

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Richard Eugene Cherry for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in Counseling presented on April 15, 1982

TITLE: Personal and National Values: A Multinational  
Comparison of Values within the Person-Centered Community

Abstract approved: Redacted for Privacy

James L. Firth

Through the development of a Values Questionnaire this study examined the relative importance of values in multinational settings. The Values studied were Respect, Power, Intelligence, Wealth, Skill, Health, Human Kindness, and Love. The person-centered approach was selected as a particular social science community for the focus of the study.

Ninety-two attendees of person-centered workshops in Zinal, Switzerland and Marienburg, West Germany volunteered to participate in the study. Representing seventeen countries, the research participants rated the values on a nine-point scale of importance from unimportant to important. The rating was performed from a personal standpoint and from the perception of most members of one's national group.

The hypotheses were (1) there will be a significant difference between the eight values in their importance rating, and (2) personal value importance differs significantly from national group value importance.

The results indicated that the eight values were considered to be distinct and that personal value importance differed from national group value importance. In an analysis of variance, the differences between the values and the personal and national group ratings were significant at the .001 level. A Newman-Keuls post hoc comparison identified the personal ratings with the highest importance placed on Love, Respect, Health, and Human Kindness; whereas, the national group ratings placed the highest importance on Wealth, Power, Skill, and Intelligence.

The Values Questionnaire was able to assess levels of value importance in multinational settings. The problems of translation were minimal. The values measured were considered as separate entities and received different ratings from personal and national group perspectives. Specific differences that were identified within and between the personal and national group ratings are reflective of the values existing within the person-centered community.

© Copyright by Richard Eugene Cherry  
1982

All Rights Reserved

PERSONAL AND NATIONAL VALUES: A MULTINATIONAL COMPARISON  
OF VALUES WITHIN THE PERSON-CENTERED COMMUNITY

by

Richard Eugene Cherry

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed April 15, 1982

Commencement June 1982

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Associate Professor of Counseling and Guidance in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Program Director of Counseling and Guidance

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented April 15, 1982

Typed by Judith L. Gump for Richard Eugene Cherry

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction . . . . .	1
Background . . . . .	1
Values in Cross-National Relationships . . . . .	3
Prosocial Cross-National Contact Approaches . . . . .	5
Language Training . . . . .	5
Social, Political, Historical Information Transfer	6
Do's and Don'ts Method . . . . .	7
Simulation Training . . . . .	8
Cross-National Values Approach . . . . .	10
Assumptions . . . . .	12
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	14
Definition of Terms . . . . .	16
Objectives and Hypotheses . . . . .	17
II. Review of the Literature . . . . .	19
Background . . . . .	19
Cross-National Value Instruments . . . . .	22
Osgood Semantic Differential Technique . . . . .	22
Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values . . . . .	26
Gordon Survey of Personal Values . . . . .	26
Rokeach Value Survey . . . . .	28
Etic Based Value Instruments . . . . .	31
Seminar Application . . . . .	32
Student Comparison . . . . .	34
Foreign Language Student Value Exploration . . . . .	35
Couple Counseling Value Clarification . . . . .	36
Values in Cross-National Relationships . . . . .	38
Marriage and Family . . . . .	38
Educational Settings . . . . .	42
Counseling . . . . .	45
General Summary . . . . .	48
III. Methodology and Procedures . . . . .	51
General Description . . . . .	51
Statistical Analysis Procedures . . . . .	53
Workshop Format: Data Request . . . . .	53
Questionnaire Completion . . . . .	54
Questionnaire Design . . . . .	56
Hypotheses . . . . .	60
Post Hoc Analysis . . . . .	61
Summary . . . . .	62
IV. Data Presentation . . . . .	63
Analysis of Variance . . . . .	63
Newman-Keuls . . . . .	64
Personal Ratings . . . . .	64
National Group Ratings . . . . .	66
Pearson Product-Moment . . . . .	67
Summary . . . . .	68

V.	Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations . . . . .	78
	Summary . . . . .	78
	The Problem . . . . .	78
	The Instrument . . . . .	78
	The Sample . . . . .	79
	Treatment of the Data . . . . .	79
	Major Outcome of the Investigation . . . . .	80
	Discussion . . . . .	81
	Hypotheses . . . . .	81
	Personal and National Group Rating . . . . .	82
	Value Ordering . . . . .	83
	Limitations and Implications . . . . .	85
	Recommendations . . . . .	87
VI.	Bibliography . . . . .	90
VII.	Appendices . . . . .	94
	Appendix A . . . . .	94
	Appendix B . . . . .	104
	Appendix C . . . . .	108
	Appendix D . . . . .	110
	Appendix E . . . . .	112
	Appendix F . . . . .	122

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Analysis of Variance for Values and Assessment . . . .	69
2. Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis Comparing Value Means .	70
3. Significant and Nonsignificant Relationships for Values Rated from Personal Standpoint . . . . .	71
4. Probability of Differences between Values for Personal Ratings . . . . .	72
5. Significant and Nonsignificant Relationships for Values Ascribed to Other Members of National Group . . . . .	73
6. Probability of Differences between Values for National Group Ratings . . . . .	74
7. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients between Personal and National Group Values . . . . .	75
8. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients between Values for Personal Ratings . . . . .	76
9. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients between Values for National Group Ratings . . . . .	77
10. Personal and National Group Ordered Listing of Values .	89

PERSONAL AND NATIONAL VALUES: A MULTINATIONAL COMPARISON  
OF VALUES WITHIN THE PERSON-CENTERED COMMUNITY

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

"It is often felt that we may have lost, in our modern world, all possibility of any general or cross-cultural basis for values. One natural result of this uncertainty and confusion is that there is an increasing concern about, interest in, and a searching for, a sound or meaningful value approach which can hold its own in today's world."

(Carl R. Rogers, 1964, p. 160)

Background

The recent expansion of the person-centered approach (PCA) into the international arena brings about many questions such as: are the techniques effective when applied cross-nationally; is the philosophical base wide enough to include other nation's views; is there a commonality shared in the nature of humans that is reflected in or by the PCA which can be identified across nations? This last question was the start of this research project. The underlying assumptions are as follows: 1) there exists a pancultural system of valuing which at the core level unifies each human being to another by its shared existence, 2) the PCA is based upon the belief that people hold organismal values which will be recognized and acted upon given a nurturing environment, 3) values held and brought into a level of awareness can be stated and measured. In other words, core values are shared by all, the PCA can bring them out, once

out they can be looked at.

The quest for the identification and measurement of universal values has crossed all fields of academic discipline, involving many definitions of value from economic, moral, political, ethical and social standpoints. For the purposes of this study, values are being defined as central tenets which are held by an individual in a consistent relationship to one's self concept. As one believes oneself to be, so one values. The result of held values is the formation of attitudes and the demonstration of behavior. Because one values, one views events in this manner, and acts accordingly. Values form the basis for decision making particularly in conflict situations. Since one values, one will choose, think, act in this preferred way as opposed to selecting another alternative choice, thought, or action.

With regard to pancultural values, Rokeach (1973) states that all people possess a small number of the same values to different degrees. Lasswell (1948), in studying primitive and modern cultures, has concluded that the decision-making process can be classified into eight universal value categories: affection, enlightenment, power, well-being, rectitude, wealth, respect and skill. Rucker et al., (1969) affirms that these eight value categories are prevalent in the institutions in society. A connection between the values of the institution and the individual has been established by Feather (1971) in finding that students across nations shared their institution's values. Rogers (1964) in describing the psychologically-mature adult

observed similar value patterns in clients from varying cultures and suggested that the process of providing a nurturing environment for these values to emerge remains unchanged across individual and national boundaries.

Values form a base from which individuals, institutions and nations develop choices, form viewpoints and initiate actions. The individual forms values through a process of combining the influences of institution and nation with personal concept. The PCA is based upon providing an environment which nurtures the individual in the process of defining self-concept and values. Assessing values within the person-centered community on a multinational level is a first step in exploring the relationship between values, the PCA, and nation. The more knowledge that is available concerning pancultural values within the PCA community, the more effective the provision of a nurturing environment will be.

#### Values in Cross-National Relationships

Values were selected as a focus for this study as it is felt that the central issue which separates and binds individuals and societies is values. The belief system that individuals hold separately and together, which prescribes resulting attitudes and behaviors, serves as the basis for forming, maintaining and terminating relationships. Depending on the level of tolerance of the individual, the similarity or difference in one's own value system as compared with another will determine the choices made in relationships. From the determination of values held by a particular individual and

those held by others, one can begin a process that will result in acceptance or rejection of another. This process becomes increasingly apparent in the field of cross-national relations.

Since values are in part a result of the societal influences reflecting a particular culture, it can be assumed that there will be a similarity of values held by similarly influenced members of the same culture. It may also be assumed that as the move is made from one culture to another, there will exist more differences. This assumption is also true when moving from one segment of a given culture to different segments within the same culture. As the difference in values increases from one culture to another, so does the likelihood for misunderstanding and possible rejection of those holding different values. There are individuals who thrive on and seek out differences for acceptance, yet they are the exception to individual value-related behavior. The evolution of the PCA to multinational communities requires knowledge of held values to facilitate positive interaction between individuals subject to these varying influences.

The concept of ethnocentrism states that new and different experiences and situations are viewed through a filter which is constructed on the bases of one's own culture and carries a concept of "rightness" to the established patterns existing within one's own culture. In practice this behavior is exemplified by the statement, "the English drive on the wrong side of the road," instead of the other side of the road. It also leads to conclusions about the individuals who are

members of the different culture. Thus, in this example the conclusion would be made that the English are wrong in the way that they drive.

This process starts with the observation of a difference, followed by a comparison to the accepted manner in one's own culture, then the conclusion that one's own cultural solution is preferable. The next step is judging the other culture as inferior with this judgment being ascribed to the individual members of that culture. In the driving example, the final step would be that the English are dumb to drive on the wrong side of the road. A similar driving-related example occurs in Italy as the Americans living there refer to the traffic markers at interchanges as "idiot sticks." Unfortunately, and not suprisingly from observation of Americans abroad, they also refer to the Italians in like terms.

#### Prosocial Cross-National Contact Approaches

Recognizing the effect of ethnocentrism on relationships, governmental and private organizations have explored and implemented many approaches to improve cross-national contact. Some of the more common approaches include language training; social, political, and historical information; "do's and don'ts;" and simulation activities.

#### Language Training

The rationale for language training is to improve cross-national communication by providing a common basis for understanding. Language training requires a propensity to acquire the ability to speak and comprehend other languages

(including one's own). Clearly not everyone going to another culture possesses this propensity. Second, it requires time which usually is not available due to operational commitments or financial limitations. Third, one can only reasonably expect that even if the time is allotted, the starting proficiency level of the new speaker will be minimal and probably limited to survival situations and basic conversation. Being able to ask where the library and bathroom are and knowing how to count are not sufficient to establish or maintain effective cross-national contacts. Unfortunately, it has often been the case that the learning of another language only enables the overseas American to insult the resident national in two languages instead of one.

#### Social, Political, Historical Information Transfer

The imparting of social, political and historical information has been used extensively by educational institutions and foreign service agencies as a means for preparing the overseas sojourner. The assumption for this approach is that the provision of information will aid the sojourner in establishing and maintaining more effective cross-national relations. This approach would include facts on the family organization, the development of the arts, the evolvement of the government and its associated structure, and the background of the society with its unique contributions. Once having undergone this training the individual is more knowledgeable about the culture. Again, there is no implied or direct link between the possession of knowledge about a culture's social, political or historical background and having

a desire for or the capability of producing more effective relations. Many people who are knowledgeable about the atrocities towards Jewish people during World War II are able to simultaneously maintain an anti-Semitic attitude.

#### Do's and Don'ts Method

The most popular approach to prepare overseas travelers and workers for cross-national contact, by its volume of use and ease of transmission, is the "do's and don'ts." Do drive on the left side of the road, don't drink the water. Do shop on the Ponte Vecchio for gloves, don't carry your wallet in your back pocket. The assumption is that knowing what is acceptable and what is unacceptable will facilitate the establishment of beneficial cross-national contact. One of the crucial objections to this type of training is the fact that within the context of the statements offered is a judgment concerning the culture.

Don't drink the water is a convenient start to the ethnocentrism pattern: the water is unfit to drink, they drink the water, they are unfit, our water is better, we are better. The worst example of this type of training the researcher observed was in Italy where the arriving Americans were given a handout concerning hepatitis. The case was made for not eating raw shellfish because of a link to the transmission of hepatitis. It was noted that the cycle existed from a person who had hepatitis, to their excretion, to the shell fish consuming the excretion, to someone eating the shellfish, and, hence, contracting hepatitis. The final statement on the

handout was in bold type, **"DON'T EAT FECES."** Again we can follow the ethnocentrism cycle with the Americans making the final conclusion that the Italians did eat feces. President Carter's comment on "Montezumas revenge" is another example of the pitfalls of this approach. There is also a deficit in this approach which is empirical in nature. If one is given a list of "do's and don'ts," what is one to do or not do when one comes across a situation which the list does not cover?

Obviously this approach is limited to the accuracy and scope of the information conveyed. It also contributes to negative beliefs and judgments. It may be appropriate for minimal contact. It certainly does not provide a productive basis for more effective cross-national relations which is the goal for the provision of the "do's and don'ts."

#### Simulation Training

Simulation activities are perhaps the best of the previously mentioned approaches in terms of effectiveness. These activities try to replicate as closely as possible the actual cross-cultural situation. The assumption is that effective performance in the simulated environment can be learned which will result in effective performance in the actual cross-national situation. The researcher was involved in a Peace Corps training camp for Nepal where simulation was used extensively. The grounds of the camp were constructed to reflect a Nepalese village. Nepalese trainers were on-site, dressing and acting in accord with the Nepalese culture.

Many different social situations were simulated from family interaction, to eating, to typical responses to Americans. This approach incorporates elements of the two above described approaches as social, political, and historical facts were presented as well as situational "do's and don'ts."

The basic limitation of this approach is that it does not systematically address the issue of motivation for increased cross-national understanding on the part of the trainee nor does it require that the trainee examine his or her own culture and how it relates to the different culture. It is possible for one to go through this training by evaluating each simulation in the same ethnocentric pattern described above with the conclusion that each difference is inferior. It is also possible for the trainee to rely on the "do's and don'ts" as depicted and hence not possess a system to resolve situations not presented.

There is also the danger that the other culture representatives are either not like those who the trainee will encounter or are operating from a bias to cater to the American in terms of what they feel might be acceptable. The other culture representatives may also be influenced by the fact they are interacting within an American framework, not to mention that their livelihood is dependent upon continued acceptance by the Americans. This is certainly not the case for those with whom the American will eventually be interacting. This is also compounded by the other culture representative being bilingual which, again, is not the case for most members of the other culture.

### Cross-National Values Approach

A substantially different approach used in the promotion of prosocial cross-national relations was developed in Naples, Italy as part of a program given to overseas Americans (Brislin, 1981). The researcher was involved with this program from its inception through the first three years of its implementation (Cherry, 1973). This approach consisted of the identification and sharing of values between Americans and Italians. It became apparent to the researcher that this values approach was essential in prompting changes which then resulted in better relations between the overseas Americans and the resident Italians.

Values functioned as a link between individuals and nations and served as a bridge beyond the ethnocentric gap. The shared knowledge of the values of the American and Italian produced motivation to view each other differently than through traditional filters. By having the American examine his or her own values and compare these to the stated values of the other culture a basis for effective interaction was established. This was true whether the resultant values were similar or different.

The basic process of value identification and sharing tends to lead to an appreciation of the other person. Whether one values X the same as another is less consequential than one's realization that the other does value X. Each individual uses a valuing process which shares several important commonalities with other individuals. Decisions are made on what is important and what is unimportant. Priorities are assigned

within chosen value systems. The rationale behind attitudes and behavior on the basis of selected values can be related. An individual's valuing process including decisions, priorities, and rationale can be shared with another person.

Once one understands that another shares the same process of valuing, it is much harder for one to judge another's choices as inferior. To do so implies that one's process is subject to the same judgment. The maintenance of a judgment as inferior is dependent on the assumption that individuals are substantially different. Once the realization is made that individuals are similar in a basic and important way, it becomes difficult for one to continue to judge another as different and inferior.

From the first understanding of the other person as similar in a basic way there follows a motivation to understand the differences between each other as well as the similarities. There is a direct connection between basic understanding of values and the motivation to accept others less judgmentally. It reflects the ethnocentrism pattern operating in a more productive fashion. If one is like another then the other is accepted. In this case the similarity of valuing processes, in spite of value content differences, promotes an increase in motivation for acceptance. This increased motivation can allow for the exploration of differences and similarities without the traditional filters of judgment.

Without this basic connection, which can be established between individuals by the sharing of value processes, it is

doubtful that there will be an increase in motivation to perceive differently. Certainly the acquisition of another language doesn't provide this motivation. Neither does the knowledge of certain social, political, or historical facts nor a list of do's and don't's. The combination of these in simulation training also lacks a motivational component.

#### Assumptions

The present study is based on certain conclusions and assumptions the researcher gained from ten years experience in the cross-national relations and counseling fields.

1. The identification and sharing of values is a necessary inclusion in approaches to facilitating more effective relations between members of different groups.

2. The identification and sharing of values preferably includes an assessment of the individual's personal position, his or her perception of own group and the perception of the other's group.

3. The process of value identification and sharing lead to an increase in motivation towards better relations between groups.

4. Many individuals hold values which they do not clearly communicate to those with whom they are in contact.

5. Individuals express their values through the formation of attitudes and the exhibition of behavior.

6. The lack of clear communication of one's values can lead to false assumptions and conclusions on the part of others with whom one is in contact.

7. The clear communication of one's values opens the door for the elimination of false assumptions and the reinforcement of correct assumptions.

8. Once communication has occurred a mutual bond can be created, based on the sharing of a value process, that promotes better relations.

These assumptions point to the need for particular value studies. Given the proposition that the number and scope of all possible values are beyond the reach of any single study, the need for selection of particular values arises. This selection involves a process which has been recently described as researcher specific (Zavalloni, 1980). By this it is meant that the values selected oftentimes are more reflective of the researcher's biases than meaningfully related to the population under study.

This tendency becomes increasingly apparent when the domain of cross-national values study is entered. An instrument developed by a Western researcher with its accompanying Western bound concepts has doubtful application or meaning in other settings. Marsella (1980:30) states that, "All assumptions about human nature necessarily reflect the cultural milieu in which they were nurtured." He continues with the example that, "Culturally speaking, Freud's theories are no more applicable to Asia than a bushman's belief that we came from the stomach of a lizard would be to a Western person" (Marsella, 1980:31). As values are reflective of the assumptions and theories present in

a particular society it becomes vital for cross-national values research to transcend culture-bound concepts (King, 1977; Starr and Wilson, 1977; Zavalloni, 1980).

A noted lack in the study of values is the measurement of the researcher and his or her associated community. Psychologists study other people's behavior, anthropologists observe the patterns of others and sociologists monitor other groups. It is rare to read a report about any of the major disciplines studying themselves. In the quest for expanding knowledge, researchers have overlooked themselves as important objects of study. Since researchers are considerable forces in the identification and transmission of values it seems most appropriate that they be included in these studies. Zavalloni (1980), in recognizing this need, predicts that

More efforts will be directed to understand the dynamics of innovation and change by focusing on values of creative minorities as 'cultural agents' or 'ideologues' as the French would say. The social scientists are asked to give a closer look to their own values. (p. 90)

This self-study will allow researchers to compare their personal views with those of society, as well as monitor the role of their own values, in the conduct of their research (Gouldner, 1969; Myrdal, 1969; Seeman, 1975).

#### Statement of the Problem

The person-centered approach (PCA) represents a major discipline in the field of interpersonal relations. Recently, the PCA has expanded its focus to include cross-national

audiences. This expansion is subject to potential misunderstanding and conflict due to different value positions held by individuals from various countries. Prior attempts to reduce or eliminate conflicts arising from cross-national interaction have met with only limited success. There is a clear and present need for a method which will enhance the PCA as it attempts to promote more effective interpersonal interaction in the international arena.

Values have been defined as central to the functioning of the individual and crucial determinants in successful interaction between individuals. The PCA is based upon a respect for the individual's capacity to identify, select and implement values which facilitate effective adjustment. Given the importance of values in relationships and the variance in values between nations, the presence of an instrument which identifies meaningful values across national groups will greatly enhance the PCA.

This study is aimed at the development of an instrument which can assess meaningful values across national groups within the PCA community. The PCA is being selected due to its current international focus and to respond to the need for study within social science communities. Values are focused upon because they are central to the functioning of individuals. The cross-national perspective is being taken due to the lack of suitable instruments which can validly measure values in this milieu.

### Defintion of Terms

Several terms are used throughout this study which are being defined here in order to facilitate understanding.

Cross-National. The interaction between individuals and groups holding citizenship from different countries. When two or more countries are represented, the interaction is considered cross-national.

Etic Values. Concepts which are able to elicit distinct meaning across national groups. When presented with these concepts, respondents from various countries are able to ascribe specific meaning and differentiate one given concept from another.

National, National Group (rating, perspective, assessment). The results of the ratings obtained from the respondents in completing the Values Questionnaire for "most members of their national group" are described in these terms. This is a reflection of the research participant's perception of their national group. National group refers to the country in which one holds citizenship.

Personal (rating, perspective, assessment). The results of the Values Questionnaire wherein the research participants were rating their own values are described in these terms. Personal refers to one's perception of oneself.

Value(s). Central tenents which are held by an individual in a consistent relationship to one's self concept. The result of held values is the formation of attitudes and the

demonstration of behavior. Values form the basis for decision making.

Values Questionnaire (VQ). Instrument designed to assess relative importance of values on a continuum of importance from unimportant to important.

### Objectives and Hypotheses

The specific objectives of this study are presented below:

1) to determine the relationship between personal and national values in terms of the relative importance placed upon them, to further clarify the extent to which personal values are also general national values;

2) to identify values which can be measured cross-nationally, to reduce the 'culture bound' influence in the selection of values;

3) to explore the relative value importance within a particular social science community, specifically the person-centered approach community, to increase the knowledge of the person-centered approach community with respect to their personal and national group values.

The following hypotheses were proposed.

Hypothesis I. **There will be a significant difference between the eight values in their importance rating. Love, power, human kindness, health, skill, wealth, intelligence and respect are distinct values.**

Hypothesis II. There will be a significant difference between personal and national group ratings of importance for the eight values. Personal value importance differs from national group value importance.

## CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As this study is directed towards the development of an instrument which can measure etic values in cross-national relationships, the literature review will be divided into three sections as follows: cross-national value instruments, etic based value instruments, and values in cross-national relationships.

### Background

Following the development of quantitative methods during the fifties the research in cross-national values started using the survey approach. Initially there was a high use of open-ended questions (Buchanan and Cantril, 1953; Gillespie and Allport, 1955). The typical format was to select certain populations, usually students, and then collectively compare their responses as representative of the national groups. Topics of study included future autobiographies, occupational choices, goals in life and elements to happiness. Replication of the Gillespie and Allport (1955) study by Rubin and Zavalloni (1969) demonstrated the Western bias of the design by noting the use of terms only familiar to Western participants. The determination of which questions to ask can be influenced by the origin of the researcher. The analysis of the answers derived is subject to the same bias. Furthermore, it is difficult to assume that each respondent in each culture will use the same frame of reference in interpreting the questions.

More recently attempts have been made to provide greater specificity, and to include comparable measures of the personal and national group values. The Rokeach Value Survey has been used widely comparing samples from different ethnic and social origins in the United States and students in various countries. This survey has been described as satisfying the requirements of a short, easy to administer instrument as well as including the logic of survey research (Zavalloni, 1980).

The importance of including both personal assessments and attributed value rankings has been continually stated (Feather, 1975; Rokeach, 1973; Klineberg, Louis-Guerin, Zavalloni and Ben Brika, 1978). In some cases the personal rankings correspond closely to the attributed rankings; however, this is clearly not always the case. Reasons offered for these varied results include political orientation, time of sampling, organizational subgroups and philosophical-existential differences. Since the student groups studied do not always appear to be homogenous, the results obtained are questionable in terms of a cross-national comparison.

The central issue in cross-national value measurement is finding factors which are equivalent across national groups. Recently this issue has been divided into the emic and etic distinction. Emic refers to monocultural values and is derived from the term phonemics which examines sounds used in one particular language. Etic describes pancultural values and comes from phonetics which attempt generalizations to all languages (Pike, 1966; Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike, 1973).

The current view is that cross-national comparisons should be made on etic values which address mutually important and significant concerns to the societies under study.

Previous studies have failed to overcome an emic focus. The Allport, Vernon and Lindzey Study of Values is clearly monocultural with its references to Abraham Lincoln and the US Supreme Court. The Gordon Survey of Personal Values is similar in that it was originally designed for use with a single individual and it has not been reworked during its cross-national implementation to allow for varying definitions of what is desirable. The Rokeach Value Survey suffers likewise in that the values presented may be outside the range of experience of many national groups.

In the search for etic values, the categories established by Lasswell (1948) seem to fit most of the requirements. These categories were empirically derived by studying the decision-making processes of modern and primitive cultures. The determination of the categories was based on the persistent and prevalent way in which decisions were made in each culture. Since these categories were pancultural in their origin it is reasonable to assume that they will be etic in their application. The number of valuing categories is limited to eight which allows for short and easy administration. Furthermore, since the value categories existed in each society under study, the problems of translation should be minimal.

### Cross-National Value Instruments

Several instruments have been developed to measure values in the cross-national context. Some of these were developed specifically for the purpose of cross-national research. Others have been adapted from their original intended design and applied cross-nationally. The consistent criticism and hence limitation of these instruments is their shared presence of a bias which reflects the national influences of the developers. Since the vast preponderance of these instruments which are reported in the literature were developed in the United States and England, this bias has been termed a "Western bias." Any conclusions drawn from the use of such biased instruments in cross-national comparisons are subject to a rival hypothesis which states that the results are more reflective of the views of the researcher than representative of true findings within and between nations.

#### Osgood Semantic Differential Technique

The most widely used tool in cross-national values research is the Osgood Semantic Differential Technique (Osgood, 1952). This technique has been described as

The most extensive cross-cultural study of attitude structure to date, (Davidson and Thomson, 1980:52), the most common single method of measurement to be found in published cross-cultural research ... (which has)... generated a staggering amount of research in many countries in areas as meanings, values, attitudes and feelings, (Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike, 1973:243), and, the method with the largest claim to panculturality in conceptualization and application, (Bochner, 1980:369).

The technique consists of presenting concepts (such as mother, war, sleep, color) which are rated by respondents on scales of bipolar adjectives (such as good-bad, warm-cold, loud-silent). The concepts were originally drawn from lists compiled by glottochronologists who consider changes in word forms and meanings over long time periods within families of related languages. The final list of 100 concepts was derived using the criteria that the nouns selected were both familiar concepts and easily and consistently translatable into the six languages used for the first study.

The bipolar adjectives were indigenously developed by asking respondents in each culture to give the first adjective (qualifier) that came to mind when presented with each of the 100 familiar concepts. With 100 respondents in each culture this yielded 60,000 adjectives for analysis. Analysis was performed by selecting the adjectives which represented the overall frequency and diversity of usage across the 100 concepts. Fifty adjectives were selected by this process and their opposites were obtained in the six cultures. The resultant fifty bipolar adjective sets were then presented as scales to 200 respondents in each culture to rate against the 100 concepts.

The results were subjected to factor analysis with three factors emerging: evaluation, potency and activity. These three factors were present across language/culture groups. Osgood (1974a) defines the three factors in the following example:

...first, is it good or is it bad for me? (is it a cute Neanderthal female or a sabertooth tiger?);second, is it strong or is it weak with respect to me? (is it a saber tooth tiger or a mouse?);third, is it an active or a passive thing? (is it a sabertooth tiger or merely a pool of quicksand that I can carefully skirt?). (p.35)

Osgood (1974b) postulates that most language/culture communities can be compared on the basis of the evaluation, potency and activity dimensions. This allows for previously culture specific or emic concepts to be meaningfully contrasted across cultures. Certainly cultures differ in their definitions of the concept. However, when the concepts are rated on bipolar adjective scales, tight clusters of affective meaning emerge along the lines of evaluation, (good-bad), potency (strong-weak) and activity (fast-slow).

Data has been collected in thirty different countries with the same three dominant, orthogonal factors consistently appearing across all the language and culture groups (Bochner, 1980). The relevance of this technique to cross-national research is clearly presented in Bochner's (1980:369) statement, "The apparent cross-cultural invariance of these three factors means that they can serve as reference points for comparing otherwise culture bound concepts."

There are some limitations to Osgood's approach. The process of comparing concepts to scales is time-consuming and fatiguing for the respondent (Feather, 1973; Davidson and Thomson, 1980). Some of the concepts appear to be universally familiar (wealth, respect, love, power) while others seem limited by culture or experience (window, horse, book, map).

Translation of the adjectives (qualifiers) elicited in other cultures back into English limits the validity of comparisons. Recognizing this Osgood (1974a:30) asks the question

...do the Japanese qualifiers that translate as cheerful, colorful, noisy, and active really tap the same factor as American English nice, sweet, heavenly, and good? His answer is ...in fact, we are sure that they do not ... (yet) ... they are carefully translation-equivalent, and the data can be ordered in their terms (Osgood, 1974a:31).

The universality of factor loadings across cultures indicates that regardless of translation, meaningful comparisons can be made on the dimensions of evaluation, potency and activity. These comparisons would become even more meaningful if the instrument were less complex, required less time, and translated more validly.

The next three instruments to be reviewed share many of the common failings of Western-designed tests. These value tools were developed using content specific to Western thought and constructed their norms with Western participants. To assert that they can be used meaningfully in cross-national comparisons is methodologically indefensible. Due to the origin of the items and the source of the normative data, construct validity cannot exist outside of a Western application. They are being reviewed since they represent major value instruments with long histories and have been, curiously enough, used in cross-national comparisons.

### Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values

The Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values (1960) has been in use since 1931. It is based on the classification of types of men developed by Spranger (1928). Relative scores are given on six areas or categories in personality: theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious.

The test operationalizes Spranger's categories by asking questions which require the choice of one response in Part I and the ordering of preferences in Part II. An example is the question, "Assuming that you have sufficient ability would you prefer to be: a) a banker; b) a politician?" This question relates to the categories of economic and political respectively.

Specific content of the test make it inappropriate for cross-national use. References are made to the Bible, Abraham Lincoln, Henry Ford, and Florence Nightingale. Even if the "dubious assumption" could be made that Spranger's categories were culturally invariant (Brislin, Lonner, and Thorndike, (1973:250), the culture-specific content of the test limits its use and makes it unsuited for cross-national research (Zavalloni, 1980).

### Gordon Survey of Personal Values

Gordon's Survey of Personal Values is a thirty segment test with each segment consisting of three statements. As described by Kikuchi and Gordon (1970), in each block or triad, three different values are represented and the respondent is to specify the one statement that reflects what is most important

and the one that represents what is least important to him or her. This forced-choice format results in an individual being measured with respect to six values: Practical Mindedness (to do things that will pay off), Achievement (to have a challenging job), Variety (to have a variety of experiences), Decisiveness (to make decisions quickly), Orderliness (to be systematic, orderly), and Goal Orientation (to stick to a problem until completion).

The original design was to assist in vocational guidance, selection procedures and counseling. The results of the survey were to be combined with other information and used on an individual basis. The use of normative data was to place the individual's score in perspective.

The Survey of Personal Values has been used in cross-national comparisons (Kikuchi and Gordon, 1966, 1970). In contrasting Japanese and American students, they found that the Japanese were less materialistically oriented and placed higher values on a well organized and routinized life. The acceptance of this data as valid representations of cross-national differences is limited by: 1) the use of norms constructed for individual interpretation as representing a "modal personality," and 2) the selected items which "do not sample the local conceptions of what is desirable" (Zavalloni, 1980:102). Clearly the Japanese conception of what is desirable was not sampled nor included in the design of the instrument. Norms designed for individual interpretation cannot be validly reconstituted into representations of a national group. The

limitations of the Survey of Personal Values are reflected by its small use in cross-national research.

### Rokeach Value Survey

Milton Rokeach developed the Value Survey (RVS) which has been used extensively in cross-national comparisons primarily with student populations. (Rokeach, 1967, 1973). Rokeach (1973) defines a value and a value system as

A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence. A value system is an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance. (p. 5)

Based on these definitions he has constructed a thirty-six item survey divided into two parts. The first part consists of eighteen values relating to preferred end-states of existence called "terminal" values such as salvation, equality, world peace, lasting contributions. The second part presents eighteen "instrumental" values relating to preferred modes of conduct such as courageous, responsible, honest, polite. The respondent is asked to rank order each list separately in terms of personal importance by placing the most important value as number one, the second most important value as number two, and so on until all eighteen values are ranked.

Cross-national comparisons have been conducted utilizing the RVS with United States, Australian, Canadian, and Israeli students (Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1970, 1971; Feather and Hutton, 1973). United States students were found to be more

concerned with the materialistic values and less concerned with equality. The Papua New Guinea students valued equality, social recognition and a comfortable life to a greater degree than the Australian students.

While these results from student comparisons seem interesting, they are subject to criticism with regard to their validity and usefulness. In a similar study of student values it was found that the political orientation of the respondents produced large differences in their personal and cultural values (Klineberg, Louis-Guerin, Zavalloni, and BenBrika, 1978). Furthermore, to assume that students are a homogenous cross-national unit without consideration to other factors such as socio-economic class, age, gender and political views violates the existence of within-culture variations (Zavalloni, 1980).

With regard to the design of the RVS, certain questions concerning its construction and administration remain unanswered. The first is the relationship between the instrumental and terminal values. Are these really separate entities? Rokeach's own research using factor analysis indicates that the categories overlap (Rokeach, 1973). The difference between Happiness and Cheerful, Mature Love and Loving, and Freedom and Independent (the first being instrumental, and the second being terminal) is not clear and has been described as "scarcely tenable" (Kitwood and Smithers, 1975:176).

A second question is how does Rokeach justify ranking the values when he states in his definition that values exist on a continuum? The ranking procedure eliminates the possibility of an individual assigning two values the same relative importance. Furthermore it produces data which are not independent and limits the statistical operations that are suited for analysis. Taking into account the wide range of values that Rokeach includes in his survey, ranking seems even more inappropriate. Kitwood and Smithers (1975:175) aptly describe this point by stating, "Thus the invitation to rank Self-Respect, A World at Peace, and True Friendship is about as meaningful as to ask, 'which do you prefer, strawberries, Bach, or air travel?'"

Two additional criticisms of RVS have been identified. Having the respondent rank thirty-six items is both time consuming and out of the range of what the capacity of the human mind is to be able to meaningfully compare at one time (Miller, 1956). The effect of the time required to complete the task coupled with the possible inability to contrast all the items one with the other reduces the validity of the obtained results. Additionally, the scope of the values presented is clearly Western and beyond the range of experience of many cross-national populations. Feather (1975:228) recognized this point in stating that the RVS should be useful "among people who have had a reasonable standard of education." Given the areas of concern relating to the RVS (student population, overlap of values, ranking, length, educational level), Zavalloni's (1980:97) statement that, "in terms of its relevance for

cross-cultural comparison, the instrument is Western and in no sense appropriate for other cultures," is justified.

#### Etic Based Value Instruments

In a review of cross-national value studies, Zavalloni (1980) points out the American or Western bias existing in many of the tools currently being utilized. Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike (1973:24) recommend that this bias can be overcome by considering "etic" or pancultural values rather than "emic" or monocultural values. One attempt to override this bias that has produced meaningful cross-national comparisons is the Simmons Value Survey which draws from many of the major works in values research (Simmons, 1974). This amalgamation of various instruments tends to reduce the individual bias of a particular researcher.

Recognizing the potential or actual bias inherent in available value instruments, another approach is to use categories of values existing within many cultures as a basis for instrument design. Since there are many values available for identification and exploration, it is necessary to limit these to a useful and workable few. The work of Lasswell(1948) has provided an excellent source for values that can be thus employed in a cross-national setting. He identified eight categories of valuing through an examination of many cultures over a long period (Affection, Enlightenment, Well-Being, Rectitude, Power, Wealth, Respect, Skill).

This process was conducted empirically, as he first looked at the decisions that were systematically made in primitive and

modern cultures, then derived the categories. Since the categories emerged out of a cross-national sample, and since the labeling was through content analysis versus the arbitrary selection of values, it can be assumed that, 1) the value categories should exist in many cultures, and 2) they should be meaningful and distinct categories. This number of eight categories also corresponds to the seven plus or minus two which Miller (1956) recommends as comprehensible by a respondent.

Since these values were derived from empirical analysis of a variety of cultures, it is anticipated that they are less subject to bias and will be meaningful to a variety of national populations. In this regard, the source of the values parallels Osgood's (1952) work with the added benefit of fewer items. Chambers and Bagdassaroff (1970) used these values effectively to assess value patterns and shifts among individuals with different cultural experiences. Studying Black and White educators, they were able to document value shifts and patterns during encounter group experiences.

#### Seminar Application

In the early stages of the researcher's work in Italy, these values were used as a part of a seminar designed to facilitate better relations between overseas Americans and resident Italians (Cherry, 1973). A Values Questionnaire (VQ) listing the eight categories with their associated descriptors was developed and presented to the Americans with instructions to rank the eight values in terms of importance from one to

eight with one having the highest degree of importance and two having the next highest importance and so on. The Americans were also asked to assess how the Italians would order these eight values.

The next step was to ask the Americans to find three Italians in the Naples area to perform the same task; to rank the values for themselves and how they felt the Americans would order them. This procedure was initially developed by Humphrey (1964) and recognized as effective by Brislin and Pederson (1976). The results were tabulated and used in a seminar during a discussion wherein Americans and invited Italians were present.

The invited Italians varied from week to week and generally represented many levels of Italian society from the religious, to the student, to the working class. The discussions that ensued proved to be the most meaningful part of the seminar. It was also a clear motivator for change in the American's attitude and behavior. The discussions were lively with each group vigorously asking the other why they placed a particular value in a particular rank as that placement did not fit with their perception. "How can you say that you value 'respect' with the way you drive? How can you say that you value 'love' over 'wealth' when all of your behavior is directed towards the acquisition of wealth?"

What would typically result would be understanding followed by a desire to check out discrepancies rather than maintain the judgment pattern which was so prevalent. The

longitudinal results of the three-year value data collection in Italy, a sample of the Italian discussants, and the initial VQ is presented in Appendix A. Brislin (1981) has reported on the effectiveness of the Italian intercultural relations program.

#### Student Comparison

The next major event in the researcher's exploration of cross-national values was to examine comparable samples of Italian and American high school students using the identified eight values (Cherry, 1979). A shift was made from ranking to rating. This choice was made due to the less powerful statistical techniques associated with ipsative data, the lack of sensitivity of ranking to distances between particular values, and to allow for values to be held in equal importance. A five-point Likert scale was developed from Unimportant to Important and the participants were asked to rate the eight values along this scale. The second VQ and the results of this study are presented in Appendix B.

This study provided a tighter research design resulting in an evaluation as to the applicability and meaningfulness of these values in cross-national research. An analysis of variance indicated that the participants were considering the values as distinct. Regardless of the nationality of the rater, each of the eight values was considered as a separate entity with a different degree of importance being assigned to each one. The problems of translation were minimal with the only change having to be made with the value of Skill as there was two alternative Italian words: capacita and abilita.

Abilita was selected as ability seemed closer to the desired meaning than capacity. This maintained the flavor of a more active, doing value than a potential. The results indicated that the Values Questionnaire (VQ) was developed at this point to identify meaningful values across nationalities. In order to reach finer discriminations it was recommended that the rating scale be expanded from five to nine-points.

#### Foreign Language Student Values Exploration

It should be noted that two additional applications of the VQ have been initially explored. The first came as a result of the pretest of the instrument designed for the 1977 student study. The VQ was administered to several sections of Italian language classes at California State University at Chico. The students were asked to rate the values for themselves and as they perceived the Italians living in Italy would rate them. This application has a basic appropriateness as the study of another language should be coupled with a broader understanding of the people from that language community. Since about thirty percent of these students were planning to participate in a summer program in Florence, Italy, the exposure to their own values and the values of Italians seemed pertinent.

After the results were tabulated, the researcher conducted discussions with each section presenting the profiles of each American group with that of their perceived view of the Italians. Since this experiment was not completely analyzed, conclusions are limited to the observations of the researcher and the professor, and comments from the students.

The students were confronted with contradictions between their own value systems, that of the students in general, and those perceived for the Italians. Rokeach (1973) identifies this type of confrontation as most effective in producing motivation for change. Due to the background of the researcher and the professor (who was originally from Italy and also conducted the Florence summer program) the discussions were able to clarify the differences with the addition of anecdotes and cultural facts. The students also examined the possible implications of their perceived views and conflicting value orientations. A sample of this form is presented in Appendix C.

#### Couple Counseling Value Clarification

The second application came while the researcher was working in the Counseling Center at California State University at Chico. The VQ was used with married couples and couples who were pursuing long term intimate relationships. The couples form of the VQ is presented in Appendix D. The couples were asked to rate the eight values for themselves and for their partner. This rating was to be done alone, followed by a discussion of the results in a session with the researcher.

At first it seemed that there should be a high degree of valid ratings for one's partner for these values. Given the level of contact, communication, and interaction over time it seemed reasonable to assume that the two people would have accurate knowledge about each other. This assumption was not borne out in the ratings. There was a definite element of surprise when the ratings were revealed.

Some of the couples finished the ratings, then discussed them prior to the counseling session. The reasons given were curiosity, confidence in their relationship, and that the researcher had indicated that that was all right as long as they did not confer during the ratings. Others chose to keep their ratings confidential until the session. The reasons were to have a mediator present when the findings were displayed and a inferred dictate that the researcher preferred this mode.

The session compared one's own values to one's partner, one's own to perceived partner and one's own to partner perceived. Central issues to the relationship emerged during and after the value session. It was not uncommon for the clients to state, "I never knew you felt this way about yourself, about me. How does your behavior reflect this way of valuing? Why didn't you tell me this was so important (unimportant) to you?" This type of new communication at important levels was particularly true for couples comprised of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

The VQ was expanded, for use in counseling differing background clients, to include the rating of most members of the particular ethnic or cultural groups. Hence the comparisons were expanded to include one's own to one's group, and one's own to partners group. This expansion proved to be particularly relevant when the couple interacted with members from each other's group. Whether this interaction was family, friends, or wider circles, there seemed to be stereotypic value positions which resulted in the formation of attitudes and the exhibition

of behavior reflecting these values. The opportunity to check out these perceptions had the effect of eliminating or reducing false value perceptions and reinforcing correct ones. There was an obvious benefit to the relationship as previously unexplained behavior, attitudes, and values were brought into the overt realm of the relationship. An example of the expanded couples's VQ is presented in Appendix D.

As with the foreign language student VQ, the couples VQ and the expanded couples VQ have not been subjected to rigorous research. This would have to be done before confidence in its administration and use would be recommended. The initial findings indicate that the VQ can be employed as a means for foreign language students to explore their value positions and thereby increase their learning. Furthermore, it seems that it is useful in providing the occasion for couples from similar and different backgrounds to explore and bring to the surface important value positions which are reflected in their interactive patterns, attitudes and behavior.

#### Values In Cross-National Relationships

Important in the study of cross-national value studies is the consideration of the role values take in relationships. What effect do similarities or differences in values have upon one to one or group relations? This has been approached from the singular one-on-one level up to the multinational level.

#### Marriage and Family

Schwab and Schwab (1978) studied the values of American and Japanese marital partners using the Survey of Interpersonal

Values developed by Gordon (1960). They postulated that persons sharing similar values would 1) "derive more satisfaction in their relationship," 2) "experience greater ease of communication," and 3) "have a desire to continue the relationship" (Schwab and Schwab, 1978:157). From previous research they postulated that similarity of values would relate positively to marital satisfaction. They compared the two groups on a self-rating of marital satisfaction and Gordon's categories of support, conformity, recognition, independence, benevolence and leadership.

Major conclusions were supportive of a positive relationship between similarity of values and marital satisfaction. There were also similarities across the cultures. Both the Japanese and Americans rated leadership (husbands higher than wives) and support (wives higher than husbands) significantly ( $p < .01$ ) different within the couples. The remaining four categories were not markedly different between the couples, except for benevolence (wives higher than husbands) for the Americans. Schwab and Schwab (1978:162) suggest "the possibility that there are certain patterns of interpersonal values which contribute to a satisfactory marital relationship and which are equally applicable to couples in more than one culture." They also point out that not all values need to be considered similarly by couples and, in fact, it may be important to maintain differences (such as in the leadership category). Satisfaction in relationships may depend on the holding of certain values in a similar manner and other

values in a differing manner.

Several studies have been conducted with the intent of identifying differences across cultures. One such area of concern is the manner in which different cultures value children. Through the study of relationships with children in various cultures the knowledge about values underlying cultural differences can be expanded.

In a study comparing child-rearing practices in Ethiopia, the Republic of China, Thailand, Israel, India and the United States, Ryback et al. (1980) state that the importance of identifying differences can serve two purposes: testing the extent to which current theories can be applied across cultures, and locating specific cultural practices which are nonexistent in the researcher's own culture. An important caution in making comparisons of this type is the possible introjection of one's values when interpreting the observed or reported behavior.

Exploring the aspects of psychological security, feeding and weaning, toilet training, and socialization, significant differences were found in each category. The researchers wisely point out that the differences obtained cannot be interpreted outside of the culture in which they occur. Finding that Chinese parents "were considered to lack sensitivity to their children's needs" while at the same time "were seen as offering closer proximity between mother and child than any of the other cultures" seems incompatible (Ryback et al., 1980:160). The answer probably lies in the Chinese view of

what 'sensitivity', 'needs', and 'proximity' mean in the structure of Chinese values. It is quite possible that different behaviors represent similar values.

The method employed by Ryback et al. (1980) was a questionnaire consisting of twenty-eight items which could be answered "yes," "no" or "undecided." An example from the category of psychological security was the question, "Is the mother near the young child most of the time?" There are several societies in which a "no" answer to this question would indicate positive psychological security, i.e. raising of infant by grandparents or raising of child by communal group. As this study employed other-culture collaborators to maintain cross-cultural conceptual equivalence, it may be assumed that all cultures were considering "near the child" in a similar way. What cannot be assumed is what "being near" means in one culture as compared to another.

Another study which reinforces the possible inaccuracy of conclusions drawn from other culture observations was performed by Macalandong et al. (1978). By describing the child rearing and bearing practices of Maranao mothers in the southern Philippines, they concluded that, "An individual human life begins in the womb and so do culturally related differences in behavior" (Macalandong et al., 1978:85). The most significant difference was in the area of parental values, specifically the importance of pride in family.

If a child hears an insult which is directed at his family, an explanation must be sought. If the explanation is not in the

form of an apology, violence will follow as, "Such a slight can be reduced only by killing the one who has caused the loss of face" (Macalandong et al., 1978:88). The North American view which contrasts with this thought is epitomized in the colloquialism, "Sticks and stones will break my bones but words will never hurt me." A Turkish saying which is closer to the Maranao view is, "The cut of a knife will heal but the cut of a word lasts forever."

When these values are placed into practice it is found that, Western mothers emphasize "growth and competence" while Maranao parents "concentrate on protection and pride" (Macalandong et al., 1978:96). The authors conclude that, "Maranao practices are coherent and appropriate when they are viewed in this perspective (within Maranao culture), whereas they are neglectful and superstitious if we apply the concepts which guide North American mothers" (Macalandong et al., 1978:96). This conclusion makes the point that observation of behavior within a particular culture must be interpreted within that culture due to the influences starting at birth which are unique to that culture.

#### Educational Settings

In contrasting the value systems between Taiwan and the United States, Scaff and Ting (1972:650) emphasize the importance of finding a "balance between individual freedom and the shared morality which gives every society its stability and provides every individual with a sense of wholeness and personal integration." This emphasis aids in understanding cultural

differences as each society's solution to individual freedom is balanced by shared societal values. Focusing on the influence of Confucianism in the formation and maintenance of Chinese values, they find a striking contrast between the American fostering of 'competition' while the Chinese promote 'cooperation.'

Using the school setting as an example Scaff and Ting (1972) find that

with the Chinese teacher, a helping relationship is consciously taught to children ...( whereas)... in an American school, a helping relationship is assumed to be the responsibility of the adults, who try to relate helpfully to each child but who do not assume that children will be genuinely helpful to each other. (p. 651)

They further observe that "it would be unthinkable to allow a Chinese child to call a classmate a 'dumb-dumb,' or to tease another child about his lack of ability," as is common in American schools (Scaff and Ting, 1972:651).

Although they recognize the influence of Western individualism which is changing certain Chinese orientations, they maintain that the two cultures remain distinct with respect to values central to each society. While they accept the value orientations proposed by Lowe (1969) of 'tradition-oriented' and 'inner-oriented' societies as relating to the Chinese-American contrast, they reject the idea that the tradition-oriented is 'primitive' while the inner-oriented is 'modern' (Scaff and Ting, 1972:650). Clearly the Chinese culture in Taiwan is 'tradition-oriented' and 'modern.' Lowe's assumptions beyond his classifications are correctly described

as another example of a "biased Western view" (Scaff and Ting, 1972:650).

Further support for the position that values differ in their behavioral expression by cultural group is found in the study by Mahoney (1977). Comparing neurotics from the United States and Israel, he was unable to find value agreement on Rokeach's Value Survey. A previous study by Rim (1970) had indicated that neurotics from a college population could be differentiated from the normal respondents in their value systems and by gender. Mahoney was unable to find agreement in the value domain or along gender lines across the two cultures. He concluded that neurosis is culture specific and, therefore, values held will reflect the conflicts within a given culture. Differences in gender will also be reflective of the culture of the respondent.

From the group perspective, Amir et al. (1978) compared the values and group preferences of Jewish youth in Israel from Middle Eastern and Western ethnic backgrounds. Previous research had shown that "the group of higher social status prefers itself and perceives the lower social status group as inferior, while the lower social status group prefers the other group and perceives it as superior" (Amir et al., 1978:101). Assessing high school students from low to high social class families, a questionnaire was constructed to measure ethnic perceptions and preferences.

Four scales were used: selection of friends, participation in activities, semantic differential, and degree

of similarity ("How similar are children whose families come from Rumania and Iraq?"). Their results confirmed the previous research findings in that the Western Jews preferred their own group and were preferred by the Middle Eastern group. However, they also found that different patterns of ethnic attitudes "may be a function of the different levels of social class" in that members of the Middle Eastern group who represented a relatively high level of socioeconomic status "display the same kind of positive attitude toward their own group as do members of the Western group toward their group" (Amir et al., 1978:110).

Although values and attitudes may follow a pattern of the 'inferior' preferring the 'superior', this pattern is affected by socioeconomic status. As members of a minority group increase in socioeconomic status their preference for the majority shifts to own-group preference. In assessing the values of differing groups, consideration should be given to socioeconomic status along with ethnic classification.

### Counseling

One of the areas of relationships in which values play a crucial role is counseling. When the counseling is performed in the cross-cultural milieu the effect of values becomes even more apparent. Sue and Sue (1977) state that

the counselor must take into consideration the interaction of class, language, and culture factors on verbal and nonverbal communications . . . because counseling is a white middle-class activity, the counselor must guard against the possible misinterpretation of behaviors and be aware that many aspects of counseling may be antagonistic to the values held by the client. (p. 427)

To overcome the antagonism or miscommunication that might develop between a counselor and a culturally different client, Sue and Sue recommend that the counselor 1) examine his or her approach with respect to the client's needs and values, 2) become knowledgeable and understanding of various group cultures and experiences, 3) understand the generic characteristics of counseling and 4) recognize the value assumptions inherent in the different schools of counseling. In the counseling relationship different values can result in misinformation, misinterpretation, and missing clients if the counselor is unable to bridge the value gap. Sue and Sue also point out that the informed counselor who accepts their recommendations must not present the same behavior in an opposite manner. To assume that all X-culture members will fit the pattern of that group's culture and experiences is equally as damaging to the counseling relationship as to be unaware of cultural differences. They conclude with the caution that the counselors expanded knowledge and understanding "must not be blindly imposed upon individuals without consideration of their unique attributes" (Sue and Sue, 1977:428).

In further examination of the counseling relationship, Vontress (1974) points out that even if the counselor is able

to surmount the values gap in the therapeutic environment, the remaining society in which the client interacts will be unchanged. The same forces which precipitated the client's need for counseling will continue to exist in the form of conflicting cultural demands and constraints. Rice (1974) describes this process as

when the culturally different client appears before the counselor, it is a specious approach indeed to evaluate his difficulties as 'maladjustment' or 'developmental' and proceed on the assumption that certain psychological ministrations alone will be sufficient to enable him to deal effectively with his problems when his problems are rooted in social institutions that prevent the maximization of his personal potential. (p. 186)

Both Rice and Vontress recommend that the counselor become involved in affecting change in the social sphere as well. Vontress (1974:164) adds that counselor training programs should be addressing this issue as "counselors are products of a culture which has been characterized as racist" ...and... "they, in spite of a few graduate courses in counseling, are shaped by that culture." In evaluating the propensity of academic institutions providing experiences which reflect a concern for the culturally different, Vontress (1974:164) indicates that the provision of "these experiences presuppose that counselor educators and supervisors have achieved enough personal insight and knowledge of minorities to help others develop in the manner suggested."

Unfortunately, Vontress (1974:164) reveals his level of insight as he proposes that counselors "can become better human beings in order to relate more effectively to other human

beings who, through accident of birth are racially and ethnically different. " It is exactly the "accident" mentality that perpetuates a lack of understanding across cultures. Thus, the consequences of cultural value differences are reflected in the one-to-one relationship, institutions in society and the society at large. As the differences increase the potential for misunderstanding, conflict and aggression also rises.

Extending the proposition that cultures maintain separate and distinct value systems, Pearson (1977) examines the consequences of the interaction between varying cultures. His stance is that "all cultures are not compatible with one another; each is based on different sets of values and assumptions about the universe that may contradict others at certain points" (Pearson, 1977:88). To assume that there is a universal set of basic cultural values is false. The consequence of differing values is conflict. His position is that the examination of different cultures must include the consideration of opposing, if not antagonistic values. When two different cultures come into contact, it is assumed that they will possess different value systems. It must also be recognized, according to Pearson, that the consequence of differing values is discordance.

#### General Summary

Consistent recognition is given throughout the literature to the crucial role that values play in interpersonal and international relationships. Unfortunately the existing instruments that have been developed to assess the potency of

values suffer from a Western bias. This bias is reflected in their content by specific references to Western events or concepts, and in their scope by the requirement of certain experiences for the comprehension of the material presented. Most of the studies conducted are limited to English-speaking and educated, easily-accessible samples.

Part of the reason for the paucity of available and useful research in the cross-national values area is the newness of this field. The first comprehensive Handbook for Cross-Cultural Psychology covering the areas of: perspectives, methodology, basic processes, developmental psychology, social psychology, and psychopathology was published in 1981. A review of the literature from 1966 to 1981, conducted by Bibliographic Retrieval Services (1981), requesting sources which combined values, counselor or counselors or counseling, with intercultural or cross-cultural or cross-cultural adjustment yielded only four references in the ERIC system and three references in the Psychological Abstracts. A request for cross-national value studies related to the person-centered approach made by the researcher directly to the Center for the Studies of the Person, La Jolla, California, resulted in the members of the Center, including Carl Rogers, reporting that they were unaware of any research in this area. Furthermore, there is no known study which has utilized Lasswell's (1948) value categories in a cross-national comparison other than the studies conducted by the researcher. The study of values is prolific and time-dated. The study of cross-national values

from a pancultural perspective is on the increase.

This new field is attempting to find value instruments which enable meaningful comparisons between nations and cultures while respecting the particular variations within each. Tomine (1980:35) is confident that this goal is obtainable as she asserts that "...in promoting the basic tenet of the richness in difference, human problems in general can be confronted with an honest appreciation of the uniqueness of the individual." This appreciation of differences requires that cross-national value instruments be developed without the traditional Western bias.

It further requires that the instrument be readily translatable, applicable to individuals with varying levels of education and experience, and suitable for meaningful statistical analysis. It is also indicated that a small number of values should be utilized so that the respondent can more readily perform the assessment task. Effective instruments are needed in many areas of study such as marriage and couple relationships, child rearing practices, counseling, group interaction, and international relations.

### CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This research was concerned with the development of an instrument that could assess the relative importance of etic values within the person-centered community in multinational workshops. This chapter will present a general description of the study, the statistical analysis procedures selected, the format of the workshops, the administration procedures, and the design of the questionnaire.

#### General Description

Utilizing the VQ developed in the Italian and American study (Cherry, 1979) with an expanded rating scale and the addition of short descriptors following each value, translations were prepared in French, German, Italian, Spanish and English employing the back translation method. Brislin (1970) recommends this method of translating from language A to B and then from B to A as the best assurance of an accurate translation. The procedure required that the initial English version of the VQ was presented to a bilingual translator who then translated the VQ into the desired language. This translated VQ was then given to a second bilingual translator who translated the VQ back into English. At this point the two English versions were compared. Any changes that were necessary as a result of discrepancies were then subjected to the same procedure for validation of an accurate translation. Samples of the questionnaires are presented in Appendix E.

The participants in person-centered workshops in Zinal, Switzerland and Marienburg, West Germany were asked to fill out the VQ in August, 1981. The VQ was a two-sided form on which the first side requested one's personal rating of eight values on a nine-point Likert scale ranging from Unimportant to Important. The second side requested one's perception of how most members of one's national group would rate these values. The list of values and descriptors was as follows: Love - caring, affection, intimacy; Power - exerting influence; Human Kindness - concern and doing for others; Health - mental, physical, spiritual; Skill - ability to do things with mind and body; Wealth - goods, services, money; Intelligence - knowledge, understanding; Respect - recognition and treatment of others.

The participants at each workshop were informed that the purpose of the study was to compare personal and national values within the person-centered community. Participation was voluntary and a copy of the results was offered to anyone who signed up at the table where the questionnaires were available. Ninety-two people chose to participate out of a total of 188 attending both workshops. There were twenty questionnaires turned in that were incomplete leaving seventy-two for analysis. Sixty-one people signed up for a copy of the results. The nations represented in the questionnaires were: Belgium; Canada; Denmark; England; France; Greece; Holland; Israel; Italy; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Scotland; Spain; Switzerland; U.S.A.; West Germany. Appendix F presents the entire population of both workshops by gender, age, and country;

and research participants by occupation and country.

#### Statistical Analysis Procedures

An analysis of variance was performed to test the difference between the values and between personal and national ratings. A 2 X 8 factorial design was used with two levels of assessment (personal and national) and eight levels of values (respect, intelligence, wealth, skill, health, human kindness, power, and love). There were sixteen scores per participant. Following the analysis of variance, a Newman-Keuls post hoc comparison of cell means was performed to determine the differences between and within personal and national ratings for each of the eight values. Then, a Pearson product-moment correlation was conducted to assess the similarities between the values, the personal, and the national ratings.

#### Workshop Format: Data Request

The format of both workshops was similar. This format included the initial use of a large "community group" which consisted of the entire population. As the workshop and interests developed, there were smaller divisions of the population into topical interest groups and personal support groups. The researcher presented the community group with the request for all to participate in this study after the workshops had been underway for several days. This choice in time of request was made to allow for the researcher to be somewhat known by the community, thus hopefully insuring a wider participation base. The request was presented as follows:

I am completing my Ph.D. studies. The topic I have chosen for my thesis is cross-national values. I would like to study the values of the participants from many different nations in person-centered workshops. I have selected eight values which I am asking you to rate on a scale from Unimportant to Important. (Showing copy of VQ). I am asking for two ratings; one for yourself, the way you feel personally about these values; and one for your national group, the way you perceive most members of your national group would rate these values. For me this would mean my personal rating on this side and my perception of most Americans on this side. The form takes about ten minutes to complete. Of course some of you may take lesser or longer time. For those of you that choose to fill out the form I appreciate your assistance in helping me with my study. For those of you that choose not to participate, I respect your choice. The forms are located on the table outside this meeting room. There are forms in English, German, Spanish, French and Italian. I have also provided a sign-up sheet for any of you that are interested in the results of this study. If you are interested just sign your name and I will send you a copy when I am finished. Any questions? Thank you for your help.

This presentation was orally translated into German and French, sentence by sentence, while it was being delivered. The researcher stood by the table immediately after the meeting in which the request was made to answer any questions and to remind the participants that the forms were there.

#### Questionnaire Completion

The questionnaires were filled out by the participants over the next three days with the completed forms being deposited in a receptacle located on the form table and labeled "completed questionnaires". The time of completion is somewhat difficult to determine as many of the participants completed them in their rooms. From reported feedback and researcher

observation, the average time was ten minutes with some only taking five minutes and some taking over an hour. The level of motivation for those who chose to participate was judged to be high. This judgment is based upon the number who signed up for copies of the results (61 out of 92), the written comments on the questionnaires, and the personal communications with the researcher.

It was brought to the attention of the researcher that at the first workshop the French version of the VQ was missing one value on the personal rating side. Unfortunately this mistake was noticed too late to contact the people who had filled out this form. Some of the French participants noticed this omission on their own and filled in the missing value and rated it. This eliminated twelve of the French participants. An additional eight forms were incomplete either due to the omission of one or more values, or the lack of demographic information. The total of incomplete forms was twenty.

The only question concerning the form itself that occurred was clarification of national group. "When you say members of my national group what do you mean?" This was answered by stating, "For me that would be American, for you Italian, French, the nationality of the person asking the question." Sometimes this initial question was followed by, "Well, I have lived in many countries, was originally from X and now live in Y." The response given was for the persons to answer for the nation from which they held a passport. Fortunately there was no one who held dual citizenship for which this presented a

problem.

### Questionnaire Design

The Values Questionnaire (VQ) was designed to provide for maximum ease of administration with sufficient detail to collect the necessary data. The directions state the nature of the task (rating values on a scale of importance), the purpose of the VQ (to determine the importance placed on the values), and the method by which choices are indicated (placing a circle around the rating selected). To avoid or reduce instruction bias the first part of the directions refer to the scale by "important or unimportant," while the second reference reverses the order to "unimportance or importance." Since two ratings are requested, the specific rating request is underlined in each case to distinguish between the two. "You" is underlined for the personal rating and "your national group" is underlined for the national rating.

A nine-point Likert scale was utilized for the rating. The previous study employing a five-point scale recommended that this length scale be used to provide for finer distinctions between the values (Cherry, 1979). Every other point on the scale was labeled to allow for choices throughout the range from Unimportant to Important. The scale was constructed so that as the numerical rating increased so did the level of importance. This choice was made as the national groups involved were familiar with this system of numerical/categorical relationships. The procedure of reversing the rating scale to avoid response sets was not used on the basis of maintaining

clarity. To also ask for ratings in which the importance decreased as the numerical values increased was considered to be adding confusion to the rating task. This decision was also based on the size of the VQ. Had the VQ been a 100 item instrument, reversing the rating scale would have been more highly considered.

The eight values were randomized to determine the order of presentation on the VQ. The result of the randomization was: Love, Power, Human Kindness, Health, Skill, Wealth, Intelligence, and Respect. This order was maintained for both the personal and national ratings on all forms. Consideration was given to reversing the order for one-half of the forms; however, the administration process did not allow for this control on response sets. Since the forms were placed on a table unattended, there was no assurance that proper distribution procedures would be followed. Furthermore, it was decided that by maintaining the same order, less confusion would be introduced. Given the setting of five different languages and seventeen different countries, it seemed appropriate that the VQ looked the same to each participant.

The order of rating tasks was to identify personal values first followed by national group values. This selected order was maintained for all forms to provide continuity. The choice of the personal rating first was to provide the participant the opportunity to express his or her own opinions initially, then she or he would be more apt to provide a national group perspective that was less influenced by personal views.

Certainly the opposite could be argued that just having given a personal view would remain fresh in the person's mind and therefore influence the national group rating. To caution against this effect, the directions specifically state, "You may feel one way which might agree or differ with what most others would feel. Here, you should give your judgment of the importance or unimportance most members of your national group place on these values." The intent of this design is to allow for the participant to make a separate judgment from personal to national. This does not preclude the possibility that both ratings would be identical. It, rather, allows for a variance of opinion should one exist. Precautions that were taken to insure independence between the personal and national ratings included: placing the personal rating first, underlining the perspective being rated, stating in the directions the judgment being requested, and placing the personal rating on one side of the sheet with the national group rating on the other.

In addition to the values listed, short descriptors were added to clarify the intent of each value. For example, Love were further clarified by the descriptors: caring, affection, intimacy. The remainder of the values and their descriptors was as follows: Power - exerting influence; Human Kindness - concern and doing for others; Health - mental, physical, spiritual; Skill - ability to do things with mind and body; Wealth - goods, services, money; Intelligence - knowledge, understanding; Respect - recognition and treatment of others. It was acknowledged that agreement as to the accuracy of the

descriptors would vary from person to person and value to value. This variance was precisely the reason for the descriptor inclusion. Since reasonably there could not be universal agreement upon the meaning of Health, it seemed appropriate to add "physical, mental, spiritual" to reduce the wide range of possible responses to a more limited and shared context. Although there was no assurance that any one participant would agree with the descriptors as accurately defining a particular value, the inclusion of the descriptors did provide the opportunity for a better assurance that each participant was rating a similar context with respect to each value. Rokeach (1973) utilizes descriptors in this same manner.

Two additional measures were taken for ease of administration. The first was to place the rating scale in vertical alignment with the numerical ratings for each value. This provided the participant uniformity of rating tasks as well as a constant reference to the scale. The second was the addition of the phrase, "PLEASE TURN OVER" at the bottom of the personal rating side of the sheet. This inclusion was to insure that both sides of the form were filled out.

The only other information requested on the VQ was demographic. The participants were requested to fill in their occupation and citizenship. The occupation was requested to be able to identify the proportion of participants active in the helping professions. This would include educators, psychologists, social workers, community action workers and students. This identification was sought as a specific focus

of this study was to ascertain the values of persons involved in social science endeavors. The identification of a specific occupational group allowed for the possibility of more in-depth knowledge of cultural segments which could then be analysed within and across national groups.

The request for citizenship was to identify the national group of the participant. Citizenship was chosen in lieu of nationality as this corresponded to the terminology utilized on passports. In addition, nationality might have been answered from an ethnic perspective instead of referring to the national group. Hence, a Swiss citizen might have responded French to nationality and Swiss to citizenship. Since the focus of the national group rating was country rather than other identifications, citizenship was the proper choice.

Consideration was given to asking for both citizenship and nationality to acquire more information. This was not implemented due to the fact that the only occasion for Europeans being asked for both is on documents relating to Eastern European countries. The researcher did not want to provide an association between the VQ and Eastern European country policies.

### Hypotheses

The following section restates the hypotheses and the statistical procedures used to test them.

### Hypothesis I

There will be a significant difference between the eight values in their importance rating. Love, power, human kindness, health, skill, wealth, intelligence and respect are distinct values.

To test this hypothesis, the VQ was administered to the participants of the person-centered workshops in the sample group. The resulting group data was used in an analysis of variance. The main effect of Values was examined for significance. If the resulting level of significance was at the .01 level, the hypothesis was accepted (Guilford, 1973).

### Hypotheses II

There will be a significant difference between personal and national group ratings of importance for the eight values. Personal value importance differs from national group value importance.

To test this hypothesis, the VQ was administered to the sample group. The resulting group data was used in an analysis of variance. The main effect of Assessment was examined along with the interaction term of Assessment X Values for significance. If the resulting levels of significance were at the .01 level, the hypothesis was accepted (Guilford, 1973).

### Post Hoc Analysis

Following the analysis of variance, if the levels of significance were at the .01 level, the group data was examined by a Newman-Keuls (NK) post hoc comparison of cell means and a Pearson product-moment correlation. The NK compared all

possible pairs of group means holding the experimentwise error rate to  $p < .05$  and  $p < .01$  for each comparison resulting in the identification of significant group mean differences at the .05 and .01 levels. The Pearson r's were examined at the .01 level for significance using a two-tailed t test of significance resulting in the identification of group means that were significantly correlated at the .01 level (Kirk, 1968; Winer, 1971; Edwards, 1972).

#### Summary

The Values Questionnaire (VQ) was developed using the design procedures delineated in this chapter. The VQ was administered within the described settings and following the presentation format as stated.

Previous studies with their associated recommendations and implications as reviewed in Chapter II formed the basis for the development of the VQ. Statistical measures were selected to determine the adequacy of the VQ with regard to assessing distinct values as well as the differences and similarities between and within the personal and national group ratings.

## CHAPTER IV DATA PRESENTATION

This chapter presents the results obtained from the administration of the Values Questionnaire.

### Analysis of Variance

Table 1 presents the analysis of variance for the personal, national assessments, and the eight values. Regardless of which value was being rated there was a significant difference ( $p < .001$ ) between the personal and national assessments. This generally indicates that these research participants from person-centered communities considered their personal value importance as significantly different than the importance most other members of their national group would place on these values. Specific support is given to the personal/national difference by examining the interaction term (Assessment X Values) which compared the personal and national assessments within the eight values. Considering each particular value these communities maintained a significant difference ( $p < .001$ ) between the level of importance assessed to personal and that assessed to national group.

The eight values were considered by these communities to be distinct entities. Regardless of whether a personal or national group assessment was being given, there was a significant difference ( $p < .001$ ) between the eight values. This indicates that these values were meaningful to these participants to the extent that they were able to differentiate between them. This finding also suggests that this instrument is capable of

identifying levels of value importance in a variety of national groups from both a personal and a national group perspective.

#### Newman-Keuls

Table 2 presents the Newman-Keuls post hoc comparison of cell means. Comparing the personal level of importance with that attributed to most members of one's national group for each value, there were significant differences for all of the values except Skill and Intelligence. For the values of Love, Respect, Human Kindness and Health, the personal ratings were significantly higher ( $p < .01$ ). The ratings for one's national group were significantly higher ( $p < .01$ ) for the values of Wealth and Power. This indicates that the intrapersonal (health) and interpersonal (love, respect, human kindness) values are more highly regarded personally by these participants than they perceive most other members of their national group to regard them. Most other members of their national group are judged to place a higher importance on less personal values indicating unequal relationships (wealth, power). In the intellectual (intelligence) and performing (skill) sphere there exists more similarity between personal and national group assessments.

#### Personal Ratings

Table 3 depicts the significant and nonsignificant relationships between the eight values for the personal ratings. The values which are connected by the line were found to have a nonsignificant difference in their mean ratings. The values which are not connected by a line were found to have a significant difference between their mean ratings at the .05 or

the .01 level. Wealth and Power were rated significantly different from all of the other personally rated values. Skill was rated significantly different from Wealth, Power, Health, Respect and Love; and nonsignificantly different from Intelligence and Human Kindness. Intelligence is significantly different from Wealth, Power, Respect and Love; and nonsignificantly different from Skill, Human Kindness and Health. Human Kindness is significantly different from Wealth, Power, and Love; and nonsignificantly different from Skill, Intelligence, Health and Respect. Health is significantly different from Wealth, Power, Skill and Love; and nonsignificantly different from Intelligence, Human Kindness and Respect. Respect is significantly different from Wealth, Power, Skill and Intelligence; and nonsignificantly different from Human Kindness, Health and Love. Love is significantly different from Wealth, Power, Skill, Intelligence, Human Kindness and Health; and nonsignificantly different from Respect. Table 4 shows the level of significance for the differences between the values for the personal ratings.

Wealth and power clearly stand out as rated differently from all of the other personal values. The research participants viewed their personal value systems as holding these values in a prominently lower position compared to the remaining values. The values of Intelligence, Human Kindness and Health share meanings with two other values. Love only shares this relationship with Respect. Wealth and Power do not share with any of the other values.

### National Group Ratings

Turning to the ratings for the national group, Wealth and Power rise to the top of the value ratings and are linked together. Table 5 shows the significant and nonsignificant relationships for the eight values for the national group. Respect stands alone as the single value which was rated as significantly different from all the other national group values. Human Kindness was rated significantly different from Respect, Health, Intelligence, Skill, Power and Wealth; and nonsignificantly different from Love. Love was rated as significantly different from Respect, Power and Wealth; and nonsignificantly different from Human Kindness, Health, Intelligence and Skill. Health was rated as significantly different from Respect, Human Kindness, and Wealth; and nonsignificantly different from Love, Intelligence, Skill and Power. Intelligence was rated as significantly different from Respect, Human Kindness and Wealth; and nonsignificantly different from Love, Health, Skill and Power. Skill was rated as significantly different from Respect, Human Kindness and Wealth; and nonsignificantly different from Love, Health, Intelligence and Power. Power was rated as significantly different from Respect, Human Kindness and Love; and nonsignificantly different from Health, Intelligence, Skill and Wealth. Wealth was rated as significantly different from Respect, Human Kindness, Love, Health, Intelligence and Skill; and nonsignificantly different from Power. Table 6 shows the level of significance for the differences between the values

for the national group ratings.

#### Pearson Product-Moment

Tables 7, 8, and 9 present the Pearson product-moment correlations between and within the personal and national group ratings. There were no significant correlations in the comparison between the personal and national group ratings. The highest correlation in this category was between Human Kindness (personal) and Love (national). The  $r$  for this correlation was .48 which only accounts for twenty-three percent of the common variance (Table 7).

Within the personal ratings, Intelligence and Skill were significantly correlated at the .01 level with a  $r$  of .58 (Table 8). This finding is supported by the nonsignificant difference noted for these values in the Newman-Keuls comparison. Within the national group ratings, Wealth and Power as well as Human Kindness and Respect were significantly correlated at the .01 level. The  $r$ 's for these correlations were .61 and .62 respectively (Table 9). The amount of variance accounted for in the within comparisons was thirty-four percent (personal) and a high of thirty-eight percent (national).

There were only three significant correlations out of a possible eighty-four. There was no systematic manner in which these research participants performed the rating function. The way in which they rated their personal values was not identifiably related to their national group ratings. Within rating tasks, there was no pattern of value importance which

would allow the prediction of the rating of a particular value based on the rating of another value. The strength of the differences noted in the analysis of variance and the Newman-Keuls analyses above are further supported by these findings.

#### Summary

This chapter presents the data collected from the administration of the Values Questionnaire.

The following hypotheses were tested:

**Hypothesis I. There will be a significant difference between the eight values in their importance rating. Love, power, human kindness, health, skill, wealth, intelligence and respect are distinct values.**

This hypothesis was accepted. The main effect of Values in an analysis of variance was significant at the .001 level. In a Newman-Keuls post\_hoc of value means, six of the comparisons were significant at the .05 level, thirty-eight were significant at the .01 level, for a total of forty-four significant differences at out of a possible sixty-four comparisons.

**Hypothesis II. There will be a significant difference between personal and national group ratings of importance for the eight values. Personal value importance differs from national group value importance.**

This hypothesis was accepted. The main effect of Assessment and the interaction term of Assessment X Values in an analysis of variance were significant at the .001 levels. In

a Newman-Keuls post hoc comparison of value means, six of the eight values were significantly different, personal from national group, at the .01 level. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient only identified three significant correlations out of a possible eight-four.

TABLE 1

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR VALUES AND ASSESSMENT (N=72)

Source	MS	df	F
Assessment	36.4063	1	11.4802*
Values	26.8084	7	11.2709*
Assessment X Values	112.7810	7	53.8200*
Error	2.0955	497	

\*p<.001

TABLE 2

## NEWMAN-KEULS POST HOC ANALYSIS COMPARING VALUE MEANS

Value	Personal Mean	National Mean	Difference
Love	8.58	6.74	1.84*
Power	6.03	7.57	1.54*
Human Kindness	7.82	6.39	1.43*
Health	8.01	7.08	.93*
Skill	7.35	7.15	.20
Wealth	4.89	7.72	2.83*
Intelligence	7.5	7.14	.36
Respect	8.26	5.81	2.45*

\*p&lt;.01

TABLE 3

SIGNIFICANT AND NONSIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIPS FOR VALUES  
RATED FROM PERSONAL STANDPOINT

---

Wealth	Power	Skill	Intell- igence	Human Kindness	Health	Respect	Love
--------	-------	-------	-------------------	-------------------	--------	---------	------

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

TABLE 4

**PROBABILITY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VALUES  
FOR PERSONAL RATINGS**

Values	WE	PO	LO	SK	IN	RE	HE	HK
Wealth	XXX	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
Power	.01	XXX	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
Love	.01	.01	XXX	.01	.01	NS	.05	.01
Skill	.01	.01	.01	XXX	NS	.01	.05	NS
Intelligence	.01	.01	.01	NS	XXX	.01	NS	NS
Respect	.01	.01	NS	.01	.01	XXX	NS	NS
Health	.01	.01	.05	.05	NS	NS	XXX	NS
Human Kindness	.01	.01	.01	NS	NS	NS	NS	XXX

.01=p<.01      .05=p<.05      NS=nonsignificant



TABLE 6

PROBABILITY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VALUES  
FOR NATIONAL GROUP RATINGS

Values	RE	HK	WE	PO	LO	HE	SK	IN
Respect	XXX	.05	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01
Human Kindness	.05	XXX	.01	.01	NS	.01	.01	.01
Wealth	.01	.01	XXX	NS	.01	.05	.05	.05
Power	.01	.01	NS	XXX	.01	NS	NS	NS
Love	.01	NS	.01	.01	XXX	NS	NS	NS
Health	.01	.01	.05	NS	NS	XXX	NS	NS
Skill	.01	.01	.05	NS	NS	NS	XXX	NS
Intelligence	.01	.01	.05	NS	NS	NS	NS	XXX

.01=p<.01      .05=p<.05      NS=nonsignificant

TABLE 7

**PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS  
BETWEEN PERSONAL AND NATIONAL GROUP VALUES**

Personal Values	National Group Values							
	LO	PO	HK	HE	SK	WE	IN	RE
Love	.45	.09	.13	.07	.06	.10	.20	-.02
Power	.24	.10	.08	.03	.05	.25	.25	.09
Human Kindness	.48	.05	.27	.14	.13	.06	.18	.19
Health	.26	.16	.16	.25	.20	.16	.25	.17
Skill	.09	.35	-.04	.04	.23	.36	.27	-.12
Wealth	.46	.03	.14	.003	-.05	.18	.12	.10
Intelligence	.25	.24	.16	.06	.08	.26	.06	.09
Respect	.21	.15	.16	-.09	.04	.05	.03	.14

TABLE 8

**PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS  
BETWEEN VALUES FOR PERSONAL RATINGS**

Values	LO	PO	HK	HE	SK	WE	IN	RE
Love	XXX	.09	.30	.26	.08	.23	-.03	.35
Power	.09	XXX	.10	.36	.27	.43	.21	.16
Human Kindness	.30	.10	XXX	.10	.21	.18	.27	.20
Health	.26	.36	.10	XXX	.18	.26	.04	.28
Skill	.08	.27	.21	.18	XXX	.30	.58*	.21
Wealth	.23	.43	.18	.26	.30	XXX	.30	.24
Intelligence	-.03	.21	.27	.04	.58*	.30	XXX	.20
Respect	.35	.16	.20	.28	.21	.24	.20	XXX

\*p<.01

TABLE 9

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS  
 BETWEEN VALUES FOR NATIONAL GROUP RATINGS

Values	LO	PO	HK	HE	SK	WE	IN	RE
Love	XXX	-.14	.36	.08	-.05	-.11	.04	.22
Power	-.14	XXX	-.28	.12	.43	.61*	.33	-.22
Human Kindness	.36	-.28	XXX	.33	.004	-.33	.21	.62*
Health	.08	.12	.33	XXX	.49	-.04	.30	.39
Skill	-.05	.43	.004	.49	XXX	.14	.46	.12
Wealth	-.11	.61*	-.33	-.04	.14	XXX	.33	-.39
Intelligence	.04	.33	.21	.30	.46	.33	XXX	.13
Respect	.22	-.22	.62*	.39	.12	-.39	.13	XXX

\*p<.01

## CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the problems under investigation. The summary addresses the instrument and the sample included in the study. A presentation of the treatment of the data and the major outcomes of the study follows. Next, is a discussion including the hypotheses, limitations and implications. Finally, recommendations for future research are given.

### Summary

#### The Problem

The central issue explored in this study was the development of an instrument that could assess the relative importance of etic values within the person-centered community in multinational settings. Relative importance was assessed by rating etic values from both a personal and a national group perspective. Etic values were defined as values which were considered distinct across both rating perspectives. Results indicated that relative importance assessments were made which distinguished the personal rating perspective from that of the national group. Furthermore, etic values were identified as distinct regardless of the rating perspective.

#### The Instrument

The Values Questionnaire was developed to provide an easily translatable instrument able to assess relative value importance from a personal and a national group perspective. The values were selected on the basis of being meaningful and distinct

across national groups. The rating scale was designed to offer discriminations within a range of importance from Unimportant to Important. Instrument bias was reduced by the randomization of values and the specificity and ordering of rating tasks (personal, national group).

### The Sample

The Values Questionnaire was administered to voluntary participants in person-centered workshops in Zinal, Switzerland and Marienburg, West Germany. A total of ninety-two participants completed the Values Questionnaire.

### Treatment of the Data

An analysis of variance was performed to test the difference between the values and between personal and national group ratings. A 2 X 8 factorial design was used with two levels of assessment (personal, national group) and eight levels of values (respect, intelligence, wealth, skill, health, human kindness, power, love). The differences between the values and the personal and national group ratings were significant at the .001 level.

Following the analysis of variance, a Newman-Keuls post hoc comparison of means was performed to determine significant differences between and within the personal and national group ratings for each value. Comparing the personal rating to the national group rating, six of the eight value means were significantly different at the .01 level (love, power, human kindness, health, wealth, respect). Skill and intelligence were nonsignificantly different. Within the personal rating,

comparing the twenty-eight possible pairs of value means; seven pairs were nonsignificantly different, two pairs were significantly different at the .05 level, and eighteen pairs were significantly different at the .01 level. Within the national group rating, eleven pairs were nonsignificantly different, four were significantly different at the .05 level, and thirteen were significantly different at the .01 level.

Lastly, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the similarities between the values, and the personal and the national ratings. Using a two-tailed  $t$  test of significance, there were no significant correlations between the personal and national group ratings for the eight values. Within the personal ratings, Skill and Intelligence were significantly correlated at the .01 level. Within the national group rating, Power and Wealth as well as Human Kindness and Respect were significantly correlated at the .01 level.

#### Major Outcome of the Investigation

Examination of the results of the analysis of variance demonstrated that the eight values were considered distinct. Viewing the values as a group of concepts, the multinational research participants rated the values as being significantly different one from the other. A significant difference also resulted between the personal and national group ratings. Generally, these multinational research participants report that their personal value importance differs from their national group value importance.

The Newman-Keuls post\_hoc analysis specifically identified Love, Power, Human Kindness, Health, Wealth, and Respect as values with significantly different levels of importance for personal as compared to national group ratings. From the personal perspective, Love, Human Kindness, Health and Respect are more important. When rating the national group, Wealth and Power are more important.

Similarities exist within the personal ratings for Skill and Intelligence, and within the national group ratings for Wealth and Power as well as Respect and Human Kindness. The similarities were evidenced by significant Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients.

### Discussion

The Values Questionnaire was able to assess levels of value importance in multinational settings. The problems of translation were minimal. The values measured were considered as separate entities and received different ratings from personal and national group perspectives. Specific differences that were identified within and between the personal and national group ratings are reflective of the values existing with the person-centered community.

### Hypotheses

The hypotheses and their associated results follow.

Hypothesis I. **There will be a significant difference between the eight values in their importance rating. Love, power, human kindness, health, skill, wealth, intelligence, and respect are distinct values.** This hypothesis was accepted.

The main effect of Values in an analysis of variance was significant at the .001 level. There was a significant difference between the eight values. Multinational research participants attending person-centered workshops considered these values as different regardless of whether they were rating them from a personal or a national group perspective.

**Hypothesis II. There will be a significant difference between personal and national group ratings of importance for the eight values. Personal value importance differs from national group value importance.** This hypothesis was accepted. The main effect of Assessment and the interaction term of Assessment X Values in an analysis of variance were significant at the .001 level. Personal and national group rating perspectives are significantly different for these eight values. Multinational research participants attending person-centered workshops considered their personal value importance as different from their national group value importance.

The Values Questionnaire was able to identify distinct etic values as well as differences between personal and national group perspectives within the person-centered community in multinational settings. This identification occurred through the use of a relative importance assessment technique.

#### Personal and National Group Rating

Wealth and Power are important values for these research participants. In the case of their personal ratings, Wealth

and Power are clearly lower in importance and separate from the rest of their value system. In contrast, Wealth and Power received the two top ratings for the national group. This relationship of being significantly lower in the personal and at the top of the national group indicates that Wealth and Power are divisionary values between the person and the national group.

As these participants construct personal value system importance for these two values, the national group is seen as exactly the opposite. Such construction places a clear division between the person and the national group. The same is true for Love and Respect. At the top of the personal ratings, Love and Respect are linked. The reverse is the case for the national group as Love and Respect are at the bottom, unconnected and separated from the rest of the values.

The implication is not that Wealth and Power are not valued by the person; nor, that Respect is not valued by the national group. What is clear is that Wealth and Power are considered to be separate and less important from a personal standpoint; and, that Respect is likewise considered separate and less important to the national group.

#### Value Ordering

Table 10 lists the personal and national group value ratings in order of importance. It is interesting to note that in the case of the personal rating, Intelligence is valued over Skill; whereas, in the national group rating Skill precedes Intelligence. This may be a reflection of the particular

research participants being largely educated and thus valuing Intelligence more importantly than Skill; yet holding that the remainder of their national group would share the reverse ordering. A similar occurrence of ordering reversal was found in the case of Wealth and Power. For the personal ratings, Power preceded Wealth; for the national group ratings, Wealth was before Power. For the personal rating, exerting influence (power) was more important than goods, services, and money (wealth); whereas for the national group, goods services, and money (wealth) were most important followed by exerting influence (power). Again this may be related to the participant's occupational frame of reference where influence is more prevalent than money, i.e., publishing for educators and psychologists brings more prestige than monetary return.

The ordering reversals examination is not complete without mention of the exact transposition of the top four values for the national group into the bottom four in the personal rating; Wealth, Power, Skill, and Intelligence become Intelligence, Skill, Power, and Wealth. This reverse-order effect tends to reinforce the Newman-Keuls finding of the Wealth-Power significance discussed earlier.

The research participants not only see a difference between themselves and most other members of their national group, they see them as opposite. The values personally held in the least importance are reversed and given the highest importance to the other members of the national group. As one considers oneself to value, one considers one's group to value the exact

opposite. What one considers most important one's group considers least important. What one considers least important one's group considers most important.

#### Limitations and Implications

The degree to which these results represent wider populations is questionable. The sample size is limited. In addition, sixty percent of the participants reported psychology or education as occupational fields. It may be that these results say more about the values of a particular socio-economic group than they are representative of larger populations. This view could be further supported by the fact that considerable time, money and effort was necessary to attend the workshops. The workshop setting could have also influenced the results. The environments were sunny, scenic and serene. All the participants to a degree had accepted the PCA if only for curiosity sake. It may be that demand characteristics of the environment contributed to the personal reports of Love, Respect, and Human Kindness over Wealth and Power.

Even considering the limitations of this study, the sharp contrast between the national group assessment for Wealth and Power and the personal assessment for Love, Respect, and Human Kindness deserves attention. One conclusion is that for these participants there exists a wide discrepancy between that which they hold dear for themselves and that which they assume for the remainder of their national groups. This discrepancy could certainly lead to estrangement and alienation for an individual interacting in a nation whose members place Wealth and Power

over Love, Respect and Human Kindness while the individual holds the opposite value ordering. A more refreshing viewpoint is that many people are sharing values amongst their national group, yet this commonality is not being communicated. If this is the case, then the identification and communication of values within the personal and national context could alleviate misconceptions that are currently serving to divide populations.

It is clear that the VQ was able to identify values, assess importance, and compare personal with national group views. This was done across seventeen national groups in five different languages. Further use of the VQ with varied populations and in different environments will decide its validity as a values tool. It seems apparent that from this initial gathering of information, a next step would be to return to multinational PCA communities and explore the meaning of these results. What do these values really mean to individuals and how do they look in behavior? Is there pancultural PCA agreement about the relationship between Wealth and Power verses Love, Respect, Human Kindness? Is the PCA similar to institutions in its possession of a value system which will be reported by its associates? This last question could present a conflict between the nurturing of the individual and the promulgation of institutional values. This potential conflict lessens if the reported values refer to a process which allows for individual definitions within a shared context. Certainly Love, Respect and Human Kindness could contribute to a nurturing context from which the individual can emerge. This investigation might be a

reflection of shared values which cross national boundaries in a manner that respects the individual and can reduce conflict between and within nations.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered as a result of the present investigation:

1. Return to the person-centered communities in multinational settings and explore the meanings of these eight values. Determine the individual definitions of the values with respect to attitudes and behavior. Identify and implement unobtrusive measures to assess the relationship between reported values and actual behavior. Close the gap between the information obtained from the Values Questionnaire and the individual's attitudes and behavior in society.

2. Revise the Values Questionnaire to separate the importance labels from the numbers on the rating scale. Since every other point on the rating scale was labeled, the possibility existed that these points were more attractive and hence received biased selection during the rating task. Although this was not indicated in this investigation, the separation of the labels would eliminate this bias.

3. Consider administering the Values Questionnaire using Osgood's (1952) Semantic Differential Technique. Construct the Values Questionnaire so that the respondents would rate the values using adjectives as qualifiers. This would allow for the collection of culture specific information and eliminate the rating technique which is unfamiliar to some national

groups.

4. Continue to administer the Values Questionnaire within social science communities such as counselor educators, practicing counselors, and specific counseling orientations (Gestalt, Neurolinguistic Programming, Behaviorist). Compare results with those obtained from the person-centered approach. Increase the knowledge of the value orientations of specific groups of social scientists thereby providing a base to effectively compare values of individuals, groups and nations.

5. Administer the Values Questionnaire to wider populations to determine more clearly the actual levels of value importance held by national groups. Contrast the data obtained from this administration with the views ascribed to the national group by individuals within the person-centered approach community.

TABLE 10

## PERSONAL AND NATIONAL GROUP ORDERED LISTING OF VALUES

---

Order	Personal	National Group
1	Love	Wealth
2	Respect	Power
3	Health	Skill
4	Human Kindness	Intelligence
5	Intelligence	Health
6	Skill	Love
7	Power	Human Kindness
8	Wealth	Respect

---

## Bibliography

- Amir, Y. et al. 1978. Asymmetry, academic status, differentiation, and the ethnic perceptions and preferences of Israeli youth. *Human Relations* 31(2): 99-116.
- Bibliographic Retrieval Services 1981. Offline bibliography prepared for Cherry #5177. Scotia, New York: BRS.
- Bochner, S. 1980. Unobtrusive methods in cross-cultural experimentation. H. Triandis & J. Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology: Methodology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brislin, R. W. 1981. Naples International Relations Program. University of Hawaii: East-West Center.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1981. Personal Communication. University of Hawaii: East-West Center.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1970. Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 1: 185-216.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Lonner, W. J., and Thorndike, R. M. 1973. *Cross-Cultural Research Methods*. New York: John Wiley.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Pederson, P. 1976. *Cross-Cultural Orientation Programs*. New York: Gardner Press.
- Buchanan, W., and Cantril, H. 1953. *How Nations See Each Other*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- Chambers, N. E. and Bagdassaroff, B. J. 1970. An evaluation of the encounter group process through assessment of value shifts and patterns of Black and White educators. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, United States International University.
- Cherry, R. E. 1982. I believe in love but I don't think you do. In J. K. Wood, J. T. Wood & D. Land (Eds.), *Journey: An International Notebook* 1(2): 5.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1979. Comparative cultural value importance between Americans and Italians. Unpublished Masters thesis, California State University at Chico.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1973. Life value and culture shock. In *Mediterranean Intercultural Relations Representative Training*. San Diego: Naval Amphibious School, Coronado.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1972. Personal and group values. In *Intercultural Relations: Vietnam Advisor Training*. San Diego: Naval Amphibious School, Coronado.

- Davidson, A. R. and Thomson, E. 1980. Cross-cultural studies of attitudes and beliefs. In H. Triandis & R. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology: Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Methodology.
- Edwards, A. L. 1972. Experimental Design in Psychological Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Feather, N. T. 1975. Values in Education and Society. New York: Free Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1971. Similarity of value systems as a determinant of educational choice at university level. Australian Journal of Psychology. 23: 201-211.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1970. Value systems in state and church schools. Australian Journal of Psychology 22: 299-313.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Hutton, M. A. 1973. Value systems of students in Papua, New Guinea and Australia. International Journal of Psychology 9(2): 91:104.
- Gillespie, J. and Allport, G. 1955. Youth's outlook on the Future. New York: Doubleday.
- Gordon, L. V. 1964. Survey of Personal Values. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1960. Survey of Interpersonal Values. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Gouldner, A. W. 1969. The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. London: Heinemann.
- Humphrey, R. 1964. Fight the Cold War. Washington, D. C.: American Institutes for Research.
- Kikuchi, A. and Gordon, L. V. 1970. Japanese and American personal values: Some cross-cultural findings. International Journal of Psychology 5: 183-187.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1966. Evaluation and cross-cultural application of a Japanese form of the survey of interpersonal values. Journal of Social Psychology 69: 185-195.
- King, M. J. 1977. Popular culture in cross-cultural perspective. Topics in Culture Learning. 5: 83-91.
- Kitwood, T. M. and Smithers, A. G. 1975. Measurement of human values: An appraisal of the work of Milton Rokeach. Educational Research 17(3): 175-179.

- Klineberg, O., Louis-Guerin, C., Zavalloni, M., and Benbrika, J. 1978. Students, Values and Politics. New York: Free Press.
- Lasswell, H. D. 1948. Power and Personality. New York: Norton.
- Macalandong, R. M. et al. 1978. Protection and pride in Maranao childhood. Journal of Social Psychology 105: 85-97.
- Mahoney, J. 1977. Values and neurosis: a comparison of American and Israeli college students. Journal of Social Psychology 102: 311-312.
- Marsella, A. J. 1980. Madness and culture: exporting the cuckoo's nest. Perspectives, Summer: 30-36.
- Miller, G. A. 1956. The magical number seven plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity of processing information. Psychological Review. 63: 81-97.
- Myrdal, G. 1969. Objectivity in Social Research. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Osgood, C. E. 1974a. Probing subjective culture. Journal of Communication 24: 21-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1974b. Probing subjective culture: Cross-cultural tool-using. Journal of Communication 24: 90-95.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1952. The nature and measurement of meaning. Psychological Bulletin 49: 197-237.
- Pearson, R. P. 1977. Cross-cultural value conflict: Limiting the conception of multicultural education. International Journal of Intercultural Relations 1(2): 88-98.
- Pike, K. L. 1966. Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior. The Hague: Mouton.
- Rice, T. K. 1974. The counselor and the culturally different client. Counseling and Values 18(3): 182:188.
- Rogers, C. R. 1964. The valuing process in the mature person. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 68: 160-167.
- Rokeach, M. 1973. The Nature of Human Values. New York: Free Press.
- Rubin, V. and Zavalloni, M. 1969. We Wish to be Looked Upon. New York: New York Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

- Schaff, M. K. and Ting, M. G. 1972. Fu tao: Guidance in Taiwan seeks a value orientation. *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 50(8): 645-653.
- Schwab, R. and Schwab, E. 1978. Interpersonal values of marital partners. *Journal of Social Psychology* 104: 157-163.
- Rucker, R. W., Brodbeck, C. V. and Arnspiger, J. A. 1969. *Human Values in Education*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt.
- Ryback, D. et al. 1980. Child-rearing practices reported by students in six cultures. *Journal of Social Psychology* 110: 153-162.
- Seeman, M. 1975. Alienation studies. *Annual Review of Sociology* 1: 91-123.
- Simmons, D. D. 1974. Personal values of university students in Mexico and Oregon. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology* 8: 103-110.
- Starr, B. and Wilson, S. 1977. Some epistemological and methodological issues in the design of cross-cultural research. *Topics in Culture Learning* 5: 125-135.
- Sue, D. W. and Sue D. 1977. Barriers to effective cross-cultural counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 24 (5): 420-429.
- Tomine, S. I. 1980. Measuring cultural competence in counselor-trainees: The development of an assessment process. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University.
- Vontress, C. E. 1974. Barriers in cross-cultural counseling. *Counseling and Values* 18(3): 160-165.
- Winer, B. J. 1971. *Statistical Procedures in Experimental Design*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Zavalloni, M. 1980. Values. In H. Triandis & R. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

## **APPENDICES**

## APPENDIX A

## VALUE STATUS QUESTIONNAIRE

Rank the following values as you perceive them in order of importance for Americans and for Italians, Your ranking will indicate your perception of most Americans and most Italians. Using the left margin first, place the number 1 by the value which you feel most Americans hold the highest; the number 2 by the second highest, and so on, until you have ranked all eight values. Next, using the right margin, indicate your perceptions for most Italians by the same method. When you are finished, you should have the numbers 1 through 8 placed by each of the values listed below on the lefthand margin for Americans and on the right-hand margin for Italians.

- RESPECT - THE WAY YOU RECOGNIZE AND TREAT OTHERS
- LOVE - THE DEEP INNER FEELING YOU HAVE FOR OTHERS
- POWER - YOUR INFLUENCE OVER OTHER PEOPLE'S BEHAVIOR
- SKILL - YOUR ABILITY TO DO THINGS WITH YOUR MIND AND BODY
- WEALTH - THE AMOUNT OF GOODS AND SERVICES YOU USE
- INTELLIGENCE - YOUR ABILITY TO RECOGNIZE AND COMPREHEND MEANING
- HUMAN KINDNESS- GIVING UP YOUR PERSONAL SATISFACTION FOR OTHERS
- HEALTH - YOUR MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH

## SCALA DEI VALORI

- Abbiamo qui sotto una lista di valori; leggetela attentamente.
- Adesso elencate questi valori in ordine di importanza numerandoli da 1 a 8 sul lato sinistro del foglio, secondo il Vostro personale giudizio (1 il piu importante, 8 il meno importante).
- Fatto questo, ripetete l'operazione sul lato destro del foglio secondo quello che credete sia il criterio degli Americani. In altre parole, da questa lista dovrebbe apparire se Americani e Italiani diano diversa importanza (o uguale importanza) a taluni valori fondamentali della vita.

RISPETTO - IL MODO DI TRATTARE GLI ALTRI E DI ESSERE TRATTATI  
 AMORE - IL VOSTRO MONDO AFFETTIVO  
 POTERE - L'INFLUENZA ESERCITATA SUGLI ALTRI  
 CAPACITA' - ABILITA' CREATIVA, FISICA E MENTALE  
 RICCHEZZA - LA QUANTITA DI BENI SERVIZI A NOSTRA DISPOSIZIONE  
 INTELLIGENZA- CAPACITA'DI CAPIRE E DI ANALIZZARE  
 ALTRUISMO - RINUNCIA A SODDISFAZIONI PERSOANALI IN FAVOR DI  
 ALTRI  
 SALUTE - FISICA E MENTALE

Per Americani

Rispetto  
 Amore  
 Potere  
 Capacita'  
 Ricchezza  
 Intelligenza  
 Altruismo  
 Salute

Per Italiani

Rispetto  
 Amore  
 Potere  
 Capacita'  
 Ricchezza  
 Intelligenza  
 Altruismo  
 Salute

## SAMPLE OF ITALIAN DISCUSSANTS

(DL = discussion leader; R 1 - R 6 = respondent 1 - 6)

DL: My name is .... and we are here for our Wednesday night discussion. Tonight we are going to discuss the differences and the difficulties between the Americans and the Italian people. For the purpose of the discussion I would like you to say your name and occupation.

R 1: I am .... I am from Naples and I study languages.

R 2: My name is .... I come from Naples and I am studying at the University for lawyer.

R 3: My name is .... I am from Naples and I am a teacher.

R 4: My name is .... and I study medicine at the University.

R 5: I am .... and I am from Naples, I am a biologist working in a laboratory.

R 6: My name is .... I was born in Naples and I work for a cameo factory.

DL: Do you think - for the first question I want to ask you - do you think it is difficult to meet Americans in Naples?

R 1: I think it is difficult to meet Americans in Naples. Apart from the difference of language there is also the difference of where you live. Americans generally have private parks or houses where Italians are not living.

R 2: I think there is a difference between military people and civil people. I think for military people - it is very difficult to meet these people, because they have a very big organization in this town. And they don't have a chance to know the way of life of other peoples. This is a different way from the civil people. I mean that they have more chance to know something of the way of life of the town and of Naples.

R 3: As regards the problem of Americans in Naples, I think it is the same problem for all people living in another town. But for Americans it may be it is more difficult for a historic reason, because they are considered the conquerers in Italy and in Naples too. I think this is a big question that divides American and Neapolitan peoples. I asked some friends of mine about this question and they answered me that the historic question is very, very important.

R 4: Well, I think it is difficult to meet American people as they live in some city within a city. They are on some island, and so it is difficult to meet. There are also other reasons, perhaps there is a difference between tourists and military. For

American military people it is difficult to meet Italian people. When they come to a new country they don't succeed to meet other people, aren't on the same level. OK. Also they think that they are the conquerers. They are the people that bring civilization in each single country. And then Americans and their soldiers think they must meet only other people for to have sexual intercourses. And they stop there. Then I think that their soldiers are educated only for some values. They must believe that the people who live in the country where they go are people that are more inferior. They don't succeed to think that the people whom they meet are also human people. OK. There are also other things, but I continue my discussion afterwards.

R 5: I think it is not difficult to meet Americans in Naples, because there are a lot of Americans in Naples. I think it is much more difficult to meet Americans from the Army - military people, but it depends maybe, because generally in every country the people from the army are closed people; and so the same thing for the armies in Italy. So, just to answer the last question, have you met any Americans who live in Italy - in Naples? I want to say that I was very surprised that I met two young people from the military doing social work in some poor country in Naples, and we work together, and we have very interesting experiences together. They were teaching English to boys; and so I think they fit very well into the town.

R 6: Well, I think there are many reasons. The historical reason is true. Then there are lodging reasons and also educational reasons. Historic reasons because they are considered, as this lady said, many people consider - they still remember when the Americans first came to Naples after the war and they consider them the conquerers. Lodging reasons - I know there is here in Naples a special office that takes care of people who come in Naples, who come to Naples, and they send these people, tell these people where are the apartments that are in their schedules that are all in the same place, in the same area. They don't try to find any building, any apartments in the quarters where the Italians live. They don't try. Then the educational reasons. Many of these Americans, either tourists or military, when they come to Italy they still think Italy is the same Italy they found after the war, the Italy of the poor people, the Italy of the - I don't know how to say - the people without any civilization. And I think before coming to Italy, these military people should - I don't know if they do this - but they should have special classes where they teach these people what they are going to meet and whom they are going to meet.

DL: What do you think are some of the major obstacles for the military people who live here in Naples which make it difficult to become involved with you?

R 1: I think that the biggest obstacle in between the military

living in Naples and that they live - as we said before - in houses that the State has fixed for them. Therefore they are off on an isle just for Americans. And then we think that they have all the NATO shops and all, so they have their personal life there, their contacts with us are always less just for this, because they find it easier to buy things at American shops where they have American sellers and all, and they have their food and their things, and so they have this all near them and don't have to cross the town to find what they want. So the problem, I think, is just that they have all what they need near their homes and they live completely separated from us.

R 3: Then there is also the problem with language I think at the basis. Because, if they want to go to another shop to buy something somewhere in the town, they have to ask and to make differences between American methods and Neapolitan methods; for example for money, for pounding, for weight and so on. It is very difficult and especially when you know that you have to leave within a month, within a year, and it is not necessary for you to learn another way, another language when you have to leave. But this is not right, I think, because if they come here and they want really to make acquaintances and to accustom themselves first of all with the people which they are living with, they have to try, just to try, at least to try to learn the Italian language, because it is not right that we have all to learn English language and they have to know nothing of Italian.

R 2: Well, I think that the biggest difficulty of the military people is probably the big organization, their organization, because this organization does not give any chance to know something of the town, or the Neapolitan people. They have everything, they for instance find the house, they have the hospital - they have everything. So, if they would learn Italian - there is also a special course in Naples to learn the Italian language, I know, for learning the Italian language. So I think they - if they want to know something of the Italian language - they can. Because if they stay in a foreign country, just to hear something, to hear the language, they can understand. Just a little, something simple, at least a few words like "Good morning", "I want to eat", or something.

R 1: I think it would be better if instead of learning Italian when they are already in the foreign country, they should do some classes not only on the civilization of the country where they are going, but also on the language, so that when they arrive here they are completely prepared to live in this foreign country.

R 6: But I think the main problem is that, because - as you say - they live in the city within a city. They want to live outside the town, because they want a place, want a garden like they are used to having in the States. But they must

understand that life here is very different. We don't have single houses. We live in big apartment buildings, and I think they could for these three years or four years they are staying here, they could live the same way we live. And so live in quarters where there are many Italians, in buildings with many Italians. Because I think nobody in Naples has any particular reason not to be friendly with Americans. It is just they don't have the opportunity to do so.

R 4: Well, I think besides the practical obstacles there are also the ideological obstacles. First of all, military people, soldiers, they have to forget all that they learned in military service. OK, I think that during this period some people are educated to hate other people. They are educated to forget the true human values, to forget the true human sentiments. And so, the soldier that lives in a poor country here remains isolated. He can't understand other people before he forgets these things. And so they all drive themselves to drink and give themselves to prostitution. And so, when soldiers find again the right values, the right human values, I think they can learn to stay with other peoples.

R 5: I think that the trouble involved in being introduced to the life of Naples is not just for military people but for all people who come from other countries. It depends on the people themselves. I am sure if someone wants, really wants to be introduced to the life, they can do so, because they must learn the language and they must accept the life of the town, and so he must frequent the plays, the theaters or the concerts. So, just doing the same things that the Neapolitan people are doing, and that is the best way to make acquaintance with the people and to know the Neapolitan people, so that way they can know what Neapolitan people are like, where are the places where some people meet to eat. I think it is very easy if they want, really. So now I believe that really they don't want. They prefer to be enclosed. It is much more easy, it is much more simple, because everything is organized.

R 6: Well, another thing, I think that they have to forget they are not - they have to realize that they are not living in the States. There are some of these Americans who don't realize that they are living in a foreign country. They still think they are living in the States, because they can't give up anything they have in the States, because they have everything they want.

DL: Personally speaking, what do you think the Americans who live in Naples are like? What are some of their character traits?

R 1: I think that Americans living in Naples are just like Americans living in the States. Their life is different, their mentality is different, but their traits are just the same.

are the same as Americans in the States. There is not a difference between Americans in Naples and Americans in the States.

R 6: I think they are good people; well, there might be some worse people like everywhere, but generally I don't think Americans are bad people, but they are maybe more - especially when they are married - I think they are more close to the family than the Italian people. They would never go out and leave their wife and their kids and go out to the movies by themselves like many Italians do. I think they are good people, really. I don't see why they should be different from Americans who live in the States.

R 3: But we have a certain view of Americans given to us by a certain type of literature, written books, articles and so on. Generally speaking we think that Americans are very, very organized, may be they are almost mechanized I can say - and everything they do is planned and they don't have a particular willingness to do something new, something that is out of the logic, their usual way and so on. But I don't think that it is real for Americans living here, because, of course, if they are living in another country they have to change and they can't live with their ideas like in the States.

R 5: Yes. But you know - it may also be very interesting for us to know the ideas of the American people and so they have to show, describe the ideas, but they must be more open and they must consider us. I think we all have to recognize that Americans and Italians, that we have completely different ideas and fields of interest, and because we believe in something in which American people do not believe or - I don't know - so we have to be both open to discussion, and so I think it would be good. They don't have to completely forget their personalities and everything; oh no.

R 3: Well, I don't say they have to forget their life or their ideas that they had in the States - not true. It is logic that they can't forget the life they had for many, many years. But they have to try, to try to know the life of the people with whom they are living and in this case they must have a change of opinions. I don't know if it is right, this expression. But they must try to make acquaintances to know how Neapolitans think and to give their ideas. Maybe it is better, an American idea than an Italian or a Neapolitan idea.

R 4: In a society with a capital view I think it is - are very different values. People believe in production, their work is production. And so people believe in work and in everything that work brings. They don't consider that people die, Vietnamese die, American people die. They believe only in money - in God: God is money for American society.

R 5: I think that will be also true for Italian society. But I

think the money would be God also for a socialistic society.

R 6: I want to tell you a story I remember. There was this little American boy that I was talking to, and I said: "What are you going to do when you will be old?" and he said, that he wants to be a doctor. And I said, "Why do you want to be a doctor?" and he said, "Because I will make lots of money." I think people have to understand that they don't study - they don't go to University to make more money; but they have to understand that they go to University to help other people, to give something to other people, because they are not any better than a worker. They serve the nation, the society in the same way a worker serves the nation or a society. It has to be an interior satisfaction, not a satisfaction because you can make more money. It has to be an interior satisfaction for helping other people, for teaching other people.

DL: Since you brought the point up - what about goals? What important things do you put in life? What do you think is the most important thing for an American in life?

R 6: Well, the most important thing in life is first of all to do something for other people, and I think it should be the same for everybody, Americans and Italians - everybody. Only in this way can we have a better society.

R 3: I agree completely with my friend, because - maybe it is idealistic. It is idealistic, of course, but I know it is idealistic to say that in one's life a person may and must do something for others. Well, he has to do something for others. But I don't think Americans have the same mentality on this point.

R 5: I think, generally, about the life which we live - both Italians and American people - and when I say life, I mean the daily life - I think we are, Italian people are very close to the family. They take care of all, of every relative. It is very important, the relationship with relatives, with friends, with the parents and so on. The same thing does not happen for American people. What I know about American people in Italy or in the States is that they are not so close with relatives, and the relationships are very strained at times, and they are less involved in religious activities. I am talking generally - about the medium (average) people.

R 2: Generally I am talking about what are the most important things for Americans and Italians; I think they differ. For the Italians it is more humanistic interest, for the United States more scientific interest.

R 3: I think that most Americans are very, very realistic. They think that they look in most cases at the real things. They don't take care for anything outside their usual activities of every day. They have certain standardized type of life and

they follow this type of life without going out of it, I think, in most cases. But I don't know really if there are many Americans who live differently. But I think that the majority of Americans has this type of life.

DL: If as an American I came to you and I ask you, how can I meet more Italians if I wanted to be more involved socially and have more things to do within the community? What suggestions could you give me, and are there any good places for meeting more Neapolitans or Italian people?

R 2: Every place. If you really want to know any Italians, a good place could be a bakery or a butchery, because any place you can meet an Italian and you can know and understand Italian life.

R 3: But in this question - if I may say something - you have of course the first and most important question. You have said "if I as an American come to you". This means that you already know and have acquaintance with Italians. I think the most important problem is if you come here and you don't know anyone. That is to say you know no one. You have to make acquaintance with at least one person. When you have made acquaintance with only one person, it will be more and more easy to know an Italian. But the most important question is, if you don't know anyone, in this case it will be more difficult, of course. And I think - and I agree with her - that every place is good. The most important thing is to overcome the diffidence of Italians toward the American people. But to suggest, I may suggest one place: to come here to know Neapolitans.

**ITALIAN AND AMERICAN COMPOSITE VALUE RANKINGS**  
**NAPLES, ITALY (1972 - 1974)**

	Italian for Italian	Italian for American	American for American	American for Italian
Rank				
1	Respect	Respect	Wealth	Love
2	Love	Wealth	Power	Respect
3	Health	Intelligence	Love	Human Kindness
4	Intelligence	Skill	Skill	Skill
5	Skill	Love	Intelligence	Health
6	Wealth	Health	Respect	Wealth
7	Human Kindness	Power	Health	Intelligence
8	Power	Human Kindness	Human Kindness	Power

## APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR VALUES AND CULTURES (N=113)  
ITALIAN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS (Cherry, 1979: 9)

---

Source	MS	df	F
Culture	36.2201	1	22.6853*
Values	9.92066	7	11.2708*
Culture X Values	2.75857	7	3.13399*
Error	.88021	777	

---

\*p&lt;.01

ITALIAN AND AMERICAN STUDENTS ORDERED  
LISTING OF VALUES (Cherry, 1979: 11)

---

Order	Italian	American
1	Love	Love
2	Health	Power - Health
3	Intelligence	
4	Skill	Intelligence
5	Respect	Skill
6	Power	Wealth
7	Wealth	Respect
8	Human Kindness	Human Kindness

---

VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

Below you will find a list of values which you are being asked to rate on a five-point scale from Unimportant to Important. The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how important or unimportant these values are for most Americans. Not all Americans place the same importance on these values; some feel that they are more important, some feel that they are less important. You may feel one way which might agree or differ with what most Americans would feel. Here, you should give your judgment of the importance or unimportance most Americans place on these values.

Record your judgment by making a circle around the number which represents the importance or unimportance for each value listed.

## RESPECT

1	2	3	4	5
Unimportant	Slightly Unimportant	Neither Important Nor Unimportant	Slightly Important	Important

## INTELLIGENCE

1	2	3	4	5
Unimportant	Slightly Unimportant	Neither Important Nor Unimportant	Slightly Important	Important

## WEALTH

1	2	3	4	5
Unimportant	Slightly Unimportant	Neither Important Nor Unimportant	Slightly Important	Important

## SKILL

1	2	3	4	5
Unimportant	Slightly Unimportant	Neither Important Nor Unimportant	Slightly Important	Important

## HEALTH

1	2	3	4	5
Unimportant	Slightly Unimportant	Neither Important Nor Unimportant	Slightly Important	Important

## HUMAN KINDNESS

1	2	3	4	5
Unimportant	Slightly Unimportant	Neither Important Nor Unimportant	Slightly Important	Important

## POWER

1	2	3	4	5
Unimportant	Slightly Unimportant	Neither Important Nor Unimportant	Slightly Important	Important

## LOVE

1	2	3	4	5
Unimportant	Slightly Unimportant	Neither Important Nor Unimportant	Slightly Important	Important

VALORI QUESTIONARIO

Sottoelencata troverai una lista di valori che ti si chiede di classificare, secondo una scala di cinque punti, da non importante ad importante. Lo scopo del questionario e' determinare quanto importanti o non importanti essi siano considerati dalla maggior parte degli Italiani; cio' che tu consideri potrebbe in qualche modo accordarsi o differire da cio' che la maggioranza degli Italiani sente. Qui si domanda il tuo giudizio sull'importanza che gli Italiani danno a tali valori.

Indica il tuo giudizio col fare un cerchio intorno al numero che rappresenta l'importanza o non importanza per ciascun valore.

## AMORE

1	2	3	4	5
non importante	un po' non importante	ne'importante ne' non importante	un po' importante	importante

## POTERE

1	2	3	4	5
non importante	un po' non importante	ne'importante ne' non importante	un po' importante	importante

## GENTILEZZA

1	2	3	4	5
non importante	un po' non importante	ne'importante ne' non importante	un po' importante	importante

## SALUTE

1	2	3	4	5
non importante	un po' non importante	ne'importante ne' non importante	un po' importante	importante

## ABILITA'

1	2	3	4	5
non importante	un po' non importante	ne'importante ne' non importante	un po' importante	importante

## RICCHEZZA

1	2	3	4	5
non importante	un po' non importante	ne'importante ne' non importante	un po' importante	importante

## INTELLIGENZA

1	2	3	4	5
non importante	un po' non importante	ne'importante ne' non importante	un po' importante	importante

## RISPETTO

1	2	3	4	5
non importante	un po' non importante	ne'importante ne' non importante	un po' importante	importante

## APPENDIX C

## VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

Below you will find a list of values which you are being asked to rate on a five-point scale of importance,

5 - Very Important, 4 - Important, 3 - Uncertain,  
2 - Unimportant, 1 - Very Unimportant

Rate the following values as you perceive most Americans hold them. In other words you will be judging how important you feel these values are for most Americans.

Record your perceptions for each value in the space provided to the left of the value list.

\_\_\_ SKILL - your ability to do things with your mind and body

\_\_\_ RESPECT - the way you recognize and treat others

\_\_\_ HEALTH - your mental and physical health

\_\_\_ WEALTH - the amount of goods and services you use

\_\_\_ POWER - your influence over other people's behavior

\_\_\_ HUMAN KINDNESS - giving up your personal satisfaction  
for others

\_\_\_ LOVE - the deep inner feeling you have for others

\_\_\_ INTELLIGENCE - your ability to recognize and comprehend  
meaning

5 - Very Important, 4 - Important, 3 - Uncertain,  
2 - Unimportant, 1 - Very Unimportant

## VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

Below you will find a list of values which you are being asked to rate on a five-point scale of importance,

5 - Very Important, 4 - Important, 3 - Uncertain,  
2 - Unimportant, 1 - Very Unimportant

Rate the following values as you perceive most Italians hold them. In other words you will be judging how important you feel these values are for most Italians.

Record your perceptions for each value in the space provided to the left of the value list.

\_\_\_ SKILL - your ability to do things with your mind and body

\_\_\_ RESPECT - the way you recognize and treat others

\_\_\_ HEALTH - your mental and physical health

\_\_\_ WEALTH - the amount of goods and services you use

\_\_\_ POWER - your influence over other people's behavior

\_\_\_ HUMAN KINDNESS - giving up your personal satisfaction  
for others

\_\_\_ LOVE - the deep inner feeling you have for others

\_\_\_ INTELLIGENCE - your ability to recognize and comprehend  
meaning

5 - Very Important, 4 - Important, 3 - Uncertain,  
2 - Unimportant, 1 - Very Unimportant

## APPENDIX D

## COUPLE'S VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

Rank the following values as you perceive them in order of importance for you and for your partner. Using the left-hand side first, place the number 1 by the value which you feel you hold the highest, the number 2 by the second highest, and so on until you have ranked all eight values. Next, using the righthand side, indicate your perceptions for your partner by the same method. When you are finished, you should have the numbers 1 through 8 placed next to the values listed below on the lefthand side for you and the righthand side for your partner.

YOU		PARTNER
___	RESPECT the way you recognize and treat others	___
___	LOVE the deep inner feeling you have for others	___
___	POWER your influence over other people's behavior	___
___	SKILL your ability to do things with your mind and body	___
___	WEALTH the amount of goods and services you use	___
___	INTELLIGENCE your ability to recognize and comprehend meaning	___
___	HUMAN KINDNESS giving up your personal satisfaction for others	___
___	HEALTH your mental and physical health	___

## COUPLE'S VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

Rank the following values as you perceive them in order of importance for you and for your partner. Using the left-hand side first, place the number 1 by the value which you feel you hold the highest, the number 2 by the second highest, and so on until you have ranked all eight values. Next, using the righthand side, indicate your perceptions for your partner by the same method. When you are finished, you should have the numbers 1 through 8 placed next to the values listed below on the lefthand side for you and the righthand side for your partner.

YOU		PARTNER
___	RESPECT the way you recognize and treat others	___
___	LOVE the deep inner feeling you have for others	___
___	POWER your influence over other people's behavior	___
___	SKILL your ability to do things with your mind and body	___
___	WEALTH the amount of goods and services you use	___
___	INTELLIGENCE your ability to recognize and comprehend meaning	___
___	HUMAN KINDNESS giving up your personal satisfaction for others	___
___	HEALTH your mental and physical health	___

Now rank the values below for your group and your partner's group. Give your impression of the way both your group and your partner's group feel about these values.

YOUR GROUP		PARTNER'S GROUP
___	RESPECT	___
___	LOVE	___
___	POWER	___
___	SKILL	___
___	WEALTH	___
___	INTELLIGENCE	___
___	HUMAN KINDNESS	___
___	HEALTH	___

CITIZENSHIP \_\_\_\_\_

VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

OCCUPATION \_\_\_\_\_

Below you will find a list of values which you are being asked to rate on a nine-point scale from Unimportant to Important. The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine how important or unimportant these values are for you. Consider each value then select the number on the scale which most truly reflects the unimportance or importance you place on that particular value.

Record your judgement by making a circle around the number which represents the importance or unimportance for each value listed.

	RATING SCALE								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Unimportant		Somewhat Unimportant		Neither Important Nor Unimportant		Somewhat Important		Important
<u>LOVE</u> - caring, affection, intimacy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>POWER</u> - exerting influence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>HUMAN KINDNESS</u> - concern and doing for others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>HEALTH</u> - mental, physical, spiritual	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>SKILL</u> - ability to do things with mind and body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>WEALTH</u> - goods, services, money	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>INTELLIGENCE</u> - knowledge, understanding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RESPECT</u> - recognition and treatment of others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

-PLEASE TURN OVER-

VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE

Below you will find a list of values which you are being asked to rate on a nine-point scale from Unimportant to Important. The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine your perception of how most members of your national group would rate these values. Not all members of your national group place the same importance on these values; some feel that they are more important, some feel that they are less important. You may feel one way which might agree or differ with what most others would feel. Here, you should give your judgement of the importance or unimportance most members of your national group place on these values.

Record your judgement by making a circle around the number which represents the importance or unimportance for each value listed.

	<u>RATING SCALE</u>								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Unimportant		Somewhat Unimportant		Neither Important Nor Unimportant		Somewhat Important		Important
<u>LOVE</u> - caring, affection, intimacy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>POWER</u> - exerting influence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>HUMAN KINDNESS</u> - concern and doing for others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>HEALTH</u> - mental, physical, spiritual	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>SKILL</u> - ability to do things with mind and body	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>WEALTH</u> - goods, services, money	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>INTELLIGENCE</u> - knowledge, understanding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RESPECT</u> - recognition and treatment of others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

NATIONALITÉ \_\_\_\_\_

QUESTIONNAIRE DE VALEURS

OCCUPATION \_\_\_\_\_

Vous trouverez ci-dessous une liste de valeurs que nous vous demandons d'évaluer sur une échelle de neuf points, allant de "Sans importance" à "Important". Le but de ce questionnaire est de déterminer l'importance ou le manque d'importance de ces valeurs pour vous, personnellement. Réfléchissez à chacune de ces valeurs, puis choisissez le numéro de l'échelle qui correspond le mieux au degré d'importance que vous donnez à cette valeur particulière.

Inscrivez votre jugement en mettant un cercle autour du chiffre qui représente l'importance ou le manque d'importance de chaque valeur de la liste.

ÉCHELLE D'ÉVALUATION

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Sans importance		Assez peu Important		Ni Important, Ni Sans importance		Assez Important		Important
<u>L'AMOUR</u> - la sollicitude, l'affection, l'intimité	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LE POUVOIR</u> - la capacité d'exercer une influence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LA GENTILLESSE</u> - égards pour autrui et actes de bonté	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LA SANTÉ</u> - mentale, physique, et spirituelle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LE TALENT</u> - l'habileté de l'esprit et du corps	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LA RICHESSE</u> - biens, services, argent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>L'INTELLIGENCE</u> - le savoir et l'entendement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LE RESPECT</u> - le fait d'être considéré et bien traité par les autres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

-TOURNER LA PAGE, S'IL VOUS PLAÎT-

QUESTIONNAIRE DE VALEURS

Vous trouverez ci-dessous une liste de valeurs que nous vous demandons d'évaluer sur une échelle de neuf points, allant de "Sans importance" à "Important". Le but de ce questionnaire est de déterminer votre opinion sur la façon dont la plupart des membres de votre groupe national évaluent ces valeurs. Les membres de votre groupe national ne donnent pas tous la même importance à ces valeurs; certains pensent qu'elles sont plus importantes, d'autres qu'elles sont moins importantes. Votre propre jugement pourrait être soit différent, soit semblable à celui de la majorité des autres. Quoiqu'il en soit, donnez ici votre jugement sur l'importance ou le manque d'importance de ces valeurs pour la majorité des membres de  votre groupe national.

Inscrivez votre jugement en mettant un cercle autour du chiffre qui représente l'importance ou le manque d'importance de chaque valeur de la liste.

	ECHELLE D'EVALUATION								
	1 Sans importance	2	3 Assez peu Important	4	5 Ni important, Ni Sans importance	6	7 Assez Important	8	9 Important
<u>L'AMOUR</u> - la sollicitude, l'affection, l'intimité	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LE POUVOIR</u> - la capacité d'exercer une influence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LA GENTILLESSE</u> - égards pour autrui et actes de bonté	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LA SANTE</u> - mentale, physique, et spirituelle	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LE TALENT</u> - l'habileté de l'esprit et du corps	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LA RICHESSE</u> - biens, services, argent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>L'INTELLIGENCE</u> - le savoir et l'entendement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>LE RESPECT</u> - le fait d'être considéré et bien traité par les autres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

STAATSANGEBÖRIGKEIT \_\_\_\_\_

WERTSKALA-FRAGEBOGEN

BERUF \_\_\_\_\_

Untenstehend finden Sie eine Liste von Worten. Sie werden gebeten, diese Werte in eine 9-Punkte Skala, von unwichtig bis wichtig, einzustufen. Der Zweck dieses Fragebogens ist es zu bestimmen, wie wichtig oder unwichtig diese Werte für Sie sind. Denken Sie über jeden Wert nach und wählen Sie dann die Zahl auf der Skala, die am besten die Wichtigkeit oder Unwichtigkeit, die Sie diesem Wert beimessen, widerspiegelt.

Machen Sie einen Kreis um die Zahl, die Wichtigkeit oder Unwichtigkeit jedes der aufgeführten Werte darstellt.

	BEURTEILUNGSSKALA								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Unwichtig		Etwas Unwichtig		Weder Wichtig Noch Unwichtig		Etwas Wichtig		Wichtig
<u>LIEBE</u> - Fürsorge, Zuneigung, menschliche Nähe	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>MACHT</u> - Einfluss	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>NACHSTENLIEBE</u> - Anteilnahme und Hilfsbereitschaft	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>GESUNDHEIT</u> - geistige, physische, soziale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>PRÄKTISCHE FÄHIGKEITEN</u> - geistige und körperliche	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>WOHLSTAND</u> - Güter, Dienstleistungen, Geld	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>INTELLIGENZ</u> - Wissen, Vorstehen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RESPEKT</u> - Achtung vor anderen Menschen, Behandlung anderer Menschen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

-BITTE UMREHEN-

WERTSKALA-FRAGEBOGEN

Untenstehend finden Sie eine Liste von Werten. Sie werden gebeten, diese Werte in eine 9-Punkte Skala, von unwichtig bis wichtig, einzustufen. Der Zweck dieses Fragebogens ist es, Ihre Auffassung davon, wie die meisten Mitglieder Ihrer nationalen Gruppe diese Werte einstufen würden, zu bestimmen. Nicht alle Mitglieder Ihrer nationalen Gruppe messen diesen Werten die gleiche Bedeutung bei; manche meinen, dass sie wichtiger, andere, dass sie weniger wichtig seien. Ihre Bewertung mag mit der Bewertung der meisten anderen übereinstimmen oder sich davon unterscheiden. Hier sollen Sie beurteilen, für wie wichtig oder unwichtig die meisten Mitglieder Ihrer nationalen Gruppe diese Werte halten.

Machen Sie einen Kreis um die Zahl, die Wichtigkeit oder Unwichtigkeit jedes der aufgeführten Werte darstellt.

	BEURTEILUNGSSKALA								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Unwichtig		Etwas Unwichtig		Weder Wichtig Noch Unwichtig		Etwas Wichtig		Wichtig
<u>LIEBE</u> - Fürsorge, Zuneigung, menschliche Nähe	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>MACHT</u> - Einfluss	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>NACHSTENLIEBE</u> - Anteilnahme und Hilfsbereitschaft	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>GESUNDHEIT</u> - geistige, physische, seelische	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>PRAKTISCHE FÄHIGKEITEN</u> - geistige und körperliche	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>WOHLSTAND</u> - Güter, Dienstleistungen, Geld	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>INTELLIGENZ</u> - Wissen, Verstehen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RESPEKT</u> - Achtung vor anderen Menschen, Behandlung anderer Menschen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

CITTADINANZA \_\_\_\_\_

## VALORI QUESTIONARIO

OCCUPAZIONE \_\_\_\_\_

Sottoelencata troverai una lista di valori che ti si chiede di classificare, secondo una scala di nove punti, da non importante ad importante. Lo scopo del questionario e' determinare quanto importanti o non importanti di questi valori secondo voi. Si consideri ogni valore e poi si scelga il numero che piu esattamente rifletta il proprio parere sull'importanza o non importanza di quel valore.

Indica il tuo giudizio col fare un cerchio intorno al numero che rappresenta l'importanza o non importanza per ciascun valore indicato.

	<u>SCALA</u>								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Non importante	Un po' Non importante			Ne'importante ne' non importante		Un po' Importante		Importante
<u>AMORE</u> - sollecitudine, affetto, intimità	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>POTERE</u> - l'influenza esercitata sugli altri	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>GENTILEZZA</u> - riguardo e buoni azioni per gli altri	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>SALUTE</u> - mentale, fisica, spirituale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>ABILITA'</u> - capacita' creativa, fisica e mentale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RICCHEZZA</u> - beni, servizi, denaro	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>INTELLIGENZA</u> - sapienza, abilita' di comprendere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RISPETTO</u> - riconoscere i diritti degli altri, trattamento degli altri	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

-PER FAVORE RIVOLTARE LA PAGINA-

VALORI QUESTIONARIO

Sottoelencata troverai una lista di valori che ti si chiede di classificare, secondo una scala di nove punti, da non importante ad importante. Lo scopo del questionario e' determinare come voi percepite la reazione della maggior parte dei vostrì connazionali nel valutare questi stessi valori. Non tutti i vostri connazionali mettono la stessa importanza su questi valori; alcuni sentono che essi sono piu' importanti altri sentono che essi sono meno importanti. Tu potresti sentire un modo che potrebbe accordarsi o differire con cio' che la maggior parte dei vostri connazionali sente. Qui, date la vostra opinione di come la pensano i vostrì connazionali riguardo l'importanza dei valori elencati.

Indica il tuo giudizio col fare un cerchio intorno al numero che rappresenta l'importanza o non importanza per ciascun valore indicato.

	SCALA								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Non importante	Un po' Non importante			Ne' importante ne' Non importante		Un po' importante		Importante
<u>AMORE</u> - sollecitudine, affetto, intimità	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>POTERE</u> - l'influenza esercitata sugli altri	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>GENTILEZZA</u> - riguardo e buoni azioni per gli altri	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>SALUTE</u> - mentale, fisica, spirituale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>ABILITA'</u> - capacita' creativa, fisica e mentale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RICCHEZZA</u> - beni, servizi, denaro	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>INTELLIGENZA</u> - sapienza, abilita' di comprendere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RISPETTO</u> - riconoscere i diritti degli altri, trattamento degli altri	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

CUESTIONARIO DE VALORES

CIUDADANÍA \_\_\_\_\_

OCUPACIÓN \_\_\_\_\_

Lo siguiente es una lista de valores los cuales les pedimos clasificar en una escala de nueve puntos de insignificante a importante. El propósito de este cuestionario es determinar cuán importante o insignificante les son estos valores a Uds. Consideren cada valor, luego escojan el número de la escala que verdaderamente refleja la insignificancia o la importancia que Uds. Ponen en ese valor en particular.

Marquen su opinión haciendo un círculo alrededor del número que representa la importancia o insignificancia de cada valor en la lista.

	ESCALA DE CLASIFICACIÓN								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	insignificante	Menos insignificante		Ni importante Ni insignificante		Poco importante		importante	
<u>AMOR</u> - querer, cariño, intimidad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>PODER</u> - ejercer influencia	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>BONDAD HUMANA</u> - interesarse y hacer por otros	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>SALUD</u> - mental, física, espiritual	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>HABILIDAD</u> - talento de hacer cosas con la mente y el cuerpo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RIQUEZA</u> - bienes, servicios, dinero	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>INTELIGENCIA</u> - conocimiento, comprensión	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RESPECTO</u> - reconocimiento y el trato con otros	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

-FAVOR DE VOLTEAR LA PÁGINA-

CUESTIONARIO DE VALORES

Lo siguiente es una lista de valores los cuales los pedimos clasificar en una escala de nueve puntos de insignificante a importante. El propósito de este cuestionario es determinar su percepción de como la mayoría de la gente de su país clasificarían estos valores. No toda la gente de su país dará la misma importancia a estos valores; algunos sienten que son muy importantes, otros sienten que son menos importantes. Lo que sienten puede estar de acuerdo o diferenciar de lo que los demás sienten. Aquí deben dar su opinión sobre la importancia o la insignificancia que la gente de su país ponen en estos valores.

Marquen su opinión haciendo un círculo alrededor del número que representa la importancia o insignificancia de cada valor en la lista.

ESCALA DE CLASIFICACIÓN

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	insignificante		Menos Insignificante		Ni Importante Ni insignificante		Poco Importante		Importante
<u>AMOR</u> - querer, cariño, intimidad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>PODER</u> - ejercer influencia	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>BONDAD HUMANA</u> - interesarse y hacer por otros	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>SALUD</u> - mental, física, espiritual	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>HABILIDAD</u> - talento de hacer cosas con la mente y el cuerpo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RIQUEZA</u> - bienes, servicios, dinero	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>INTELIGENCIA</u> - conocimiento, comprensión	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<u>RESPECTO</u> - reconocimiento y el trato con otros	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

## APPENDIX F

DISTRIBUTION OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS BY  
GENDER, AGE AND COUNTRY

Category	Zinal	Marienburg	Total
Female	71	33	104
Male	61	23	84
0-10	12	-	12
11-20	13	3	16
21-30	19	12	31
31-40	40	24	64
41-50	28	11	39
51-60	17	5	22
61-70	3	1	4
Belgium	3	5	8
Canada	-	1	1
Denmark	-	4	4
England	10	8	18
France	17	1	18
Greece	-	2	2
Holland	1	4	5
Israel	-	3	3
Italy	1	2	3
Norway	-	7	7
Poland	-	2	2
Portugal	2	-	2
Scotland	1	-	1
Spain	3	-	3
Sweden	-	1	1
Switzerland	64	-	64
U.S.A.	24	5	29
West Germany	6	11	17

**DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRE PARTICIPANTS  
BY COUNTRY AND OCCUPATION (N=72)**

---

Country	Occupation
France (3)	Psychology teacher Person-centered therapist trainee Teacher
Italy (3)	Employer "non importante" - not important Banker
Norway (2)	Social worker (2)
Denmark (3)	Psychology, housewife Student, psychology - biochemistry
Israel (3)	Psychologist Counselor Farmer
Poland (2)	Psychotherapist Sociologist
Greece (2)	Musical teacher Psychiatrist
Portugal (1)	Teacher
Spain (2)	Psychologist Professor
Scotland (1)	Teacher
Belgium (2)	Nutritionist Psychologist
Holland (4)	C.P.A. Nurse, student Psychologist Social/organizational worker
West Germany (6)	Student (2) Teacher (2) City inspector Biology student
U. S. A. (18)	Nutritionist Psychotherapist Psychologist Assistant Manager Teacher (2) Counselor educator Guidance counselor Psychologist Professor

Therapist  
 Student (2)  
 Sales  
 Health education; school nurse  
 Bank worker  
 Director boy's ranch  
 Geologist  
 Switzerland (8)  
 Teacher (3)  
 Conjugal counselor  
 Journalist  
 Becoming trainer  
 Certified psychologist  
 Psychologist  
 England (13)  
 Counselor/teacher  
 Student  
 Art restoration  
 Teacher (2)  
 Lecturer in management subjects  
 Student counselor  
 Race relations advisor to the  
     probation service  
 Advice training and administration  
 Youth worker (2)  
 Midwife, and Mother  
 University lecturer

-----

Summary

-Occupations-	-Percentage-
Education	39.5%
Psychology, Counseling	28.4%
Social Service	11.1%
Health	6.2%
	Sub Total      85.2%
Business, government, self-employed	14.8%
	100.0%

---