). Note again that a middle-class black group was not obtained. Race and class are partially confounded in this study, a point to bear in mind in interpreting our results.

#### Results

In order to assess the reliability of the items, Pearson Product Moment Correlations were computed for the two scores on each item. Only one item had extremely low reliability ("to have enough to eat,"  $r = .13$ ), and was dropped from further analyses. All other items had reliability coefficients in excess of .50. The intercorrelation matrices of value preferences of the two sets of subject samples were separately submitted to principle components factor analysis. The number of factors to be rotated was determined by inspection of the "elbow" in the plot of differences in percent variance accounted for between successive factors. Using this method, eight factors were extracted and varimax rotated, for each of the two set of samples.

Items loading above .50 on each of these factors are presented in Table 1 (for set one) and Table 2 (for set two).

-----  
Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here  
-----

There are some strong similarities between factors obtained from these separate analyses. Factor 1 of both groups have four items in common, and three items of factor one for set 1 are common with three of the five items in Factor IV of the set 2 analysis. The second factors of the two subjects sets also share four value items. Factor IV of set 1 and Factor V of set 2 also share common items, as do Factors VI and VII, respectively.

These similarities between the factor structures obtained from these two samples are sufficient to treat them as relatively stable clusters of values. Five clusters of items were constructed and composite scores obtained for each subject by summing the scores on the items in the cluster. These five clusters and the value items comprising them are presented in Table 3.

-----  
Insert Table 3 about here  
-----

An important question concerns the pattern of preferences shown by the samples represented by this analysis, and the degree to which they are differentiated in their preferences. Since the five value clusters represent items common to all ten subject groups from both sets of samples, all 10 were considered together in the following analyses. The five composite value scores for subjects of all 10 groups were submitted to a one by ten

multivariate analysis of variance. The multivariate F ratio was 6.766 (df = 45,1756,  $p < .00001$ ). Univariate F tests and the means of the ten groups on the four value composites on which there was a significant F are presented in Tables 4 and 5, respectively.

-----  
Insert Tables 4 and 5 about here  
-----

The greatest contrast in preference for "the good life" is between middle-class and lower-class groups, the lower-class groups expressing greater preference. A similar pattern appears for "pleasant working companions," with lower-class samples again expressing greater preference. Middle-class samples express greater preference for "Balance and Adjustment." The basis for differentiation in preference for "religiousness" is not simple. Those samples which are both male and white express less preference, while samples which are either female or black express greater preference.

As another means of examining sex, race, and class as bases for differentiation in value preference, groups of samples homogeneous in these respects were assembled and submitted to separate one by two multivariate analyses of variance on the five value composites. The multivariate F ratios were 56.9, 24.47, 23.95, respectively, for class, race and sex (df = 5,400;  $p < .0001$  in all cases). Univariate tests and means of groups are presented in Tables 6 and 7. Differentiation is greater on the basis of social class for "the good life," "pleasant working companions," and "Balance and Adjustment."

-----  
Insert Tables 6 and 7 about here  
-----

A more powerful means of testing the degree to which groups assembled on the basis of their social class, race or sex are differentiated by their value preferences is provided by discriminant function analysis. The three means of constructing composite groups were successively submitted to such an analysis, using scores on the five value composites. The standardized discriminant function coefficients for each of these analyses is presented in Table 8, and the means of the groups on the discriminant functions are presented in Table 9. Again, taking the optimal combinations of the value composites, the greatest differentiation between groups is observed when subjects are classified by their social class.

-----  
Insert Tables 8 and 9 about here  
-----

#### Discussion

This study of value preference shows two levels of results. First, there are patterns of value preferences that are associated with each other across this quite diverse set of people. Second, while samples can be assembled on the basis of their social class, race, or sex and found to differ in preference expressed for the sets of values, social class provides greater differentiation for three of the value composites while race provides the only significant univariate differentiation on a fourth (religion).

The subjects in set one were entirely high school students, and were, therefore, younger and less experienced in adult roles than subjects in some of the set two samples. It is interesting that having pleasant supervisors and coworkers is for them strongly related to the values represented by "the good life," while for the more experienced samples these two value composites are not strongly related (form different factors).

The lower-class samples clearly show a greater preference for the values forming the "good life" composite than do the middle-class samples. Further, while males and females or blacks and whites can be differentiated on this (and the other) value preferences, social class provides the greatest differentiation. At first glance it is somewhat puzzling to find that the value expressions of the lower class groups reflect the popularization of middle-class values. The middle-class groups are higher in the preference for "Balance and Adjustment" and "being artistic." This probably reflects the goals of these groups: An upward movement in an univariate-unidirectional status hierarchy. The lower class values what the middle class has, and the middle class, having those things, pursues other things. This motivational interpretation can be expanded to assert that the middle-class samples value what was given up or what were costs in the process of achieving the good life. This interpretation is consistent with a new popularization of American society: The disenchantment of the middle class.

Class was not the best criterion for discriminating groups on all value composites, however. Neither class or sex significantly differentiated groups on the value composite "religiousness," while race did (black>white).



These results must be interpreted with the caveat, mentioned above, that there was no middle-class black group included in the samples used. The inclusion of such a group could either weaken or strengthen the inference that class is a more important dimension of differentiation than race or sex, on preference for these value composites. This is not to say that there are no important differences between blacks and whites, even in groups homogeneous by class. Had we examined this point, and performed our factor analyses using only lower class groups, we would no doubt have found shared patterns of value preferences which differentiate our samples. Further, there may be many related behavioral domains in which important differences exist, such as in preferences in means of attaining the goals represented by the value composites used in this study. Likewise, Stewart (1972) found that while subjects agreed in interpretations of behavioral descriptions of children's behavior in school settings, they disagreed markedly on what to do about them. Differences in behavioral intentions regarding the child were differentiated as a function of the ethnicity of child and observer, even when observers of varying ethnicity agreed on interpretations.

The value statements used in the present study were very widely sampled, and put into the vernacular by decentering procedures (Werner & Campbell, 1970). We are fairly confident that the common value composites we developed are widely replicable ones. If they are not the only widely replicable ones, they are certainly among the set of those which are important. Given this set of values and our set of subject samples, it is fairly clear that the most important dimension of differentiation is social class.

## References

- Barton, A. Measuring the values of individuals. Reprint No. 354, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1961.
- Berrien, F. K. Japanese vs. American values. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 65, 181-191.
- Bowerman, C. E., & Campbell, E. Q. Aspiration of southern youth: A look at racial comparisons. Transaction, 1965, 2, 24.
- Buhler, C. Values in psychotherapy. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1962. (a)
- Buhler, C. Goal-structure of human life: Model and project. Psychological Reprints, 1962, 10, 445-446. (b)
- Dawson, J. L. M. Attitudinal consistency and conflict in West Africa. International Journal of Psychology, 1969, 4, 39-53.
- Dennis, W. Uses of common objects as indicators of cultural orientations. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 21-28.
- Dreger, R. M., & Miller, S. K. Comparative psychological studies of Negroes and whites in the United States. Psychological Bulletin, 1960, 57, 361-402.
- Dreger, R. M., & Miller, S. K. Comparative psychological studies of Negroes and whites in the United States: 1959-1965. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, Monograph Supplement, 1-58.
- England, G. W. Personal value systems of American managers. Academy of Management Journal, 1967, 10, 53-68.
- Frazier, E. F. Black bourgeoisie. New York: Collier Books, 1968.
- Gillespie, J. M., & Allport, G. W. Youth's outlook on the future: A cross-national study. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1955.

- Gist, N. P., & Bennett, W. S., Jr. Aspirations of Negro and white students. Social Forces, 1963, 42, 40-48.
- Gorlow, L., & Noll, G. A. A study of empirically derived values. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1967, 73, 261-269.
- Jacob, P. E., Teune, H., & Watts, T. Values, leadership and development: A four-nation study. Social Science Information, 1968, 7, 49-92.
- Klett, C. J., & Yaukey, D. W. A cross-cultural comparison of judgments of social desirability. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1959, 49, 19-26.
- Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F. Variations in value orientation. Evanston: Row and Peterson, 1961.
- Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E. Negro and white youth: A psychological study in a border state community. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Marx, G. T. Protest and prejudice. New York: Harper, 1967.
- Morris, C. Varieties of human value. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Myrdal, G. An American dilemma, Vol. II. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Reiss, A. J., Jr., & Rhodes, A. L. Are educational norms and goals of conforming, truant, and delinquent adolescents influenced by group position in America? Journal of Negro Education, 1959, 28, 252-267.
- Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes and values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.
- Scott, W. A. Social desirability and individual conceptions of the desirable. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 574-585.

- Simon, J. L., & Simon, R. Class, status and savings of Negroes. American Sociologist, 1968, 3, 218-219.
- Smith, H. P., & Abramson, M. Racial and family experience correlates of mobility aspiration. Journal of Negro Education, 1962, 31, 117-124.
- Stewart, E. C. Aspects of American culture: Assumptions and values that affect cross-cultural effectiveness. Pittsburgh: Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh, 1966.
- Stewart, I. S. Cultural differences in attribution and intentions of Anglos and Chicanos in an elementary school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1972.
- Triandis, H. C., Vassiliou, V., Vassiliou, G., Tanaka, Y., & Shanmugam, A. The analysis of subjective culture. New York: Wiley, 1972.
- Triandis, H. C., Feldman, J. M., & Harvey, W. M. Person perception among black and white adolescents and the hardcore unemployed. Report No. 5, SRS No. 12-P-55175/5. Champaign, Ill.: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1970.
- Werner, O., & Campbell, D. T. Translating, working through interpreters and the problem of decentering. In R. Naroll and R. Cohen (Eds.), A handbook of method in cultural anthropology. New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1970.
- Wickert, F. A test of personal goal values. Journal of Social Psychology, 1940, 11, 259-274.
- Zurcher, L. A., Jr., Meadow, A., & Zurcher, S. L. Value orientation, role conflict, and alienation from work: A cross-cultural study. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 539-548.

Footnotes

1. This study was supported by Research Grant No. 15-P-55175/5 from the Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Harry C. Triandis, Principal Investigator).
  
2. Now at the Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

Table 1  
Value Items that Load Above .50 on Each of the Eight  
Rotated Factors: Subject Set 1

Factor I: (25% common variance)

Own a nice house (.67), Economic achievement (.73)  
Being refined (.51), Many simple pleasures (.62)  
Job with pleasant black supervisor (.57), Job with pleasant black  
coworker (.59)  
Job with pleasant white coworkers (.65)  
Pleasant working conditions (.50), Job with pleasant white super-  
visor (.63)  
Secure job (.55)

Factor II: (15% common variance)

Being wise (.51), Being receptive (.62)  
Being kind (.59), Being self-controlled (.53)  
Able to integrate action, enjoyment and reflection (.58), Be dutiful (.55)  
Be well adjusted (.64)

Factor III: (13% common variance)

Scientific achievement (.64), Being a leader (.71)  
Being wealthy (.57), Political achievement (.56)  
Fame and immortality of my name (.59)

Factor IV: (12% common variance)

Artistic achievement (.50), Being artistic (.56)  
Being skillful (.54), Achievement in peace (.58)  
Being creative (.55)

Factor V: (10% common variance)

Have intimacy (.57), Enjoy life sensually to the full (.50)  
Have an exciting life (.54)

Factor VI: (9% common variance)

Religious achievement (.50), Being religious (.54)  
Salvation (.65)

Table 1 (Continued)

Factor VII: (8% common variance)

Cultivate independence of persons and things (.67)  
Being independent (.46)  
Being conservative (.48), Have privacy (.46)

Factor VIII: (8% common variance)

Have many sexual experiences (.56), Being sexually attractive (.58),  
Have mature love (.66)

NOTE: The value items are listed here in an abbreviated form.

Table 2

Value Items that Load Above .50 on Each of the Eight

Rotated Factors: Subject Set II

Factor I: (21% common variance)

Own a nice house (.64), Economic achievement (.77)  
Being refined (.63), Many simple pleasures (.56)  
Be pleasure loving (.55), Be wealthy (.68)  
Have a comfortable life (.53), Be sexually attractive (.51)

Factor II: (20% common variance)

Being wise (.50), Being receptive (.62)  
Being kind (.65), Being self-controlled (.50)  
Being honest (.51), Free of inner conflicts (.51)  
True friendship (.61), Have contentment (.54)  
Have intimacy (.62), Feeling of self-respect (.58)  
Have mature love (.54)

Factor III: (14% common variance)

Achievement in peace (.70), Being initiating (.52)  
Adventuresome job (.53), Scholarly achievement (.63)

Factor IV: (11% common variance)

Job with pleasant black supervisor (.56), Job with pleasant black  
coworker (.59)  
Job with pleasant white coworker (.57), Being serene (.56)  
Wait in quiet receptivity (.54)

Factor V: (11% common variance)

Artistic achievement (.56), Being artistic (.57)

Factor VI: (8% common variance)

Being highly intelligent (.50), A job that allows self-actualization  
(.53)

Factor VII: (8% common variance)

Religious achievement (.50), Being religious (.60)  
Salvation (.57)



Table 2 (Continued)

Factor VIII: (8% common variance)

Being well taken care of (.47)  
Being loving (.50)

NOTE: The value items are listed here in an abbreviated form.

Table 3  
Value Composites

I. The Good Life

Own a nice house  
Economic achievement  
Being refined  
Many simple pleasures

II. Pleasant Working Companions

Job with pleasant black supervisor  
Job with pleasant black coworkers  
Job with pleasant white coworkers

III. Balance and Adjustment

Being wise  
Being receptive  
Being kind  
Being self-controlled

IV. Artistic Creativity

Artistic achievement  
Being artistic

V. Religiousness

Religious achievement  
Being religious

NOTE: The value items are listed here in an abbreviated form.

Table 4  
Univariate F Tests on Variation of Ten Groups  
on Five Value Composites

<u>Value Composite</u>	<u>Between M.S.</u>	<u>F</u>
1. The Good Life	83.6	12.51**
2. Pleasant Working Companions	72.0	13.74**
3. Balance and Adjustment	29.4	5.78**
4. Artistic Creativity	5.2	1.51
5. Religiousness	6.4	1.98*

NOTE:  $df = 9,396$

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .0001$



Table 5  
Means of 10 Samples on Five Composite Values, in Rank  
Order, with Intergroup Distances

Groups and Their Characteristics

SET I

1. Set 1, Black, Male, Lower Class
2. Set 1, Black Female, Lower Class
3. Set 1, White, Female, Lower Class
4. Set 1, White, Male, Lower Class
5. Set 1, White, Male, Middle Class
6. Set 1, White, Female, Middle Class

SET II

7. Set 2, Black, Male, Lower Class
8. Set 2, White, Male, Lower Class
9. Set 2, Black, Male, Lower Class
10. Set 2, White, Female, Middle Class

Value Composites

<u>1. The Good Life</u>	<u>2. Pleasant Working Companions</u>	<u>3. Balance and Adjustment</u>	<u>5. Religiousness</u>
2. 15.42 <sup>a</sup> (.61) <sup>b</sup>	2. 10.17 (.39)	6. 16.90 (.18)	9. 6.39 (.14)
4. 14.81 (.01)	7. 9.78 (.11)	10. 16.73 (1.19)	2. 6.25 (.27)
1. 14.80 (.27)	1. 9.67 (.07)	1. 15.53 (.06)	7. 5.98 (.16)
7. 14.54 (.06)	4. 9.59 (.02)	5. 15.48 (.18)	3. 5.83 (.04)
3. 14.48 (.30)	9. 9.57 (.27)	8. 15.29 (.03)	6. 5.79 (.05)
9. 14.18 (.85)	3. 9.30 (.39)	3. 15.26 (.05)	1. 5.73 (.19)

Table 5 (Continued)

<u>1. The Good Life</u>	<u>2. Pleasant Work- ing Companions</u>	<u>3. Balance and Adjustment</u>	<u>5. Religious- ness</u>
8. 13.32 (1.06)	8. 8.91 (1.24)	9. 15.21 (.05)	10. 5.55 (.46)
5. 12.26 (.05)	10. 7.68 (1.29)	2. 15.17 (.20)	5. 5.09 (.01)
6. 12.21 (.60)	6. 6.38 (.25)	7. 14.97 (.04)	4. 5.07 (.02)
10. 11.61	5. 6.13	4. 14.93	8. 5.06

<sup>a</sup>Means

<sup>b</sup>Distance between adjacent group means.

Table 6  
 Univariate F Tests of Contrasts of Sample Groupings on the Basis  
 of Social Class, Race and Sex, on Five Value Composites

<u>Value Composite</u>	<u>Between M.S.</u>	<u>F</u>
	<u>Social Class</u>	
1. The Good Life	674.2	99.93**
2. Pleasant Working Companions	538.9	99.74**
3. Balance and Adjustment	223.5	43.82**
4. Artistic Creativity	17.1	4.96*
5. Religiousness	3.9	1.20
	<u>Race</u>	
1. The Good Life	366.8	48.87**
2. Pleasant Working Companions	313.3	52.55**
3. Balance and Adjustment	97.5	18.01**
4. Artistic Creativity	0.0	0.01
5. Religiousness	31.2	9.62*
	<u>Sex</u>	
1. The Good Life	330.1	43.45**
2. Pleasant Working Companions	192.4	30.73**
3. Balance and Adjustment	185.6	35.75**
4. Artistic Creativity	12.2	3.53
5. Religiousness	0.1	0.05

NOTE: df = 1,404

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .001

Table 7  
Means of Groups Compiled on the Basis of Social Class,  
Race or Sex, on Five Value Composites

	<u>Value Composites*</u>				
	1	2	3	4	5
	<u>Social Class</u>				
Lower Class	14.39	9.54	15.14	5.09	5.74
Middle Class	11.81	7.24	16.62	5.50	5.54
	<u>Race</u>				
White	12.48	7.82	16.20	5.30	5.47
Black	14.58	9.75	15.12	5.28	6.08
	<u>Sex</u>				
Male	14.05	9.12	15.16	5.11	5.62
Female	12.25	7.74	16.52	5.46	5.66

\*Value Composites

1. The Good Life
2. Pleasant Working Companions
3. Balance and Adjustment
4. Artistic Creativity
5. Religiousness

Table 8  
 Standardized Coefficients of Five Value Composites on Discriminant Functions  
 Differentiating Groups Assembled on the Basis of Three Criteria  
 (Social Class, Sex and Race)

<u>Value Composite</u>	<u>Social Class</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Race</u>
The Good Life	.725	.728	-.610
Pleasant Working Companions	.494	.296	-.464
Balance and Adjustment	-.710	-.755	.633
Artistic Creativity	-.033	-.014	-.148
Religiousness	.022	-.103	-.265
	$\chi^2$		
	215.75	105.17	107.15
	df	5	5
	p	<.0001	<.0001



Table 9  
Means of Groups Combined on Criteria of Social Class, Race  
and Sex, on a Discriminant Function Composed of Five Value Composites

<u>Criteria</u>		<u>Means on Discriminant Function</u>	<u>Difference Between Means</u>
Class	Lower	1.199	1.681
	Middle	-.482	
Sex	Male	-.590	1.092
	Female	-1.682	
Race	Black	-2.289	1.214
	White	-1.075	