AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Kaye Glenda Abbott   for the degree of   Master of Science

in College Student Services Administration presented on May 2, 1977

Title: VALUE DIFFERENCES IN UNIVERSITY LIVING GROUPS

Abstract approved: _____ *Redacted for Privacy* _____
                         Dr. J. Roger Penn

The purpose of this study was to explore possible differences in value patterns of students residing in four types of university living environments--residence halls, Greek houses, cooperatives, and off-campus dwellings. The Rokeach Value Survey was utilized as the major measurement tool for identification of the value patterns of students. Within each living group type, 125 males and 125 females were asked to respond to the questionnaire, creating a total random sample of 1,000. The data were collected during Fall Term 1976, on the Oregon State University campus.

The hypotheses considered seven major factors: immediate versus delayed gratification, competence versus religious morality, self-constriction versus self-expansion, social versus personal orientation, societal versus family security, respect versus love, and inner- versus other-directed.

The analysis of variance technique with the F-ratio was used to identify significant differences between the value rankings of students in the four living groups. The level of significance was set

at .01 for all of the tests. Additional analyses of data included comparisons of value rankings of students grouped according to sex, academic major, level of participation in campus activities, political philosophy, hometown size, and geographic region.

The major findings were as follows:

1) As a whole, students rated delayed gratification, self-expansion, personal orientation, family security, love, and inner-directed values higher than the opposite factor poles, respectively.

2) Students from Greek houses tended to place significantly less importance on the delayed gratification values when compared to the other groups.

3) Students who reside in off-campus environments tended to give higher priority to competence values, while members of the university sponsored living groups considered religious morality values more important.

4) When comparisons were made on self-expansion and self-constriction values, it was found that students from cooperatives, ranked expansion values significantly lower than did students from the other three living groups.

5) Students residing in Greek houses ranked family security values significantly higher than did students in the other groups when compared with societal values.

6) Students residing in cooperative and off-campus units tended

to rate love values significantly higher than did Greek or residence hall students, when compared with respect values.

7) Students in residence halls tended to rate inner-directed values significantly lower than did members of the other groups, when compared with other-directed values, while off-campus residents ranked the inner-directed values significantly higher.

8) Comparisons between factors when students were grouped according to sex revealed that females tended to rate delayed gratification, religious morality, societal, and inner-directed values significantly higher than did males.

9) Students who classify themselves as liberals tended to rate societal, competence, and self-expansion values higher than did "middle-of-the-road" or conservative students when contrasted with family security, religious morality, or self-constriction values, respectively.

10) Immediate gratification values were rated higher by students who identified themselves as active in campus events when compared with students who were classified as non-participants.

The results of this study offer a basis for further research on student values, as well as providing those associated with institutions of higher learning information on the value patterns of students who reside in different types of environments.

Value Differences in University Living Groups

by

Kaye Glenda Abbott

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science

Completed May 2, 1977

Commencement June 1977

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Assistant Professor of Education
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of the School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented _____ May 2, 1977 _____

Typed by Opal Grossnicklaus for Kaye Glenda Abbott

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

VALUE DIFFERENCES IN UNIVERSITY LIVING GROUPS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Each fall there is an influx of students entering college for the
first time. Some enter with specific goals, both academic and
personal, but many begin with only a vague notion of their educa-
tional direction. The role of the institution appears to be critical
in providing students a variety of options, not only in curriculum
and career choice, but in lifestyle and social environments. Tradi-
tionally, colleges have had the transmission and shaping of certain
values as one of their tasks (Rokeach, 1973). Level of education has
been identified as a discriminating factor in the value patterns of
adults. Thus, one is led to conclude that higher education nurtures
student values in a manner different from the value development of
members of society who have not been exposed to the collegiate
environment.

At one time, alterations in value patterns were believed to be
a product of the classroom experience and related to academic major.
Studies indicate, however, that such classroom experience does not
provide the impetus for value reorientation (Jacob, 1957). Personal

and social growth of university students stems from a variety of value-laden experiences, many of which may occur in the context of one's living environment (Jacob, 1957).

Although attitude studies have described the perceptions of students regarding university environments, little research has been performed in the area of value measurement among students in various living groups (Schumacher and Todd, 1975). Attitudes, however, depend upon time or situation, while value patterns tend to change under the pressure of a stressful environment. For example, research has revealed that incompatibility of value systems can be a source of friction or conflict between college roommates (Rokeach, 1972). Once a person experiences this tension, he or she is most often motivated to reduce it. In light of this innate need to reduce stress, Norman Feather (1975) has identified several options a person may utilize. First, a person may reorganize his or her value system and conform to the expectations of other residents. Second, an individual may distort the value priorities of the social environment as they appear to be closer to his or her own values. Last, an individual may tolerate a discrepancy in values and sublimate the differences temporarily or ridicule those with opposing values and attempt to change the social environment by influencing important agents within or move to a different environment that is more compatible to one's own value system.

Each year a number of students who leave home in order to attend college select or are placed in a living environment that may cause tension due to the exposure to contrasting value systems. For example, a student who places high priority on privacy and personal values such as wisdom or independence may be placed in a living unit where little or no privacy is possible and where social values such as politeness and friendship are preferred among the residents. Such a situation may not allow for positive growth experiences, either academically or socially, and can result in negative feelings about higher education in general.

A possible solution to this problem is to assess students' values in order to provide a living experience for students that appears to be most appropriate. Insight into the process of matching people with similar value systems is presented in an account by Hunt (1971):

> any discrepancy between central processes and circumstances beyond the limits of an organism's capacity for accommodation evokes distress and avoidance, while any discrepancy within the limits of an organism's capacity for accommodation is a source of pleasurable interest or curiosity. . . when circumstance and central process match perfectly, the result is stultifying boredom in which development fails (p. 269).

Consequently, the goal would be to find an environment for students that provides a challenge, yet is within the coping capacity of the students. It is rare when the values of individuals residing in living groups are ever acknowledged or discussed, even though such

a factor of college life may be one of the greatest influences in the development of university students. Impetus for value change comes ultimately from the individual student as a result of inspecting and comparing one's own perceived values with those of others (Rokeach, 1973). Without knowledge of other residents' value systems, a student may find it difficult to ascertain differences between his or her own value system and the value systems exhibited by the peer group within the living unit (Feather, 1975). Therefore, the literature suggests that type of environment may directly influence a student's overall attitude toward a learning environment at a particular college or university and the amount of involvement in college-related activities.

This study, then, is concerned with the identification of the value patterns of the students residing in four university living groups--residence halls, Greek houses, cooperatives, and off-campus dwellings. The data that is collected and analyzed should provide a description of the value patterns of students who reside in these four living environments. Within any type of living unit there may be considerable diversity among individual value patterns or, on the other hand, student values may prove to be congruent. Further, hypotheses concerning differences that may exist between the types of living groups will be tested.

Beyond the hypotheses which will be examined, the study will also concern itself with the identification of possible groupings of

values around certain social or personal entities which often are labeled the factor analytic structure of values. Milton Rokeach, a renowned axiologist, has performed extensive studies on possible factor groupings for American society in general. Using Rokeach's seven factors I have developed hypotheses for the study. Because college students tend to be homogeneous in value-ranking patterns when compared to other groups, the factor analytic structure may be different and may therefore provide an alternate base from which to test hypotheses (Jacob, 1957).

The results of this study should assist educators and administrators in gaining greater insight into the university environment and value patterns of students within specific subenvironments. Also, it is hoped that comparisons among these groups will identify similarities and differences in value patterns as exemplified by the living units. Further, the results should enable students to make more appropriate decisions regarding living options, based upon their own needs and perceived value ranking patterns. Last, the results should expand the body of knowledge in psychology and sociology which is concerned with value patterns of young people.

Hypotheses

Previous studies performed by Feldman and Newcomb (1969) and Schumacher and Todd (1975) have been utilized in developing the

specific hypotheses of this study. Since college students are basically homogeneous in their value-ranking patterns, it is appropriate to select general factors around which the values tend to cluster. On this basis the hypotheses were established. Rokeach has identified seven bipolar factors for American society in general which account for 41% of the variance in value ranking patterns. These factors tend to distinguish certain values that are social from those that are personal and others that are moral from those that are competence oriented (Rokeach, 1975). These seven factors were examined in this study due to the fact that the interpretation of the factor comparisons is more meaningful and useful than specific consideration of each individually ranked value. The seven bipolar factors consist of immediate versus delayed gratification, competence versus religious morality, self-constriction versus self-expansion, social versus personal orientation, societal versus family security, respect versus love, and inner- versus other-directed. The factors with their contributing values are presented in Table 12.

The following hypotheses will serve as a focal point for this research:

1) Students who rank immediate gratification values higher than delayed gratification values live in Greek housing units.

2) Students who rank religious-morality values above competence values live in residence halls.

3) Students who rank self-constriction values higher than self-expansion values live in cooperative units.

4) Students who rank social values higher than personal orientation values live in off-campus or residence hall units. Students who rank personal-orientation values higher live in Greek housing units.

5) Students who rank family-security values higher than social values dwell in Greek or cooperative units.

6) Students who rank love values higher than respect values reside in Greek or off-campus housing units.

7) Students who rank inner-directed values higher than other-directed values reside in off-campus environments.

Definitions

For purposes of clarity, the following definitions are provided for the present research study:

1) Value: A type of belief centrally located within one's own moral belief system about how one ought to behave or about some end state of existence (Rokeach, 1968).

2) Attitude: An organization of several beliefs focused on a specific situation or object, predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner (Rokeach, 1968).

3) Belief: A conviction that some mode of conduct or end state

of action is desirable or undesirable (Rokeach, 1973).

4) Terminal Value: A belief that a certain end-state of existence is personally and socially beneficial. The following terminal values have been identified: A Comfortable Life (a prosperous life), An Exciting Life (a stimulating, active life), A Sense of Accomplishment (lasting contribution), A World at Peace (free of war and conflict), A World of Beauty (beauty of nature and the arts), Equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all), Family Security (taking care of loved ones), Freedom (independence, free choice), Happiness (contentedness), Inner-Harmony (freedom from inner conflict), Mature Love (sexual and spiritual intimacy), National Security (protection from attack), Pleasure (an enjoyable, leisurely life), Salvation (saved, eternal life), Self-Respect (self-esteem), Social Recognition (respect admiration), True Friendship (close companionship), Wisdom (a mature understanding of life) (Rokeach, 1968).

5) Instrumental Value: A single belief that a certain mode of conduct is personally and socially preferable in all situations with respect to all objects. The following instrumental values have been identified: Ambitious (hardworking), Broadminded (open-minded), Capable (competent, effective), Cheerful (lighthearted, joyful), Clean

(neat, tidy), Courageous (standing up for your beliefs),
Forgiving (willing to pardon others), Helpful (working for
the welfare of others), Honest (sincere, truthful), Imagina-
tive (daring, creative), Independent (self-reliant, self-
sufficient), Intellectual (intelligent, reflective), Logical
(consistent, rational), Loving (affectionate, tender), Obedi-
ent (dutiful, respectful), polite (courteous, well-mannered),
Responsible (dependable, reliable), Self-controlled (re-
strained, self-disciplined) (Rokeach, 1968).

6) University Living Group: Any type of residence maintained
by a student while attending an institution of higher education
as described by the following four categories: a) Residence
Hall: An on-campus house of 300-400 students, owned,
maintained, and staffed by the university and its appointed
representatives; b) Cooperative: An on-campus hall of
35-80 students, sponsored by the university, where mainte-
nance and staffing is done in conjunction with the student
residents; c) Greek House: An off-campus house accom-
modating 40-70 students, sponsored by the university--the
maintenance, staffing, and regulations must conform to
university policy, but are determined specifically by the
residents; d) Off-campus Dwelling: An off-campus resi-
dential unit such as mobile home, apartment, house, etc.,

for which the university has no responsibility for mainte-

nance, regulations, staffing, etc., except as a defender of

students' rights in regards to discriminatory housing.

7) Student: Any person presently enrolled at Oregon State

University to include married, single, male, female, and

different age and class levels.

8) Bipolar Factor Analytic Structure: The identification of

natural groupings of values indicated by relatively high

absolute correlation contributing to one of the poles of a

specific factor. The structure identified when analyzing

American value systems consisted of seven bipolar factors:

immediate vs. delayed gratification, competence vs. reli-

gious morality, self-constriction vs. self-expansion, societal

vs. family security, respect vs. love, social vs. personal

orientation, and inner-directed vs. other-directed.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History

The study of values is essentially the study of man, stretching across all branches of social sciences. Historically, however, specific value studies have not been considered credible because of their inability to observe value differences directly and their lack of a theoretical framework from which to initiate research. Attempts to develop theory were shunned by social scientists who were concerned with establishing psychology and sociology as fields worthy of scientific study.

This reluctance to study values may also have been due to the definition of the term "value" and related concepts that existed during the early 1900's. In 1918, Thomas and Znaiecki described a value as a sociological concept, a natural object that has acquired social meaning. Campbell, Jones, Gerard, and others felt that value is synonymous with attitude objects (Rokeach, 1968). Not until recent years have value and attitude theory been separated and distinctly defined. The study of attitudes focuses on observable behavior and, therefore, is preferable for research studies, while value has remained a nebulous entity.

Allport (1935) traced three phases of the concept of attitude development. The first occurred in experimental psychology during the late nineteenth century where muscular set and mental/motor attitude were examined. The second period emphasized the unconscious base as studied through psychoanalysis. Finally, in sociology, attitudes were recognized as representations of societal and cultural influences. In 1935, Allport stated that attitude study was "the most distinctive and indispensable concept in American psychology" (p. 157).

With this approach, Allport incorporated Edward Spranger's (1928) theory on "basic types of man" into a measurement scale. Spranger had theorized that each person can be classified by one of the following attitudes: economic, where concerns mainly revolve around self-preservation and freedom from want; aesthetic, where experiences and feelings that are antitheoretical are cherished; social, where there is a desire to imprint one's own values on others and control people; and religious, where a search for the highest values of mental life takes precedence over other endeavors. He thought that each person's character tends to be dominated by one of these classifications. In varying situations, however, an alternate behavior type may prevail. Allport's original measurement scale ascertained the relative importance of the six behavioral approaches. Further revisions of this scale have been made, resulting in one of the most widely used instruments in the study of values.

However, other psychologists and axiologists were not content with relying on Spranger's "basic types of man theory" and developed differing approaches to measuring attitude and value systems. Gradually, such individuals began to move away from the sole consideration of attitudes and attempted to define value. One such theorist, John Dewey (1939), veiwed each person's values as being unique. However, he suggested that an individual could learn how to value. Dewey theorized that values were chosen freely, chosen from among alternatives, and chosen after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative. In addition they provided action for choice and were to be prized, cherished, affirmed (publicly), and repeated. In essence, through his theory, Dewey attempted to identify the elements involved in the process of learning to value.

About the same time that Dewey was studying the process of valuing, Charles Morris (1942) attempted to identify a person's basic mode of conduct as determined by his or her value system. In his theory, values are thought of in three ways: preferred, conceived, and object. He proposed that humans conduct their lives through releasing impulses, controlling impulses, or modifying the world. Each individual possesses a certain ordering of these three components which form seven "paths of life" that are integrated into one's value system. Biological, psychological, social, and ecological factors influence the development of this integrated system. Morris

concluded that a change in one of these domains necessitates a revision in another area.

More recently, Abraham Maslow (1971) observed that axiologists often attempt to construct a value system that is void of outside influences and derived exclusively from one's own nature. He believes that these approaches are inadequate since culture plays a significant role in the process of giving priority to human attitudes and values. Maslow concludes that there is a single ultimate goal toward which all men strive, usually labeled self-actualization or the realization of the potentialities of self. However, lower needs and values such as security and safety, take precedence over the higher needs of love, self-esteem, and self-actualization for most of society. Therefore, only the healthiest and most mature individuals are able to develop beyond basic needs in preference to higher self-actualizing values. The prioritizing of one's needs, then, determines one's values.

Still other axiologists have developed theories and measurement scales based upon their own approaches. For instance, the concept of values having a hierarchy of richness, from intrinsic to extrinsic to systemic, gave impetus to the development of the Hartman Value Inventory (Hartman, 1959). In this scale, a person's capacity to value was compared to a theoretical predetermined score. In another example, Robinson and Shaver (1969) created a measurement tool where three value scales were considered according to values that

are desired, values that ought to be desired, and a mixed conception
of values.

Although each psychologist may approach values differently,
many common or similar theories about values underlie most present
value scales and studies. In short, it can be said that value systems
are definitely hierarchal, provide one with a sense of direction, and
help to guide one's actions. Further, values are everchanging depend-
ing upon one's present state of balance or growth, the influence of
society, and the nature of one's culture. Also, the ability to select
alternative values freely from a common domain and to cherish and
affirm such values is considered an important element in all theories
concerning human values.

Value research, because of the lack of clear definition has been
intertwined with the study of attitude and belief systems. The pre-
ceding discussion reveals the rather fruitless attempts within the last
few decades to delineate among these three categories. Milton
Rokeach (1968), however, has provided a much clearer delineation
between attitudes, values, and beliefs. Originally, Rokeach based
his theory of beliefs on three major assumptions: not all beliefs are
equally important to the individual nor vary along a central dimension;
the more central a belief, the greater the repercussions within the
belief system when the belief is altered; and the more central a belief,
the more it will resist change. He hypothesized that individuals

organize their beliefs on a continuum which is utilized when consider-

ing another person's system of beliefs. When another person exhibits

values that are incongruent with one's own value orientation, one

responds less favorably than to someone who displays a similar belief

system. Such congruence seems to be more powerful than even race

or ethnic similarity and provides an outlook on human nature quite

different from what is normally believed to be valid.

According to Rokeach, a value, then, is a type of belief centrally

located within a belief system. Rokeach is not alone in defining value

in such a manner. Further, a value is a guiding principle for behavior

or an end-state of existence. Values are abstract; therefore, they

represent ideal modes of conduct or end-states of existence.

Rokeach's criteria for the formulation of his theory proposes that

the total number of values possessed by a person is relatively small;

all men possess the same values to different degrees; and values are

organized into value systems. Antecedents of human values can be

traced to culture, society, and its institutions; the consequences of

values will be manifested in all phenomena that social scientists

investigate. In summary, a system of values, by Rokeach's defini-

tion, is a learned organization of principles and rules to help one

select alternatives, resolve conflicts, and make decisions (Rokeach,

1973).

The problem of delineation between values and attitudes has yet

to be resolved. Rokeach defines an attitude as a "relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner" (p. 112). In this context, an attitude refers to an organization of several beliefs around a specific object, while value refers to a single belief independent of situations or objects. Attitudes are infinite in number, observable, and usually not ideals. Even non-human animals display attitudes, but only humans can be described as having values (Rokeach, 1973).

Another difficulty in ideology stems from considering values as social norms. Again, Rokeach clearly separates the two areas. A social norm only refers to a mode of behavior that is consensual and external to the individual. In contrast, a value transcends specific situations, refers to end-states of existence as well as modes of behavior, and is personal and internalized (Rokeach, 1973).

The Measurement of Values in Society   Theor

Rokeach developed a measurement scale for determining value hierarchies with his more specific definition of value. The scale includes two separate value systems, one consisting of instrumental values (guiding principles for behavior), and the other composed of terminal values (end-states of existence). Each has its own rank-ordered structure which is connected functionally and cognitively. This distinction emphasizes a popular theory of psychology--namely,

the means-goal relationship. In this theory, modes of conduct are seen as instrumental in attainment of values concerning goals or end-states. Rokeach defends such a distinction although it may be conceptually difficult to make. He believes that there is a "conceptual advantage to defining all terminal values as referring only to idealized end-states of existence and to defining all instrumental values as referring only to idealized modes of behavior. . . (Rokeach, 1973, p. 12).

After accepting this delineation, we may describe terminal values as being social or personal behavior, depending upon which area has priority. Usually, an increase in either social or personal values will tend to increase the importance of other social or personal values respectively. Instrumental values, on the other hand, identify moral and competence values.

Another basic feature of Rokeach's theory regarding value systems is that values are relatively stable yet can be modified as a result of changes in culture, society, and personal experience. Rokeach argues that there are probably few distinctive human values, the number being limited by man's social and biological make-up. Empirical procedures utilized in developing the measurement tool also indicate that the number of values is fairly restricted (Feather, 1975). A look at previous studies utilizing Rokeach's scale and other value measurements is important to the development of this thesis.

Research indicates that value hierarchies do significantly differ between men and women, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, and among persons varying in age, occupation, and life styles. These value hierarchies usually alter as individuals mature, depending upon the environment and culture within which the individual develops. The basic mechanism involved in this change of value orientation has been identified as the arousal of an affectual state of dissatisfaction (Rokeach, 1974).

Also, developmental patterns indicating the change in relative importance of value types with maturation have been identified by Rokeach. The first pattern of values includes the values of a <u>sense of accomplishment, wisdom, responsible</u> that are ranked low in early adolescence, increase in importance through college years, and decrease in priority through mid-life. The values of <u>imagination, intellectual, logic, and inner harmony</u> follow a similar maturational pattern. <u>A world of beauty, true friendship,</u> and <u>polite</u> are ranked ranked relatively low during early adolescence, decline in importance through college years and level off as having lowest priority in adulthood. A different pattern for an <u>exciting life</u> and <u>pleasure</u> develops when the two values are considered moderately important during early adolescence; decline to lowest in the hierarchy for college students and those older. Conventional values such as <u>clean, forgiving, helpful, cheerful,</u> decrease in adolescence and increase unevenly

with maturation. <u>Salvation</u> becomes increasingly important with age; <u>loving</u> declines linearly from high to low priority.

Some of the patterns discovered by Rokeach indicate a definite drop or increase in certain values during the college years. <u>A world at peace, family security, capable, equality, independent,</u> and <u>na-tional security</u> all decrease rather sharply in traditional college-age individuals, then return to being important in later life. <u>Mature love, self-respect, ambitious,</u> and <u>broadminded</u> are values that increase specifically during college years and level off through adulthood. <u>Honesty</u> and <u>freedom</u> are the most stable values, ranked high across all age group levels. <u>Freedom, happiness, social recognition, cour-age,</u> and <u>self-control</u> also fluctuate little with maturation. Familiar-ity with these developmental patterns provides a base for further research and comparison of value hierarchies.

College Student Value Systems

When considered as a group, college students are basically homogeneous in their value orientation hierarchy. In one of the first extensive studies of college student values, Philip Jacob (1957), con-cluded that students were self-centered, concerned with moral virtues and conforming to the status quo, and confident that their destiny is within their own control. The overall influence of higher education on the value systems of students is one which appears to increase the

homogeneity and consistency of value orientations among graduates

when compared with the value systems of entering freshmen. Gener-

ally, Jacob's research showed that value patterns emphasized the

acceptance of a wide diversity of ideas and beliefs, a self-critical

approach to a national American culture, tolerance of unconventional

behavior in social relations, and a skepticism of the supernatural as

a determining force in life situations. Also, in the same study, it

was concluded that the impetus for change in values does not come

from the formal educational process, but from value-laden personal

experiences (Jacob, 1957).

Recent studies reveal that college students who classify them-

selves as liberals, middle-of-the-roaders, or conservatives do differ

significantly in their value orientations. While liberals value such

ideals as a world at peace, a world of beauty, equality, and wisdom,

conservatives place higher priority on social recognition, ambitious

and logical (Rokeach, 1969). Likewise, in additional research, sig-

nificant differences in value priorities appear between students in

various academic majors. For example, humanities students identi-

fied the most important instrumental values as forgiving, imaginative,

and intellect, with a world of beauty being the most significant ter-

minal value. Students majoring in social and physical sciences rated

a comfortable life relatively higher, along with the instrumental

values of ambitious, self-control and capable (Rokeach, 1973). These

studies indicate that college students do differ in value patterns and may behave differently depending upon their value orientation.

In a related study by Norman Feather (1975) it was found that students' value systems more closely resemble the perceived value systems of the school they enter than the school they decide not to enter. His study also revealed that after two and a half years there was more stability than change among student value patterns. Feather concluded that the most important influence on a student's values was the student's peer group, with the family assuming a secondary reference group role.

From these studies, it would appear that college students' values are relatively stable, but may change depending upon the relative affective satisfaction felt within the primary peer group. Often a student's immediate and major peer group consists of the residents who are in close proximity to each other within one's living unit. Although many studies have been performed analyzing the effects of living situations on students' growth and attitudinal patterns, the research on values of students within different living options is negligible (Schumacher and Todd, 1975). The effect a living situation has on the developmental growth of a student depends greatly upon the value orientation of that student. Because of the difficulties inherent in value measurement, it has been preferable to examine attitudes rather than values.

Value Differences in Life Styles

It was once thought that for society in general, social class values explained the differences in preferred living options. In a more recent study by Cora Marrett (1973), previous experiences were identified as the underlying factors in housing preference. If the previous experience had been positive, individuals felt good about remaining in such residences. Similarly, college students may select living options on the basis of previous experiences, selecting those that have been most satisfying.

One of the most insightful documents on college students was completed by Kenneth Feldman and Theqdore Newcomb (1969). Although their study encompassed all aspects of college life, their data regarding residence groupings provide extensive information on differences among college residential units. The same residence was determined to have differing influence on individual members depending upon the group with which a student actually identified. Although not living in a Greek residence, students may be a member or identify with that type of living unit, thereby exemplifying a similar value system as members of the Greek residence. Students often choose to live together because they share similar personal characteristics.

The following conclusions concerning Greek house residents were drawn from the study by Feldman and Newcomb. Students in

various residences differ in family background, with those affiliated with Greek residences coming from higher socioeconomic families. The residents of Greek houses were generally more self-confident and self-assertive, less liberal in the areas of civil rights, labor, and political-economic issues, less independent or concerned with inter-personal relations, and more likely to change majors than students in residence halls, cooperatives, or off-campus dwellings. In some studies Greeks have been found to be more conservative, more authoritarian and prejudiced, and less academically and intellectually oriented. Such characterization does not always hold, however, especially when campus living units are lumped into traditional categories.

From their study, Feldman and Newcomb also drew some general conclusions about students living in other university environments. They determined that residents of organized living groups tend to be more socially adjusted and participate in campus activities. Students tend to leave groups where they are different from the norm and move to groups which they find more compatible. Students who reside in non-Greek units were more stable in major selection, more likely to develop interest in national and world affairs, more pro-civil rights, and more independent than Greek members. Finally, students who remained in residence halls or apartments were most likely to remain stable in political liberalism when compared with other living group members.

In another study, Schumacher and Todd (1975) surveyed women students residing in three different types of living groups (sororities, residence halls, and off-campus units) in order to identify differences in value hierarchies. The instrumental and terminal values identified by Rokeach were used; the results showed that the three groups differed significantly on elven of the thirty-six ranked values. Students who ranked the values of <u>forgiving, helpful, self-controlled, salvation,</u> and <u>equality</u> relatively high in priority tended to live in residence halls. <u>True friendship</u> and <u>clean</u> best identified women living in sororities, since these values were ranked relatively high. <u>Mature love, independent,</u> and <u>ambitious</u> were also ranked fairly high among sorority members. Those women living in off-campus dwellings were typified by ranking values of <u>happiness, courage, equality, mature love, independent,</u> and <u>ambitious</u> relatively higher than women in the other two living units. Among all three groups, <u>freedom</u> and <u>harmony</u> on the terminal value scale were listed in the top three ranks, while <u>honesty</u> was valued in the top two ranks on the instrumental value scale. The study by Schumacher and Todd included small numbers of students; therefore, the results may be misleading. Only women were included and cooperative housing members were ignored. The research does identify the need for further, more elaborate study in this area.

Since attitude studies often overlap into value theory, it is

necessary to consider relevant research performed to assess such behavior. Attitude studies have identified that the socioeconomic status of a family is significantly related to the decision to be a commuter or resident student (George, 1971).

In a study by Leonard Baird (1969) traits and achievements were compared among students who lived in Greek houses, residence halls, off-campus units, and at home. Few differences between the groups were noted except in the area of social involvement where students residing in Greek houses rated highest. It was determined that students distributed themselves and were selected by groups with certain characteristics. As a result of general homogeneity of the distribution, the different living groups were credited with little impact on students' personal characteristics and achievements.

A few years later, Hountras and Brandt (1970) found that with first semester grades of freshman students, the type of residence was important in determining academic performance. It was found that students who resided in residence halls had earned significantly higher grades than students living at home or off-campus. More recently, a study utilizing the Personal Orientation Inventory, concluded that a greater increase in self-actualization occurred for residence hall students than for off-campus or commuting individuals (Scott, 1976).

Such research is difficult to synthesize into a body of information

that can serve as a basis for the establishment of more beneficial

college environments for students. However, most of the studies

tend to support the theory that a student's residential unit can play a

key role in reinforcing or altering student value systems and there-

fore behavior. Change in values can result in very stressful and

negative situations. Value study among students in university resi-

dences is essential in determining contrasts and similarities among

the value systems reinforced by peers in the different living environ-

ments.

Summary

Numerous methodological problems as well as lack of common

definitions have resulted in a variety of difficulties for those research-

ers studying value systems. As noted earlier, values cannot be easily

identified by behavior patterns and are often difficult to describe.

Traditionally, axiologists have failed to make any delineation between

beliefs, attitudes, and values; therefore, they simply pooled the three

under one group. Thus, only within the last decade have theorists

been willing to discriminate between the concept of values and other

behavioral characteristics. This recent trend has resulted in more

precise measurement tools and further research.

From those studies conducted on the values held by college

students, it can be concluded that as a subgroup of the general

population, college students are generally homogeneous with regard to their value patterns. Further, research has shown that the values of college students change little while they attend college. However, among society in general, education is a factor which does discriminate between various value patterns. For example, college graduates prioritize values differently than non-college graduates; yet research leads us to believe that the formal educational curriculum is not the reason for the difference.

It would be fallacious to assume that the difference in value hierarchies among the less and more educated individuals in our society results from anything other than a combination of factors ranging from socioeconomic background to major or occupation, to residential living experience. Each variable must be examined independently to identify possible differences among individual value patterns. Peer influence on value orientation as associated with various types of living situations is one variable that requires further study. Identification of value differences between various living units or life styles can provide insight to the basic psychological and social needs of students as well as provide a partial explanation regarding adjustment problems students may experience. Such information is critical in the process of providing living situations that compliment the formal educational environment of a college or university.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Description of the Sample

Students attending Oregon State University were used as subjects in this study. Approximately half of the student body of 16,000 students reside in university-owned or controlled dwellings, with the other half living in off-campus housing. University housing includes a residence hall system of 13 halls that accommodates 4,100 students in both single-sex and coed halls, a Greek system consisting of 30 fraternities and 15 sororities which provides residence for 2,000 students, and a cooperative system with six units each for males and females that houses approximately 500 students. For the purpose of this study, off-campus housing includes those dwellings in which students live without parents or guardians and which are not owned or controlled by the university. Because of the variance in the numbers of students residing in the four living groups, a stratified sampling method was used. Both female and male students were included in the sample as well as all class groups, freshman through graduate level. No discrimination was made with regard to age, marital status, race, or reason for selection of a living group.

Special techniques were used to obtain random samples from

each of the eight strata (male and female within each of the four living groups). For both the residence hall and off-campus students a computer program randomly selected 250 students for each respective living unit from available registration lists. An alphabetical listing of students who reside in university cooperatives was secured, and 250 students were selected through the use of a random number table. A roster of all students residing in Greek houses was available through the Office of Student Services. From this list, 250 students were selected randomly. Thus, the total sample size was 1,000 subjects.

Of the 1,000 students sampled, responses were received from 516 (51%) of the subjects. This resulted in a response rate of 61 to 68 replies from each of the strata. Therefore, the number of responses in each strata can be considered equal for the data analysis methods employed in the investigation. Previous calculation using the error of estimation method (Ingram, 1975; with 99% confidence interval and error rate of 1.5) determined that each strata would need a minimum of 60 observations. Since the return rate of each subgroup was similar, one can conclude that any bias resulting from nonparticipants was equally distributed among all strata and need not be considered when analyzing the results.

Descriptive information was gathered to assess a variety of characteristics of the respondents. With regard to age of the respondents, 18% were under 19 years of age; 69% were between 19

and 23 years of age, and 13% were over 23. The majority of the participants identified themselves as previously residing mainly in the Pacific Northwest (65%) and growing up in towns with less than 400,000 people (75%). Seventeen percent of the respondents were Liberal Arts majors; 39% declared science as their major; and 35% identified professional schools as their major. Other descriptive data are included in Appendix B.

Measurement Tools

Each participant in the study was asked to complete a two-part survey. The first portion of the questionnaire consisted of biographical items such as previous living experiences, hometown size, religion, age, political philosophy, and other similar data. The second part of the questionnaire was composed of the Rokeach Value Survey.

The Rokeach Value Survey was developed by Milton Rokeach in 1968 and is used to establish an individual value preference for guiding principles in one's life. Rokeach discriminates between terminal values, those that identify certain end-states of existence, and instrumental values, those that identify preferable modes of conduct for an individual. Each of the two sets of value terms consists of 18 expressions which are ranked in order of importance to the respondent, with one being the most important and 18 being the least

important. It is not the absolute rank of the value that is of interest,
but rather the relative ordering of the values. Each of the 36 values
is socially desirable in our culture so the respondent does not need
to feel that he or she must misrepresent his or her value system.

Test-retest reliabilities have been obtained for each of the lists
for time intervals ranging from three to seven weeks. Terminal
values ranged from .51 for a sense of accomplishment to .88 for
salvation, while instrumental values ranged from .45 for responsible
to .70 for ambitious. The reliability for the total value system was
established by correlating the rankings from test-retest data. Vari-
ous sample sizes, age levels, and time intervals were included in
the evaluation. The lowest reliability of the terminal value scale
was shown to be .62 for seventh graders over a three-week period,
while the highest reliability score was .72 among college students
over a three-week interval.

Factor analysis of matrices of the 36 values reveals low corre-
lation between terminal and instrumental values that may appear to
be congruent, such as mature love (terminal value) and loving
(instrumental value), or salvation and forgiving. Thus, the ranking
of any one of the 36 values is, for practical purposes, unrelated to
the ranking of any other value listed. The factor analytic structure
does indicate, however, that the 36 values are not independent and
that they tend to cluster around certain factors. No factor accounts

for more than eight percent of the variance and all the factors con-
sidered together do not account for more than 41% of the variance.
This leads one to believe that none of the variables appears to mea-
sure the same entity, and the value list cannot be reduced to fewer
values and maintain the same degree of validity and reliability.

Based on his research, Rokeach (1973) asserts that the re-
sponses of those individuals previously surveyed are significantly
predictive of behavior and attitudes. Thus, the survey instrument
is valid. For instance, high rank ordering of the terminal value
salvation has been indicative of church attendance, while ranking
patterns of the terminal values of equality and freedom have predicted
an individual's relative attitudes towards civil rights demonstrations.

Method

Once the students were selected from each of the living groups,
they were sent the questionnaire. A cover letter explained the pur-
pose of the study, gave instructions for completion and return of the
survey, and requested their participation. A self-addressed envelope
was included in order to enable the respondent to return the question-
naire either through the mail or to deposit it in a box located in the
student activities area on campus. Although no individual respond-
ents were identified and the questionnaire was confidential, a coding
system was used to determine who failed to return the survey.

After the initial mailing, a follow-up contact was made with students in order to encourage participation. In some instances it was impossible to contact the original student in the sample since some individuals were no longer students or no longer resided at the address provided. Therefore, additional students from off-campus dwellings were selected at random to participate.

Following the deadline for returning the questionnaires, participant responses were keypunched onto computer cards. Each student was identified by a code number. The responses were punched on three cards. The first card contained the biographical data, and the second and third cards consisted of the value rankings of the terminal and instrumental values.

Data Analysis

The data analysis of the value patterns was performed mainly with the use of the Statistical Interactive Programming System on one of the Oregon State University computers (Rowe and Barnes, 1976). This system is preprogrammed to perform a variety of statistical analyses. For this study, the system was utilized to compute means, variances, and tabulations from groupings, as well as chi-squares, t-tests, analysis of variance, and F-ratios.

Initially, the means for each of the ranked values were obtained for each subgroup of students (male or female, type of living group,

and male or female within each living group). A rank correlation

was performed on these various groups utilizing both Kendall's tau

and Spearman's rho coefficients to determine the degree of correla-

tion between any two of the groups (Snedecor and Cochran, 1967).

A descriptive analysis of the biographical data was carried out to

evaluate the differences and similarities among the participants'

backgrounds.

Testing of the seven hypotheses was performed through analysis

of variance techniques (Neter and Wasserman, 1974). This provided

comparisons of the results in parametric statistics. In previous

analyses of Rokeach value rankings, however, both parametric and

non-parametric tests have proved to reveal similar results. Since

the sample size was adequate and the F-test is considered robust,

precise normality of sample was not a concern when evaluating the

validity of the results.

Because of the specific data grouping requirements of the SIPS

analysis of variance program (each cell must be identical in number

of observations), several adjustments were necessary in order to

secure the F-test ratios on the seven factors. First, mean differ-

ences for each of the eight cells in the two-by-four array (male-

female constituted the vertical cells, with the four living groups

creating the horizontal categories) were computed. By using one-

way and general analysis of variance techniques, the analysis of

variance tables and F-ratios for interaction and significance were obtained. (Refer to Appendix C.) T-tests for comparisons between groups as indicated by the hypothesis were then computed.

A third area of analysis consisted of comparing value ranking patterns of students categorized by biographic information. Here, chi-square tests were used to determine differences in the value factors of students grouped according to academic major, political philosophy, level of participation in campus activities, hometown size, and geographic region.

Lastly, a multivariate analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull Jenkins, Steinbrenner and Bent, 1975) was performed on the 36 values to compare the factor loadings and the factors identified by college student responses with those presented by Rokeach as being typical of American society in general.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This study focused on the value system of college students

residing in four types of university living environments. Seven

hypotheses were tested which concerned possible differences in

value orientations of individuals within the living groups. Data were

collected by means of the Rokeach Value Survey which lists 36 values

to be ranked in order of importance by each respondent. The find-

ings were obtained through a variety of data analysis techniques

employed to describe value rankings, test hypotheses, and factor

analyze the value systems of the respondents.

The results are presented mainly in tabular form with a brief

discussion of the rationale for utilizing a certain statistical technique

and the major findings obtained. Chapter Four includes displays of

the mean rankings of the terminal and instrumental values with cor-

relation coefficients for the various groups as well as results from

tests on the hypotheses. Also presented are other findings such as

differences in the value rankings of students grouped according to

sex, academic major, political philosophy, level of participation in

camps activities, hometown size, and geographic region. The final

portion of the chapter displays the results of the multivariate analysis.

Correlation of Strata

The review of literature has indicated that college students as a subgroup of the general population are a homogeneous group with regard to values held. Results of this study support this fact. According to the value ranks obtained from the data analysis, all four living groups were similar in rating true friendship and happiness as the most important of the terminal values, as well as rating honest, responsible and loving, as the highest instrumental values (see Tables 1 and 2). Those values considered least important were also consistent among all groups with the terminal values of social recognition and national security and the instrumental values of clean and obedient ranked lowest. The relative similarity in ranking of both the least and most important values suggests that college students give a higher priority to personal competence values and a lower priority to societal values. When values were ranked according to sex, similar results were obtained (see Tables 3 and 4).

A correlation matrix was produced which compared all possible combinations of the eight strata (four living groups and male-female within each living group) using Kendall's tau and Spearman's rho coefficients. Although results were similar, Kendall's tau has been utilized as the correlation determinant because of its comparative ease of interpretation. Kendall's tau measures the degree of

concordance of any two values, whereas Spearman's rho offers no easily accessible definition (refer to Tables 5 and 6).

All comparisons revealed a satisfactory to high degree of correlation. Table 5 displays the correlation between the four living groups on both instrumental and terminal values. Table 7 presents the correlations between the sexes within each living group on the two value scales. Those that were lowest in degree of concordance were off-campus females and Greek males as well as female students from cooperatives and Greek males. The correlation for these groups appeared low only in the terminal value comparison. Generally, correlations revealed agreement among all groupings of the students within the living units.

Hypotheses

Each of the hypotheses was tested through parametric statistical methods. Since the F-test resulting from the analysis of variance is considered robust and more powerful than non-parametric tests, it was utilized for the basis of comparison of differences between the groups on the hypotheses factors. Comparison between groups was tested by analysis of variance in order to evaluate where specific differences existed. It should be noted that within any living group there were students who favored both poles of each factor. These poles represent the opposing viewpoints of the seven factors. The

TABLE 1

MEAN RANKS OF INSTRUMENTAL VALUES[1]

Value	Residence Hall		Greek House		Cooperative		Off-Campus	
Honest	1	4. 3	1	4. 52	1	4. 63	1	4. 42
Responsible	2	5. 64	2	5. 79	3	6. 29	2	5. 99
Loving	3	6. 88	3	6. 77	2	5. 82	3	6. 72
Broadminded	5	7. 88	4	7. 56	5	8. 01	4	7. 69
Forgiving	4	7. 82	6	8. 11	4	6. 69	7	8. 72
Self-controlled	7	8. 65	10	9. 38	6	8. 48	8	9. 10
Cheerful	9	9. 35	5	8. 07	8	9. 04	9	9. 24
Independent	8	8. 92	9	9. 09	9	9. 71	5	8. 00
Helpful	6	8. 50	8	9. 04	7	8. 85	11	9. 51
Ambitious	10	9. 47	7	8. 15	10	9. 72	14	10. 51
Capable	11	9. 84	11	9. 60	11	10. 04	6	8. 46
Courageous	13	11. 15	12	10. 45	12	10. 57	13	10. 00
Intellectual	16	11. 67	13	11. 39	14	11. 11	10	9. 25
Logical	14	11. 16	15	11. 73	16	11. 69	12	9. 61
Polite	12	10. 46	14	11. 50	13	10. 86	16	12. 61
Imaginative	15	11. 30	16	11. 85	15	11. 96	15	10. 51
Clean	17	13. 45	17	12. 21	18	12. 85	17	13. 32
Obedient	18	14. 50	18	14. 40	17	12. 70	18	13. 86

[1] The values are listed in rank order for the overall group of college students. The first number in each column is the rank of the value for the group and the second number is the numerical mean rank associated with the value.

TABLE 2

MEAN RANKS OF TERMINAL VALUES[1]

Value	Residence Hall		Greek House		Cooperative		Off-Campus	
True Friendship	1	5. 66	2	6. 00	1	5. 53	2	6. 39
Happiness	2	5. 82	1	5. 46	2	6. 27	1	6. 16
Self-Respect	5	7. 28	3	6. 85	3	6. 83	3	6. 44
Inner Harmony	4	7. 03	4	6. 88	4	6. 95	4	6. 50
Freedom	3	6. 89	5	7. 96	5	7. 06	6	7. 18
Wisdom	6	7. 95	9	8. 58	6	7. 93	5	6. 52
Love	7	8. 50	8	8. 49	9	8. 62	7	7. 27
Family Security	8	9. 03	6	8. 01	8	8. 41	9	8. 47
Sense of Accomplishment	9	9. 23	7	8. 40	10	8. 33	8	8. 27
Exciting Life	10	9. 83	11	9. 96	12	10. 45	10	10. 11
World at Peace	11	10. 30	12	10. 25	11	10. 69	12	10. 99
Comfortable Life	12	10. 33	10	9. 52	15	11. 37	14	11. 00
Equality	13	10. 91	14	10. 81	13	10. 59	11	10. 30
Salvation	16	11. 78	15	11. 39	7	8. 34	16	12. 40
Pleasure	15	11. 48	13	10. 27	16	11. 77	13	10. 95
World of Beauty	14	11. 17	16	12. 28	14	11. 26	15	11. 70
Social Recognition	17	13. 47	17	12. 95	17	14. 06	17	13. 61
National Security	18	14. 44	18	15. 03	18	14. 71	18	14. 48

[1]The terminal values are listed according to the overall ranking by the college students. The first number in each column is the rank order and the second number is the arithmetic average of the living unit.

TABLE 3

MEAN RANKS OF TERMINAL VALUES ACCORDING TO SEX[1]

Value	Sex			
	Male		Female	
True Friendship	2	6. 28	1	5. 51
Happiness	1	5. 91	2	5. 94
Self-respect	4	7. 29	4	6. 41
Inner Harmony	5	7. 30	3	6. 38
Freedom	3	7. 09	5	7. 45
Wisdom	6	7. 69	6	7. 80
Love	7	7. 72	8	8. 72
Family Security	9	8. 79	7	8. 17
Sense of Accomplishment	8	8. 27	9	9. 10
Exciting Life	10	9. 17	14	11. 00
World at Peace	13	10. 99	10	9. 79
Comfortable Life	11	9. 44	15	11. 67
Equality	14	11. 51	11	9. 80
Salvation	15	11. 59	12	10. 36
Pleasure	12	10. 51	16	11. 72
World of Beauty	16	12. 20	13	10. 98
Social Recognition	17	13. 87	17	13. 17
National Security	18	14. 70	18	14. 63

[1]The values are listed according to the overall ranking by college students. The first number in the column is the rank of the value and the second number is the arithmetic mean of the value for the specific category.

TABLE 4

MEAN RANKS OF INSTRUMENTAL VALUES ACCORDING TO SEX[1]

Value	Sex			
	Male		Female	
Honest	1	5.05	1	3.87
Responsible	2	5.93	3	5.93
Loving	3	7.44	2	5.65
Broadminded	4	7.70	5	7.86
Forgiving	6	8.44	4	7.23
Self-controlled	5	8.36	10	9.48
Cheerful	11	9.59	6	8.26
Independent	7	8.94	8	8.91
Helpful	9	9.18	7	8.77
Ambitious	10	9.31	9	9.44
Capable	8	9.01	11	9.96
Courageous	14	10.85	12	10.24
Intellectual	13	10.72	13	10.99
Logical	12	9.80	16	12.29
Polite	16	11.04	14	11.45
Imaginative	15	10.86	15	11.94
Clean	17	12.47	17	13.44
Obedient	18	13.65	18	14.07

[1] The values are listed according to the overall ranking by college students. The first number in the column is the rank of the value and the second number is the arithmetic mean of the value for the specific category.

44

TABLE 5

KENDALL'S TAU CORRELATION OF VALUES[1]

Living Groups

	Residence Hall	Greek House	Cooperative	Off-Campus
Residence Hall	1 / 1			
Greek House	.817 / .804	1 / 1		
Cooperative	.791 / .882	.739 / .843	1 / 1	
Off-Campus	.869 / .673	.817 / .712	.765 / .712	1 / 1

KEY: The upper right-hand value is the correlation for terminal values and the lower left-hand number is the correlation for instrumental values.

[1] For the n=18, p=.025, the correlation coefficient for the groups must be greater than .346.

TABLE 6

KENDALL'S TAU CORRELATION OF VALUES[1]

Living Groups and Sex

	Residence Hall		Greek House		Cooperative		Off-Campus	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Res. Hall M	1 / 1							
F	.771 / .673	1 / 1						
Greek House M	.680 / .699	.595 / .817	1 / 1					
F	.797 / .569	.817 / .843	.542 / .765	1 / 1				
Coop. M	.810 / .765	.725 / .778	.582 / .699	.804 / .752	1 / 1			
F	.614 / .686	.738 / .856	.385 / .803	.765 / .830	.699 / .817	1 / 1		
Off-Campus M	.850 / .660	.699 / .516	.686 / .542	.647 / .516	.712 / .556	.542 / .529	1 / 1	
F	.719 / .660	.791 / .669	.464 / .673	.764 / .725	.595 / .764	.817 / .739	.621 / .686	1 / 1

KEY: M = Male; F = Female

The upper right-hand value is the correlation for terminal values; the lower left-hand number is the correlation for instrumental values.

[1] When p = .025 the correlation coefficient must be greater than .346 to reveal correlation between the groups. (N=18)

positive and negative poles are displayed below in Illustration 1.

These factors were utilized in determining which pole has greater

priority for a group of respondents. For the purposes of testing and

interpretation of the results, the average rating of the groups was

used as the basis of comparison.

ILLUSTRATION 1: EXPLANATION OF FACTORS

Factor 1: Immediate (+) vs. Delayed (-) Gratification

Factor 2: Competence (+) vs. Religious Morality (-)

Factor 3: Self-Constriction (+) vs. Self-Expansion (-)

Factor 4: Social (+) vs. Personal (-) Orientation

Factor 5: Societal (+) vs. Family (-) Security

Factor 6: Respect (+) vs. Love (-)

Factor 7: Inner- (-) vs. Other- (+) Directed

The following summarizes the results of the data analysis:

HYPOTHESIS 1: Students who rank immediate gratification values

higher than delayed gratification values live in Greek housing units.

The F-ratio tests revealed significant differences between the

four living groups on the ranking of immediate and delayed gratifica-

tion values. Specific comparisons of residents from Greek houses

and students living in other units revealed a significant difference in

the ranking patterns. While all groups rated delayed gratification

values higher than immediate gratification values, Greek residents

placed even greater priority on the immediate gratification pole.

This analysis supported the original hypothesis; therefore, the

hypothesis was not rejected (refer to Tables 7, 8 and 9).

HYPOTHESIS 2: Students who rank religious morality values above

competence values live in residence halls.

The analysis of this hypothesis revealed the greatest difference

between students in the four living groups (refer to Tables 7, 8 and 9).

Results from the analysis showed significant differences between the

four groups. Off-campus students were the only group that ranked

competence values above religious morality values ($p < .001$). In

other comparisons, it was revealed that students living in coopera-

tive units ranked religious morality values significantly higher than

students living in other living groups ($p < .001$). Thus, the results

do not support the hypothesis as stated, but do reveal that students

residing in university living groups give significantly higher priority

to religious morality values when compared with competence values.

Therefore, the original hypothesis was not accepted.

HYPOTHESIS 3: Students who rank self-constricting values higher

than self-expansion values live in cooperative units.

The F-ratio test in this instance identified significant differ-

ences between the four living groups and specifically between students

residing in cooperative units when compared to all other students

(refer to Tables 7, 8 and 9). Although all groups consistently ranked

self-expansion values higher than self-constriction values, cooperative

students rated self-expansion values significantly lower than other students. This finding reveals that students living in cooperative housing give higher priority to self-constricting values. Therefore, the original hypothesis was not rejected.

HYPOTHESIS 4: Students who rank social values higher than personal orientation values live in off-campus or residence hall units. Students who rank personal orientation values higher live in Greek housing units.

There were no significant differences identified by the analysis of variance techniques on the personal versus social orientation factor (refer to Tables 7, 8 and 9). All groups exhibited a considerably higher ranking of personal values when compared with social orientation values. The original hypothesis was not supported by the results of this study; therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

HYPOTHESIS 5: Students who rank family security values higher than social values reside in Greek or cooperative units.

Results from the tests on this factor revealed significant differences between the four living groups on societal and family security values (refer to Tables 7, 8 and 9). Comparisons between the specific groups supported the hypothesis. Although all groups rated family security values higher than societal values, the Greek house residents rated family security values higher than did the members of other groups (p <.001). In this case, only a portion of the

hypothesis was supported by the statistical analysis. Students living in cooperatives did not rate family security values significantly higher than residence hall or off-campus students. Therefore, the hypothesis was not rejected.

HYPOTHESIS 6: Students who rank love values higher than respect values reside in Greek or off-campus housing units.

Once again, significant differences were revealed through the F-ratio test (refer to Tables 7, 8 and 9). All groups placed higher priority on love values when compared to respect values. However, students residing in cooperatives as well as off-campus residents rated love values significantly higher than Greek or residence hall students. When Greek and off-campus students were compared to residence hall and cooperative students, the test statistic was only slightly significant (p <. 025). Since this original hypothesis was only supported in part with students from cooperatives as well as off-campus students ranking love values significantly higher than students from the other two living groups (p <. 001), the hypothesis was not rejected.

HYPOTHESIS 7: Students who rank inner-directed values higher than other-directed values reside in off-campus environments.

For the final factor hypothesis, parametric tests revealed significant differences among the four living groups. The analysis also supported the original hypothesis (refer to Tables 7, 8 and 9). All

TABLE 7

UNWEIGHTED AVERAGE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FACTOR POLES

Living Group	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Residence Hall	-2.577	- .374	- .615	-4.336	-1.946	-2.69	- .432
Greek House	-1.346	- .824	-1.366	-4.565	-3.09	-2.274	-1.733
Cooperative	-2.861	-1.936	- .147	-4.454	-2.043	-3.225	- .722
Off-Campus	-3.473	-1.647	-1.809	-4.249	-2.238	-3.033	-3.153

TABLE 8

F-RATIOS FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FOUR GROUPS

Factor	F-ratio	Significance
1	28.10	$p < .001$
2	79.63	$p < .001$
3	16.45	$p < .001$
4	.9432	$p > .10$
5	8.307	$p < .001$
6	6.57	$p < .001$
7	58.527	$p < .001$

TABLE 9

SPECIFIC COMPARISONS BETWEEN GROUPS

Group Comparisons	F-ratio	Significance
Factor 1: Greeks vs. all others	47.396	$p < .001$
Factor 2: Residence Hall vs. others	.078	$p > .10$
Factor 3: Cooperative vs. others	23.780	$p < .001$
Factor 5: Greek and Cooperative vs. Residence Hall and Off-Campus	14.766	$p < .001$
Factor 6: Cooperative and Residence Hall vs. other	3.368	$p < .025$
Factor 7: Off Campus vs. others	67.980	$p < .001$

For all comparisons, the significance level at .001 indicated a critical F value of 5.42.

students rated inner-directed values higher than other-directed values, but off-campus students tended to rank inner-directed values significantly higher than the other three groups. At the same time students in residence halls ranked inner-directed values significantly lower than any other group (p <. 001). Therefore, the original hypothesis was not rejected.

Summary of Hypothesis Analysis

Generally, tests on the hypotheses revealed significant differences between residents of the four living groups in every comparison except one--social versus personal orientation. Six of the hypotheses were at least partially supported. Those that were not fully supported by the analysis were competence versus religious morality and respect versus love.

Other Bipolar Factor Comparisons

In addition to comparison of the seven bipolar factors based on type of living group, other background categories were considered. Possible differences in ranking of factor values were compared for groups as determined by sex, academic major, political philosophy, level of participation in campus activities, hometown size, and geographic region. F-ratios were used as a basis of comparison for groups determined by sex, while chi-square tests were utilized for

the other categories. The number of male and female respondents was nearly equal conforming to the requirements of a general analysis of variance technique. However, since the number of students within any of the other biographic groups was quite variant, the F-ratio and analysis of variance becomes quite complex; therefore, it was not used as a basis of comparison (see Appendix A for the specific groupings given by the questionnaire).

The analysis based on sex of the students revealed significant differences on four of the seven factors. As displayed in Table 10, females ranked delayed gratification values higher than males although both groups rated delayed gratification values higher than values depicting immediate gratification. Females also rated religious morality values higher than competence values. Males, as a group, ranked competence values higher. Males also gave a higher priority to family security values than females, while females rated inner-directed values higher than the males. As with the comparisons among the living groups, all students rated family security values above societal values and inner-directed values over other-directed values. These results support the proposition that there are significant differences in value preferences between males and females.

Other categories of students were formed based upon their reply to questions regarding their backgrounds. When students were grouped according to academic major or hometown size and compared

on the seven factors, chi-square tests revealed no significant differ-
ences between the groups (refer to Table 11). These results support
the premise that value differences do not occur due to academic
major. They also indicate that hometown size is not a discriminat-
ing factor in value patterns.

Significant differences were discovered between other groupings
of students (refer to Table 11). When students were grouped accord-
ing to political philosophy, no significant differences on four of the
seven factors were found. However, chi-square tests showed differ-
ences between groups on values contributing to societal versus family
security, competence versus religious morality, and self-constriction
versus self-expansion factors. In these comparisons, students who
considered themselves liberal tended to rate societal values higher
than students who categorized themselves in the middle-of-the-road
or conservative groups. Students in the middle-of-the road classifica-
tion rated family security values higher than did members in the other
two groups. Conservative students tended to favor religious morality
values and self-constriction values while liberals ranked competence
and self-expansion values higher. Political philosophy, therefore,
tended to be a criteria that delineated value ranking patterns among
these groups of young people.

Two other groups were formulated for purposes of comparison
according to geographic region (residence in the Pacific Northwest

and permanent residence outside the area). When these two groups were compared, the chi-square tests revealed no significant differences on five of the factors. However, the tests did show significant differences on social versus family security values. Students residing in the Pacific Northwest rated family security values higher than did students who claimed residency outside the Northwest. On competence versus religious morality values, students residing outside the Northwest rated competence values relatively higher than did students in the other group.

The final analysis concerned students who were categorized by their level of participation in campus activities. Although six of the seven factors revealed no significant differences between the groups, the chi-square test identified a difference on the immediate versus delayed gratification factor. Here, students who identified themselves as having greater participation in campus activities rated delayed gratification values considerably lower than those students who participate minimally.

Summary of Biographic Group Comparisons

The results of the analysis indicate that a variety of previous and present experiences influence differences in value ranking patterns of college students. However, some groupings of students reveal few, if any, differences. Further consideration and

TABLE 10

RESULTS OF FACTOR COMPARISONS BASED ON SEX

| Factor | Unweighted Average Differences between Poles | | | Significance |
	Male	Female	F-ratio	
1	-2.135	-2.993	22.87	$p < .001$
2	.3378	-1.081	71.53	$p < .001$
3	-1.173	- .7995	4.214	$p > .10$
4	-4.291	-4.510	.4587	$p > .10$
5	-2.675	-1.9833	14.61	$p < .001$
6	-2.653	-2.959	3.522	$p > .10$
7	-1.149	-1.871	20.21	$p < .001$

With significance level at .001 the F-ratio indicated as critical from the standardized tables is 10.8.

TABLE 11

RESULTS OF FACTOR COMPARISONS BASED ON BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION[1]

Factor Number	Major	Political Philosophy	Level of Participation	Size of Hometown	Geographic
1	16.675 $p > .10$	6.696 $p > .10$	34.61 $p < .025$	19.793 $p > .10$	7.557 $p > .10$
2	20.798 $p > .10$	37.3053 $p < .005$	28.073 $p > .10$	13.257 $p > .10$	12.574 $p < .05$
3	7.201 $p > .10$	41.77 $p < .005$	27.48 $p > .10$	19.46 $p > .10$	5.21 $p > .10$
4	22.95 $p > .10$	14.61 $p > .10$	23.66 $p > .10$	19.13 $p > .10$	5.86 $p > .10$
5	28.24 $p > .10$	58.77 $p < .005$	19.03 $p > .10$	19.09 $p > .10$	17.36 $p < .025$
6	28.37 $p > .10$	16.10 $p > .10$	23.97 $p > .10$	24.32 $p > .10$	8.19 $p > .10$
7	14.81 $p > .10$	18.42 $p > .10$	20.27 $p > .10$	8.70 $p > .10$	2.87 $p > .10$

[1]The number in each square is the chi-square test statistic for the group comparison. All squares where $p > .10$ are considered to be not significant.

examination of these categories may assist in determining the experiences that contribute to personal growth in a college environment.

Multivariate Analysis

The seven bipolar factors used in comparing the various groupings of students as described above were based on Rokeach's factor analysis of value rankings of American society in general (refer to Table 12). Although the factors are not identical except for factor seven, there is a great degree of similarity between the two factor analyses. The factor analysis results performed on college student value rankings is presented in Table 13.

Based on Rokeach's original titles for the poles of the factors, rearrangement and combinations of the titles were developed for this factor analysis. In some instances a conflict existed between Rokeach's classification and the college student factors. For example, social recognition and mature love were grouped together where originally they were on opposite poles. Generally, however, there is a consistent similarity between the two factor analyses even though some of the personal values in Rokeach's original analysis are substituted with differing personal values in the college student analysis. This appears to be true for competence, social, and moral values as well. Other minor discrepancies in the factor analysis fall within the realm of natural differences resulting from sample

size and diversity of population.

The amount of variance in the value rankings attributed to each factor as well as the overall variance accounted for by all seven factors has also been presented in Tables 12 and 13. Rokeach's analysis had no factor accounting for more than eight percent of the variance and all seven factors accounted for 41% of the differences in value rankings. In Table 13, factor one, being a combination of Rokeach's original factors, is attributed with a greater portion of the variance than any of the factors identified by Rokeach. The total variance (42.8%) accounted for by the seven factors determined in this study is remarkably similar to the variance Rokeach obtained.

Because of the degree of similarity between the multivariate analysis of college student values and Rokeach's original factor analysis, it was not necessary to perform further comparisons between various student groups. Analysis of any further comparisons should only substantiate the results already obtained from utilization of Rokeach's bipolar factors.

TABLE 12

FACTOR ANALYTIC STRUCTURE OF AMERICAN VALUES (N= 1, 409)

Factor	Highest Positive Loadings	Highest Negative Loadings
1. Immediate vs. delayed gratification	A comfortable life Pleasure Clean Exciting Life	Wisdom Inner Harmony Logical Self-controlled
2. Competence vs. religious morality	Logical Imaginative Intellectual Independent	Forgiving Salvation Helpful Clean
3. Self-constriction vs. self-expansion	Obedient Polite Self-controlled Honest	Broadminded Capable
4. Social vs. personal orientation	World at Peace National Security Equality Freedom	True friendship Self-respect
5. Societal vs. family security	World of Beauty Equality Helpful Imaginative	Family Security Ambitious Responsible Capable
6. Respect vs. Love	Social Recognition Self-Respect	Mature love Loving
7. Inner- vs. other-directed	Polite	Courageous Independent

Percent of Variance

Factor 1 8. 2%	Factor 5 5. 0%	
Factor 2 7. 8%	Factor 6 4. 9%	TOTAL 40. 8%
Factor 3 5. 5%	Factor 7 4. 0%	
Factor 4 5. 4%		

TABLE 13

FACTOR ANALYTIC STRUCTURE OF COLLEGE STUDENT VALUES (N=491)

Factor	Highest Positive Loadings	Highest Negative Loadings
1. Immediate gratification vs. love and religious morality	Ambitious Comfortable Life Exciting Life Social Recognition	Loving Inner Harmony Forgiving Salvation
2. Self-constriction vs. societal, self-expansion	Family Security Obedient Polite National Security	Imaginative Broadminded World of Beauty
3. Social orientation vs. personal, respect	Peace Freedom Equality World of Beauty	Social Recognition Comfortable Life Mature Love
4. Immediate vs. delayed, religious gratification	Pleasure Happiness Comfortable Life	Wisdom Salvation
5. Competence vs. Religious morality	Intellectual Logical Independent	Forgiving Helpful Cheerful Friendship
6. Love vs. Self-constriction	Loving Intellectual	Self-controlled Responsible
7. Inner- vs. other-directed	Polite	Courageous Independent

Percent of Variance

Factor 1 11%   Factor 5 4.2%

Factor 2 8.5%   Factor 6 4.0%   TOTAL 42.8%

Factor 3 6.3%   Factor 7 3.7%

Factor 4 5.1%

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study sought to identify and compare value patterns of

college students in four basic living environments--residence halls,

Greek houses, cooperatives, and off-campus dwellings. Although

attitude studies have described behaviors that are typical of such

groups, there has been little research completed on the values of

students in different living environments. Without knowledge of

differences and similarities in values held by students who reside

in different college living units, it is difficult to understand the

behavior patterns of individuals as well as student groups.

Throughout their college experience, students are influenced

by immediate peers, often within their living unit. Such interpreta-

tion may result in reorientation of personal value systems. Knowing

the influence of living environments on personal growth is of prime

importance in understanding an individual's adjustment to college life.

Development of profiles regarding value orientation of students resid-

ing within various living groups provides insight for new students in

their attempts to identify suitable living environments. With the

availability of value profiles, present residents can compare percep-

tions of their own value systems with aggregate value systems of their

respective living group. The information also provides administrators and educators with a better perspective on values held by students and reinforced within particular sub-elements in the total college environment. Since level of education has been identified as a delineating factor in the value patterns of American society and classroom experience has not been found to provide the impetus for such a difference, it is important to search further and examine the value-laden experiences that stem from living environments.

The hypotheses tested in this study suggested certain differences between four living groups based on seven bipolar factors previously identified by Milton Rokeach (1973). It was hypothesized that students who live in Greek houses would place greater emphasis on values signifying concern for immediate gratification, personal orientation, family security, and love. Residence hall students were hypothesized to place a higher priority on values depicting religious morality and social orientation. Students residing in cooperative units would indicate a preference for self-constriction and family security values, while off-campus residents would rank higher those values related to personal orientation, love, and inner-direction. Thus, through the consideration of these seven factors, differences and similarities within various types of living situations are more appropriate to the study of value systems than are individual descriptions of the values ranked by each student.

To test the hypotheses, a stratified sample of 1,000 students was randomly selected from among the four types of living groups. Equal numbers of men and women were surveyed from each living group without regard to race, class, marital status, age, or reason for selection of a living unit. With a return rate of 51% (516), there were 61 to 68 responses for each of the eight strata (living groups and male-female within each group) to be considered in the study.

The instrument used to survey the sample consisted of two major portions, a biographical questionnaire and the Rokeach Value Survey. Rokeach's value survey provides two lists of eighteen values: terminal (end-states of existence) and instrumental (modes of conduct) which must be ranked in order of importance by each respondent. Each of the 36 values are socially desirable and cannot be eliminated without weakening the validity and reliability of the survey. A previous reliability score obtained among college students over a three-week period through a test-retest process was .72 (Rokeach, 1973). Other research indicates that responses are significantly predictive of behavior, implying the validity of the instrument.

The analyses of the data consisted of four major portions: the first included determining the correlation between mean rankings of the terminal and instrumental values by living groups and sex. Kendall's tau was utilized as the correlation coefficient in the comparison of the eight groups. Following this, analysis of variance

and the resulting F-ratios were used to compare the eight strata on

the average differences in the rating of the values of opposing poles

on each of the seven factors. Further comparisons were made on the

factors as indicated by the original hypotheses. These comparisons

revealed possible differences in rankings between the students in one

or two of the living groups and students in the remaining groups. A

third area of analysis involved chi-square tests to consider value

ranking patterns of students when grouped according to other bio-

graphic information such as academic major, political philosophy,

level of participation in campus activities, hometown size, and geo-

graphic region. Finally, a multivariate analysis was performed on

the value rankings. This served as a basis of comparison for identi-

fication of factors for college students with the seven bipolar factors

previously determined by Rokeach for American society in general.

Findings

For clarity, the results of this study are presented point by

point as determined by the various analyses.

1) Kendall's tau correlation coefficient revealed a high degree of

   concordance between most of the groups for both terminal and

   instrumental value rankings. The lowest correlations appeared

   between off-campus females and male Greek students and be-

   tween females residing in cooperatives and male Greek

residents.

2) As a whole, students among the groups tended to rate delayed gratification values higher than immediate gratification values. Students from Greek houses tended to place significantly less importance on the delayed gratification values when compared to the other groups.

3) Students who reside in off-campus environments tended to give higher priority to competence values, while members of the university sponsored living groups considered religious morality values more important. Students in cooperative units generally ranked religious morality values significantly higher than the other living units.

4) When comparisons were made between self-expansion and self-constriction values, it was found that all groups ranked self-expansion values higher. Students from cooperatives, however, ranked such expansion values significantly lower than did students from the other three living groups.

5) No significant differences were found between the living groups on the social versus personal orientation factor. All groups ranked personal orientation values considerably above social orientation values.

6) Students residing in Greek houses rated family security values significantly higher than did students in other groups when

contrasted with societal values. All groups rated family secur-

ity values higher than societal values.

7) As a whole, the living groups rated love values higher than

respect values; however, students residing in cooperative and

off-campus units tended to rate such values significantly higher

than did Greek or residence hall students.

8) Inner-directed values were given preference by students within

all of the living groups when compared to other-directed values.

Students in residence halls tended to rate such inner-directed

values significantly lower than the other groups, while off-

campus residents ranked the inner-directed values significantly

higher.

9) Comparisons between factors when students were grouped ac-

cording to sex revealed that females tended to rate delayed

gratification, religious morality, societal, and inner-directed

values significantly higher than did males. Once again, all

students tended to rate delayed gratification, family security,

and inner-directed values as more important than the opposite

factor pole.

10) Students who classify themselves as liberals tended to rate

societal, competence, and self-expansion values higher than

did middle-of-the-road or conservative students when contrasted

with family security, religious morality, or self-constriction

values, respectively.

11) Students who identified themselves as maintaining residence in the Pacific Northwest tended to rate family security and religious morality values significantly higher than did students who maintain permanent residence outside the area.

12) Immediate gratification values were rated higher by students who identified themselves as active in campus events when compared with students who were classified as non-participants.

13) No significant differences were found on the seven factors when students were grouped according to major or hometown size.

14) Seven hypothetical factors determined through multivariate analysis of college student values were shown to be similar to those identified by Rokeach. Both the values contributing to the factor poles and the amount of variance in value ranking attributed to the individual factors were comparable to Rokeach's bipolar factor analysis.

Discussion

College student values have previously been considered homogeneous. Also, value patterns of individuals who have attained a higher level of education have been significantly different from other less formally educated persons. This study attempted to identify some possible differences in value patterns of students in university living

environments in order to provide insight into the degree of similarity
of college student values and to assess their overall value priorities.
As a result of the preceding, the discussion of findings will concen-
trate on possible reasons behind the similarities and differences
exemplified by the value ranking patterns of the students. Also in-
cluded are the general descriptions of the various college living
environments as predicated by the results.

Generally, the concept regarding homogeneity of college stu-
dents was upheld throughout the study. Since college students experi-
ence many similar situations when compared to experiences of indi-
viduals outside of the collegiate influence, it is reasonable to assume
that value fluctuations and reorientations would also be similar. The
single situation that did reveal differences between the poles of a
factor concerned values related to the competence and religious
morality pole, where all three of the university sponsored groups
rated such values exactly opposite. Off-campus students have tradi-
tionally established themselves as bing more independent than students
living in formalized residence groups. This one value could easily
have created the dissimilarity between groups on this factor.

There were individuals within each group who differed in the
ranking of values contributing to the factor poles. Generally, how-
ever, the groups maintained agreement on which of the factor poles
were considered most important within any one factor. The differing

degrees that a pole was favored among students in a living group type caused many of the differences that appeared between the groups.

Value ranking patterns that resulted in significant differences for students in residence halls when compared to other groups concerned respect and other-directed values. Residence halls have traditionally attracted a diverse population of students. As a result, students selecting to live in residence halls must cooperate and respect each other. This premise is upheld in that residence hall students ranked respect and other-directed values as most important than did students from other living groups. Without such prioritization (which does occur) it is difficult to maintain a cooperative, positive atmosphere among students. Residents who refuse to conform to a working relationship are generally dissatisfied with their living situation. Therefore, they leave the residence hall or drop out of college to "escape" from what they perceive to be a negative situation.

Students residing in Greek houses are often thought to be pressured socially and academically to a greater extent than other groups. Some of this experience is revealed in their value patterns. Significantly higher ranking of immediate gratification and respect poles stemming from values such as pleasure, a comfortable life, and social recognition tended to be typical of students living in Greek houses. Loyalty and success, two characteristics that are commonly thought to be stressed in the Greek environment, were expressed in

the value systems with significantly higher rating of family security values. Family security and ambition were key values ranked relatively high by the Greek residents as reflected by this factor.

Students residing in cooperative units displayed differences in value patterns in the area of self-constriction and religious morality. As the name indicates, students from this type of living group must cooperate in various maintenance and regulatory roles for the betterment of the group. This situation is unique for these residents and seems to be reflected in the values of self-controlled and forgiving being ranked relatively high compared to the rankings of residents in other living units. The extremely high ranking by students living in cooperatives of the value salvation is not as easily explained, and it is left up to the reader to contemplate possible reasons for this ranking.

Finally, off-campus students, who are often thought of as independent and desirous of more privacy, reflected these traits through the ranking of such values as independent, capable and intellectual comparatively higher than did students in the other three groups. They rated polite relatively lower. Thus, off-campus students appeared to be significantly more inner-directed and competence oriented than other students.

Generally, as stated previously, the comparisons of student values did reveal a degree of homogeneity, depicting college students

as being more concerned with delayed gratification, self-expansion, personal orientation, family security, love, and inner-directed values when compared with immediate gratification, self-constriction, social, societal security, respect, and other-directed values, respectively. Being responsible, honest, and loving typified the important instrumental values, while true friendship and happiness were the preferred end-states or terminal values. College students are normally more concerned with improving themselves and planning for the future as indicated by their enrollment in an institution of higher learning. Such a decision carries certain responsibilities and rewards that are depicted somewhat in the preferential values and through the comparison of factor poles.

Although other groupings of students based on biographic information could only be analyzed in general terms, it is interesting to consider the results. Sex differences appear to support more traditional roles of male competitiveness, ambitiousness, and capability. Females exhibited ranking patterns that favored religious morality and politeness. The distinction between materialistic and religious values was also identified by Rokeach in his study on value rankings of a cross-section of American adults.

Other differences revealed in the analysis of conservatives versus liberals and students grouped according to level of participation in campus activities conformed to the value expectancies of such

groups. The difference in value rankings of students categorized by region of permanent residence may warrant further discussion. Students residing in the Pacific Northwest revealed a preference for family security and religious morality values when compared to students who claim permanent residence outside of the Northwest. This may result from the tendency of students who have close family ties or obligations to be less independent and attend a college or university closer to home. It would be unwise to assume that because students live in the Pacific Northwest they are more family or religious oriented.

Limitations and Suggestions

As with any research, the results are only a product of certain limitations of the study. The predominant limitation of this study is that it only considered students at Oregon State University. The value patterns exemplified by students attending a moderately large, state land-grant institution may be vastly different from value patterns of students attending a private school or one that differs greatly in student population. Also, certain"types" of students may be attracted to the university as a result of rural location and geographic region.

Beyond this limitation it must be realized that the results were based on averages of rankings of the students within the living groups. Any one group contained students who ranked any one value

from low to high. Within any living unit, therefore, students may be influenced by a variety of value patterns, depending upon one's closest associates. This study was an attempt to describe the general value orientation of the groups and leaves more specific differences as a topic for future study. When considered as a whole, the living groups also tend to lose sight of the possible differences that may exist between any two residence halls or any two sororities. It would be erroneous to conclude that every unit within a type of living group automatically reveals similar value patterns.

Such limitations give rise to possibilities for further research, including comparisons of student values in a specific subenvironment within a living group. A study of comparisons of the results of the student value rankings in this study with those of a diverse student population could also be performed. Further examination of the effects of a living environment on student values prior to entering a living environment and before moving to a different type could be considered. Now that a general description of the values of students in the different living groups has been presented in this study, it would be easier to understand the influences and possible value reorientations that students may undergo while residing in one particular type of living group versus another.

Through more awareness of self-values and through the knowl-edge of the values of various groups, students can identify

discrepancies in their own value patterns and attempt to accommodate any weaknesses. This does not mean that every person would alter their value patterns to conform to a certain mold. Rather, students may be able to understand better their own frustrations with certain peers or situations and to adjust depending upon their own needs. A student's decision to enter college often reveals a desire to grow, not only academically, but also personally and socially. The study of values held by individuals residing within particular living environments is a link in establishment of concern for each student's personal growth. Without continual examination and further study regarding this issue, students will remain unknowledgable about their own development and the influence of others upon them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, Gordon. Attitudes: A Handbook of Social Psychology. Massachusetts: Clark University Press, 1939.

Baird, L. B. Effects of College Residence Groups on Self-Concepts, Goals, and Achievements. Personnel and Guidance Journal. 1969, 47, 1015-1021.

Beech, R. P. and Schoeppe, A. Development of Value Systems in Adolescents. Developmental Psychology. 1974, 10, 644-655.

Dewey, J. Theory and Valuation. (International Encyclopedia of Unified Science.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Feather, N. T. Values in Education and Society. London: Collier MacMillan Publishers, 1975.

Feldman, K. A. and Newcomb, T. M. Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. , Publishers, 1969.

Gerst, M. A. and Moos, R. H. Social Ecology of University Student Residences. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1972, 63, 513-525.

George, R. L. Resident or Commuter: A Study of Personality Differences. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12, 216-219.

Hoge, D. R. and Bender, I. E. Factors Influencing Value Change Among College Graduates in Adult Life. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 29, 572-585.

Hountras, P. T. and Brandt, K. R. Relation of Student Residence to Academic Performance in College. Journal of Educational Research, 1970, 63, 351-354.

Hunt, D. E. Matching Models in Education. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1971.

Ingram, J. A. Introductory Statistics. Menlo Park, Calif.: Cummings Publishing Company, 1973.

Jacob, P. E. Changing Values in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957.

Kohn, M. L. and Schooler, C. Class, Occupation, and Orientation. American Sociological Review, 1969, 34, 659-678.

Marrett, C. B. Social Class Values and the Balanced Community. Social Problems, 1973, 21, 259-268.

Maslow, A. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature. New York: Viking Press, 1971.

Morris, C. Varieties of Human Values. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Mueller, D. J. A Test of the Validity of Two Scales on Rokeach's Value Survey. Journal of Social Psychology, 1974, 94, 289-290.

Neter, J. and Wasserman, W. Applied Linear Statistical Models. Homewood, Illinois: Richard Irwin, Inc., 1974.

Nie, N., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., and Bent, D. H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Robinson, J. P. and Shaver, P. R. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1969.

Rokeach, Milton, Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968.

Rokeach, M. Values and Public Opinion Research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1969, 32, 547-559.

Rokeach, M. Nature of Human Values. London: Free Press, Collier and MacMillan, 1973.

Rokeach, M. Change and Stability in American Value Systems, Public Opinion Quarterly, 1974, 38, 222-238.

Rowe, K. and Barnes, J. A. Statistical Interactive Programming System, Command Reference Manual. Corvallis: Oregon State University, 1976.

Scheibe, K. E. Beliefs and Values. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Schumacher, K. and Todd, R. Assigned Values Associated with Choice of Housing. Unpublished Honors Thesis, Oregon State University, 1975.

Scott, S. H. Impact of Residence Hall Living on College Student Development. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1975, 16, 214-219.

Smail, M. M., DeYoung, A. J., Moos, R. H. The University Residence Environment Scale: A Method for Describing University Student Living Groups. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1974, 15, 357-365.

Snedecor, G. W. and Cochran, W. G. Statistical Methods. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1967.

Spranger, E. Types of Man. New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1928.

Unger, R. and Raymond, B. External Criteria as Predictors of Values: The Importance of Race and Attire. Journal of Social Psychology, 1974, 93, 295-296.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

October 18, 1976

Dear Student:

You have been randomly selected to participate in a study of college student values at Oregon State University. This is not a psychological test and it is hoped that you will complete the attached confidential questionnaire. Through your cooperation, we will be able to provide the university with information regarding student values.

You will notice on the questionnaire that there is a number. This is for follow up purposes only. This number will be removed when the data is tabulated, insuring that your responses remain confidential. No individuals will be identified and only group comparisons will be made.

It will only take several minutes to complete the questionnaire. Please return it in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope by November 5, 1976. The questionnaire may be returned through campus mail or by dropping it in the "Student Housing Survey" Box in the Memorial Union Activities Center. If you have any questions, please call me at 754-2572.

Thank you for your help and participation.

Please answer the following questions by checking the appropriate response.

1. Please check the living situations you have experienced during your college years and indicate your overall feeling about each.

   _____ Residence Hall   _____ Cooperative

   (   ) Positive   (   ) Positive

   (   ) Negative   (   ) Negative

   _____ Greek House   _____ Off-Campus Unit

   (   ) Positive   (   ) Positive

   (   ) Negative   (   ) Negative

2 Identify the living situations of your two closest friends (please do not check more than two types).

   _____ Residence Hall   _____ Cooperative

   _____ Greek House   _____ Off-Campus Unit

3. Please check your age group level.

   (1) _____ Under 19

   (2) _____ 19 - 20

   (3) _____ 21 - 23

   (4) _____ Over 23

4. Please identify your academic major according to one of the following:

   (1) _____ College of Liberal Arts

   (2) _____ College of Sciences

   (3) _____ Professional School

   (4) _____ Graduate School

5. With which of the following religious groups do you identify:

   (1) _____ Christian

   (2) _____ Jewish

   (3) _____ Other (Moslem, Buddhist, etc.)

   (4) _____ None

6. If you had to classify your overall political philosophy, which would you consider yourself?

    (1) _____ Liberal

    (2) _____ Middle of the Road

    (3) _____ Conservative

7. If you had to re-select your living situation, which of the following would you prefer?

    (1) _____ Residence Hall

    (2) _____ Cooperative

    (3) _____ Greek House

    (4) _____ Off-Campus Unit

8. If you had to classify your overall level of participation at Oregon State University, which one of the following would apply to you?

    (1) _____ Active in a variety of campus-wide events and groups

    (2) _____ Active mainly within living group

    (3) _____ Participate in activities but not involved in the planning of such events

    (4) _____ Rarely participate in group activities; prefer to socialize on an individual basis.

9. Please select the community that best depicts where you spent most of your childhood years.

    (1) _____ 0-4,000 population

    (2) _____ 4,000-40,000 population

    (3) _____ 40,000-400,000 population

    (4) _____ Over 400,000 population

10. In what region of the United States have you primarily resided?

    (1) _____ Pacific Northwest

    (2) _____ Far West (to exclude Oregon, Washington, Idaho)

    (3) _____ West

    (4) _____ Midwest

    (5) _____ South

    (6) _____ East

11. Please identify your present living situation.

    (1) _____ Residence Hall   (2) _____ Cooperative

    (3) _____ Greek House   (4) _____ Off-Campus Unit

VALUE SURVEY

Below is a list of 18 values arranged in alphabetical order. Your task is to arrange them in order of their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in your life.

Study the list carefully. Then place a 1 next to the value which is most important to you, place a 2 next to the value which is second most important to you, etc. The value which is least important, relative to the others should be ranked 18.

Work slowly and think carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. The end result should truly show how you really feel.

_____ A COMFORTABLE LIFE (a prosperous life)

_____ AN EXCITING LIFE (a stimulating, active life)

_____ A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (lasting contribution)

_____ A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)

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

_____ EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)

_____ FAMILY SECURITY (taking care of loved ones)

_____ FREEDOM (independence, free choice)

_____ HAPPINESS (contentedness)

_____ INNER HARMONY (freedom from inner conflict)

_____ MATURE LOVE (sexual and spiritual intimacy)

_____ NATIONAL SECURITY (protection from attack)

_____ PLEASURE (an enjoyable, leisurely life)

_____ SALVATION (saved, eternal life)

_____ SELF-RESPECT (self-esteem)

_____ SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)

_____ TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)

_____ WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)

Below is a list of another 18 values. Rank these in order of importance in the same way you ranked the first list on the preceding page.

_____   AMBITIOUS (hard working)

_____   BROADMINDED (open-minded)

_____   CAPABLE (competent, effective)

_____   CHEERFUL (lighthearted, joyful)

_____   CLEAN (neat, tidy)

_____   COURAGEOUS (standing up for your beliefs)

_____   FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)

_____   HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)

_____   HONEST (sincere, truthful)

_____   IMAGINATIVE (daring, creative)

_____   INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)

_____   INTELLECTUAL (intelligent, reflective)

_____   LOGICAL (consistent, rational)

_____   LOVING (affectionate, tender)

_____   OBEDIENT (dutiful, respectful)

_____   POLITE (courteous, well-mannered)

_____   RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)

_____   SELF-CONTROLLED (restrained, self-disciplined)

Please remember to return this questionnaire to the "Student Housing Survey" box located

in the Memorial Union Activities Center or through campus mail.

Thank you for your assistance.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

SUMMARY OF BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Age

Years	Percent	Number
Under 19	18	93
19-20	37	192
21-23	32	165
Over 23	13	66

Religion

Denomination	Percent	Number
Christian	75	389
Other	2	15
None	21	109

Major

Field	Percent	Number
Liberal Arts	17	87
Sciences	39	200
Professional	35	178
Graduate	8	43

Political Philosophy

Type	Percent	Number
Liberal	26	134
Middle	52	270
Conservative	19	99

Reselection of Living Option

Residence	Percent	Number
Residence Hall	14	74
Cooperative	17	87
Greek House	22	113
Off-Campus	46	235

Participation in Activities

Level	Percent	Number
Campus Wide	21	108
Living Group	32	167
Participant Only	18	93
Rare Participation	27	141

Hometown Size

Population	Percent	Number
0-4,000	20	104
4,000-40,000	38	198
40,000-400,000	27	137
Over 400,000	14	71

Geographic Region

Location	Percent	Number
Pacific Northwest	65	336
Far West	5	25
West	10	50
Midwest	10	50
South	1	7
East	8	41

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

Factor 1: Gratification Differences

	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Living Group	3	4.799	1.599
Sex	1	1.472	1.472
LG * Sex	3	3.165	1.055
Within Cells	508		.0569

Factor 2: Moral Differences

	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Living Group	3	13.448	4.483
Sex	1	4.027	4.027
Interactions	3	.257	.0857
Within Cells	508		.0563

Factor 3: Self Differences

	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Living Group	3	3.327	1.109
Sex	1	.284	284
Interactions	3	.1659	.0553
Within Cells	508		.0674

Factor 4: Orientation Differences

	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Living Group	3	.2091	.0697
Sex	1	.0334	.0334
Interactions	3	2.5689	.8563
Within Cells	508		.0739

Factor 5: Security Differences

	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Living Group	3	1.6323	5441
Sex	1	.957	.957
Interactions	3	.6231	.2077
Within Cells	508		.0655

Factor 6: Respect vs. Love Differences

	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Living Groups	3	1.0473	.3491
Sex	1	.1870	.1870
Interactions	3	.7017	.2339
Within Cells	508		.0531

Factor 7: Direction Differences

	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Living Group	3	9.061	3.020
Sex	1	1.0426	1.0426
Interactions	3	.2646	.0882
Within Cells	508		.0516