

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.**
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.**

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

76-6514

MEDFORD, Bobby Lee, 1934-
A COMPARISON OF THE ROKEACH AND VALUES
CLARIFICATION METHODS OF VALUES CHANGE.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro,
Ph.D., 1975
Education, curriculum and instruction

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1975

BOBBY LEE MEDFORD

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

A COMPARISON OF THE ROKEACH AND VALUES
CLARIFICATION METHODS OF
VALUES CHANGE


by

Bobby Lee Medford

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
1975

Approved by


Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser

J. Allen Watson

Oral Examination
Committee Members

Rebecca M. Smith

James H. Halloway

Ernie M. James

William A. Power III

March 28, 1975
Date of Examination

MEDFORD, BOBBY LEE. A Comparison of the Rokeach and Values Clarification Methods of Values Change. (1975) Directed by: Dr. James A. Watson. Pp. 146.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relative effectiveness of two methods of producing change in the order of values of adolescents. Milton Rokeach's method based on cognitive dissonance was compared to certain values clarification strategies which have been widely used in the classroom. A control group was included with the two treatment groups.

Rokeach's Value Survey was the instrument used for the pretest and posttest measurement. This instrument contained 18 value words which were ranked according to relative importance. The two values Freedom and Equality were selected as the dependent variables for this study. Three hypotheses were tested. Hypothesis one was that the ranking of the value Freedom would not change in the Rokeach or values clarification group. Hypothesis two was that the ranking of the value Equality would increase toward the ranking of Freedom in both the Rokeach and values clarification group. Hypothesis three was that the ranking of the value Equality would increase toward Freedom to a greater degree in the Rokeach group than in the values clarification group.

The subjects were 210 adolescents (age 14-18), who were attending a three day religious conference. The

subjects were assigned randomly to one of three groups with age and sex distributions kept even. The Rokeach and values clarification groups contained 77 subjects, while the control group contained 56.

The data were analyzed by a separate three by two analysis of variance on each of the two variables Freedom and Equality. As a result of the analyses of the data the three hypotheses were dealt with in the following manner: hypothesis one that the ranking of the value Freedom would not change in either the Rokeach or values clarification group was accepted. Hypothesis two that the ranking of the value Equality would increase toward the ranking of Freedom in both the Rokeach and values clarification groups was rejected. Hypothesis three that the ranking of the value Equality would increase toward Freedom to a greater degree in the Rokeach group than in the values clarification group was not tested due to the rejection of hypothesis two.

The conclusions drawn from this study were that the value of an immediate posttest to measure the dissonance or self-dissatisfaction which the Rokeach treatment stirs up was not supported. Secondly, the use of powerful values clarification strategies for short term change in value systems of adolescents was not supported. Thirdly, further research is needed with more controls before the conclusions of this study are accepted.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my profound appreciation to Dr. J. Allen Watson, my adviser, whose consistent encouragement and advice helped make this study possible. Other committee members were Dr. Rebecca Smith, Dr. Eunice Deemer, and Dr. Harold Mahoney. All of these were most helpful.

Dr. Carl Cochran, whose death occurred at a critical time, had already given me invaluable help in the statistical design and data analyses for this study. Fortunately, Dr. William Powers made himself available to me to continue the data analyses and I wish to express my deepest gratitude to him.

My wife, Pam, and my children, Steve and Kristy, patiently gave up a good deal of "family togetherness" to allow me to proceed with this study. They are due my thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
III. METHOD	32
Subjects	32
Experimental and Control Group Assignments.	33
Teachers.	34
Design	37
Instruments	38
Procedure	40
IV. RESULTS	46
Analyses	47
Discussion.	54
V. SUMMARY	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY	73
APPENDIX A THE ROKEACH VALUE SURVEY FORM E	81
APPENDIX B THE ROKEACH VALUE SURVEY FORM E POSTTEST	84
APPENDIX C THE ROKEACH VALUE CHANGE INSTRUMENT	86
APPENDIX D THE MODIFIED ROKEACH VALUE CHANGE INSTRUMENT.	100
APPENDIX E INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS OF ROKEACH GROUP	116
APPENDIX F INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS OF VALUES CLARIFICATION GROUPS	122
APPENDIX G INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS OF CONTROL GROUPS.	133
APPENDIX H SCHEDULE.	143
APPENDIX I 123 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' AVERAGE RANKING OF ROKEACH'S 18 TERMINAL VALUES	145

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Rokeach, Values Clarification and Control Groups, According to Age and Sex	35
2. Subgroup Division of Rokeach, Values Clarification, Control Subjects According to Age and Sex	36
3. Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance on the Freedom Variable	49
4. Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance on the Equality Variable	50
5. Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance on the Difference Scores of the Variables Freedom and Equality	52
6. Mean Difference between the Three Groups from Pretest through Posttests 1 and 2	53

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to examine certain aspects of values change among adolescents. Specifically, the study compared two different methods of altering the value systems of adolescents. Note was taken of the rather widespread publicity and use of values clarification techniques. On the one hand the use of such techniques was growing rapidly, but on the other hand there was a paucity of empirical research to verify that the process actually worked. The values clarification technique was compared to the Rokeach method which, according to its chief proponent, Milton Rokeach (1971, 1973), could produce long-term change in a subject's basic value system with a 20 minute paper and pencil test followed by a 10 or 15 minute talk by an instructor.

The question which this study proposed to answer was: Which of two methods will bring about the greatest change in certain target values as measured by an immediate posttest? Related questions were: Does the Rokeach method produce immediate measurable change or does it occur after a few hours of incubation? Does the Rokeach method work as well with adolescents under college age as with college age students? Do the strategies of values clarification which are reportedly most powerful have any effects which can be

measured immediately? Does any change occur when two powerful values clarification strategies are used on two consecutive days focusing on the same target values?

Background for Values Study. The increasing need for viable options for teaching values has become more and more clear. Methods of indoctrination have been suspect for two reasons. First, because studies such as Hartshorne and May (1928) have shown them questionable in effects. Secondly, because in a democratic society who should have the power to decide which values are to be taught? On the other hand, educators have begun to realize that there can be no such thing as a value vacuum. It is impossible to do nothing in terms of values in the classroom. When a teacher mentions grades, college, career, he is promoting or devaluing perhaps, the work ethic, materialism, and the capitalistic economy. What teacher has not taken pride in the fact that his teaching does change the values, attitudes and behavior of his students in some way? These are values and values are taught in the classroom implicitly. The very presence of a school building in a community represents a value.

The admission that values are taught in the classroom inevitably, does not lessen the confusion and embarrassment felt by teachers as to what approach should be taken by them. Kerckhoff (1970) asked six college marriage preparation classes and their teachers to divulge their attitudes about the value stance held by the professors. He was able to

classify three ideal value stances taken by the teachers on family life questions:

1. The Moralist: "He seemed to have a particular set of attitudes and beliefs on such topics and he tried to influence students to accept these attitudes and beliefs."

2. The Scientist: "He seemed to see his chief job as helping students learn scientific facts and theories concerning such topics."

3. The Guide: "He seemed to see himself as a guide who would help students make their own decisions on such topics."

The professors claimed that they divulged their own views on controversial issues (in family life questions) when asked, and to a lesser extent, when not asked. The students, however, viewed their professors as willing to divulge their opinions when asked, but not voluntarily thrusting them on the class.

Brubaker (1968) reported several surveys of literature as well as a survey of public school social science teachers which indicated that teachers do not make a distinction between facts and values. He recognized several areas where prescriptive statements are legitimate in the classroom as well as areas in which the teachers should open up for discussions by students in an analytical way. Brubaker's thesis was an excellent argument for assisting teachers to handle prescriptive and normative issues differently.

The thesis of the essay was threefold:

(1) Prescriptions are inevitable and can be expected from all who are interested in social studies instruction... (2) Social studies teachers and their students should recognize the distinction between normative value judgments and analysis; and (3) The way in which the teachers' prescriptions are made is usually more important than the particular prescription advocated by the social studies teacher (p. 490).

This study was proposed, in part, because it was assumed that ultimately there are some values which are in the best interest of society. Also it was assumed that mankind should identify and move toward these universal values. Most of all the assumption was made that what is needed now is a way to assist young people to improve the tools they have for clarifying and adjusting their own value systems for their own benefit and the good of society.

The implications of this research are not only for teachers and public schools, but for religious and private schools, religious groups, counselors, therapists, psychologists and psychiatrists. This is a partial list of those who are served by studies of value development.

Theoretical Background for This Study. In order to provide perspective for the remainder of this study, the values clarification and Rokeach theories should be described in detail. Raths, Harmin, and Simon published the book, Values and Teaching, in 1966. The book contained a theory of values, a method for implementing the theory in the

classroom and some relevant current research on the status of values clarification. Since 1966, values clarification has engendered a great deal of interest and considerable use in the public schools as well as in religious schools. Raths, et al., defined a value by drawing seven criteria which must be met before something can be called a value. The seven criteria are;

1. Choosing freely. No coercion must apply or else the value will not be of lasting significance.
2. Choosing from among alternatives. If there are no alternatives than the thing chosen, then value does not exist.
3. Choosing after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative. Only when the consequences of each of the alternatives are clearly understood can one make intelligent choices, thus, impulsive, thoughtless choices are not included in this definition.
4. Prizing and cherishing. We are happy with our values, not sorry we have to choose them.
5. Affirming. A value must be publicly affirmed willingly by those who hold it in order to fit this definition.
6. Acting upon choices. Life has to be affected by a value, that is, a value gives direction to life.
7. Repeating. Values persist enough to be repeated in the life of the valuing person, thus tending to make a pattern in life.

These criteria may be summarized in three processes, choosing (1, 2, 3), prizing (4, 5) and acting (6, 7). Kirshenbaum (1973), who is an active disciple of Raths' theory, has continued to develop and alter the original definition. His chief criticism of the criteria was that they were not operationally defined. For example, if one must "prize and cherish" something before it can be called a value, to what extent must he prize it? How can it be measured? On the other hand, if one must act before the criterion for valuing is met, how many times must he act, once or ten times? The validity of Kirshenbaum's criticism has led to a rethinking of the criteria of valuing. He suggested that these did not define values but described a process of valuing.

Values clarification theorists have maintained their interest was primarily in delineation of the process of valuing. The identification of specific values which might be the result of this process has not claimed their interest (Raths, et al., 1966, p. 37). Traditional approaches toward teaching values by pointing out good example, persuasion, limiting of choices, rules, religious dogma, appeals to conscience, have not led to values according to Rath, for they are not freely chosen. He described the behavior of the person with a lack of valuing ability as poorly motivated, other-directed, unable to match word and deed, and lacking purpose and commitment.

The hypothesis stated by Raths holds forth a dramatic, apparently testable solution:

If children are helped to use the valuing process of this book, we assert that they will behave in ways that are less apathetic, confused, and irrational and in ways that are more positive, purposeful, and enthusiastic. (Raths, et al., 1966, p. 11).

"Strategies" for use in helping the student clarify his values have been developed and distributed by the original theorists of values clarification (Raths, et al., 1966) in books, articles, and workshops. Students and associates have also worked out other strategies. Essentially, a "strategy" was a method or model to be used. The content of the strategy was variable and teachers were urged to develop new content material to use with the strategies. Early on in this study it seemed feasible to ask whether some strategies were more effective than others, whether some worked better with a different type of curriculum.

The next problem which had to be faced was an instrument to measure values and value change. The work of Milton Rokeach provided an instrument as well as an alternative method of altering the value stance. Rokeach created considerable notoriety in an article (1971) in which he claimed to have produced long-term change in core values with a very brief test followed by a talk. He also claimed that the direction and nature of the changes could be predicted with his method. The theory was a variant of Festinger's (1957)

theory of cognitive dissonance. Festinger regarded "X" and "Y" as two or more elements in the cognitive system that stand in some unharmonious relationship with each other. Festinger usually identified "X" and "Y" as "ideas" (beliefs, attitudes, values, or rationalizations) about some particular situations or actions that occasionally differ from or are incompatible with one another. Rokeach did not regard "X" and "Y" as variant but as invariant. "X" was equivalent to self, while "Y" was the person's interpretation of his own performance in a situation. Dissonance occurred when "Y", his interpretation of his performance, caused him to be dissatisfied with himself, "X".

Rokeach distinguished his concept of self-dissatisfaction from ordinary loss of self-esteem. He regarded self-esteem as an enduring characteristic of personality over all situations. On the contrary, cognitive dissonance was a dissatisfaction related to a specific situation. Although one may have more or less self-esteem, he is generally motivated to perform as morally as he can in specific situations. To the extent he meets these expectations, he will be reasonably satisfied with himself in that dynamic situation. To the degree he fails, he will be dissatisfied with himself in that situation.

The terms morality and competence were closely linked in Rokeach's theory. He associated them with universal human strivings for goodness and greatness. Incompetence

was regarded by Rokeach as a person's own judgment of his performance, whether he was deficient in skill, ability, intelligence, ability to appraise reality correctly, or ability to play assigned roles in society successfully. Rokeach described immorality as the extent to which a person believed he was harming himself or others or believed he was not exercising impulse control over his thoughts and feelings (Rokeach 1973, p. 228).

This theory, in summary, held that when one encountered a contradiction between his self-conception and his performance in a given situation, self-dissatisfaction arose. Self-dissatisfaction implied to one that he was either incompetent or immoral or both. Cognitive and behavioral change, theoretically, followed such arousal. The change usually took the direction which reduced or eliminated the source of displeasure with oneself.

Rokeach operationally defined attitudes and values, which he regarded as two distinctively separate aspects of the personality. An attitude was defined as a more or less enduring organization of interrelated thoughts and feelings called into being by a specific object or situation. "Thus, an attitude always has a historical context as well as a personal one toward the pill, for instance, or civil rights demonstrations, hotpants, or J. Edgar Hoover" (Rokeach 1971, p. 67). A value was regarded as less embedded in particular situational contexts and defined to describe either a

desirable end-state of existence or a desirable mode of behavior. Thus, values were of two kinds, terminal values which refer to desirable end-states, and instrumental, which refer to desirable modes of behavior.

The important difference assigned to the terms attitude and value by Rokeach has enabled him to say that there are hundreds or thousands of attitudes while values are relatively few in number. It is possible to hold as many attitudes as there are encounters with specific objects and situations. The number of such has been regarded as in the thousands by Rokeach. On the other hand, only a limited number of end-states of existence or preferable modes of behavior have been found.

Originally, the purpose for looking into the work of Rokeach was to examine his instruments for an appropriate one to measure change in value indicators. However, it became apparent that to partially replicate his work with younger subjects, while comparing its effects with values clarification in the same study, would be very worthwhile. Accordingly, the research was designed after a review of literature and a pilot study (to be reported later).

Hypotheses. The major part of Rokeach's research has been aimed at certain target values. His most significant reported research has been with the two values Freedom and Equality. Students were asked to rank 18 values (Appendix A) according to their importance to them. After the Rokeach

treatment the subjects were asked to indicate whether they were now satisfied or dissatisfied with the original rankings. The treatment itself was focused on the two values Freedom and Equality.

Consequently, it seemed appropriate to focus upon the same values in this study. The Rokeach method reported to be effective with college students could be tested with younger students. The values clarification strategies could be compared to the Rokeach method in terms of immediate change.

Three hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. The ranking of the value Freedom will not change in the Rokeach or values clarification group.
2. The ranking of the value Equality will increase toward the ranking of Freedom in both the Rokeach and values clarification groups.
3. The ranking of the value Equality will increase toward the ranking of Freedom to a greater degree in the Rokeach group than in the values clarification group.

Definitions. The following definitions were determined for the purposes of this study:

1. Adolescence means the ages 14-18. This age group was expected to attend a conference during which this study could be done. The conference was for Young Friends (Quakers) of North Carolina Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of

Friends. Guilford College, North Carolina was the site for the conference.

2. Value means a desirable end-state of existence or a desirable mode of behavior. This is the Rokeach definition but it is also generally accepted in social psychology today (Williams 1968). There are two basic types of values, terminal, which refers to end-states of existence, and instrumental, which refers to desirable modes of behavior. As shown in Appendix A both the values Freedom and Equality are terminal values.

3. A values clarification strategy is a device for use with students to promote individual thought toward arriving at one's own values. The leading proponents of values clarification have urged teachers to develop their own materials for strategies. For example, one strategy is called "Public Interview". While sample questions and possible subjects have been suggested for use in these "Public Interviews", the teacher must provide his own content according to the kinds of values with which he plans to have the students deal. In this research, the sources have been given for materials that have been borrowed. However, the story of Cynthia's Baby (Appendix F), as well as the Public Interviews (Appendices F & G) and the Values Voting Questions (Appendices F & G) were all written by the experimenter.

4. "Table 1" and "Table 2" appear in quotations in this study to differentiate them from the usual Tables 1 and 2

in the paper. In the former case "Table 1" and "Table 2" refer to two tables in the Rokeach Value Change Instrument (see Appendix C). Without referring to these tables in a special sense the Rokeach research could not be adequately discussed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review of relevant research is divided into four sections. These divisions correspond to the major emphases of this research. The sections are: the background for a values review, studies of values among adolescents, studies of values clarification, and studies of the Rokeach work.

Background for Values Review. Studies of values have taken various approaches. William F. Dukes (1955) first reviewed about 200 articles in Psychological Abstracts up to 1955 on the subject of values. McClure and Tyler (1967) followed the Dukes review with one covering the same sources from 1955 to 1967. The result of these reviews led to three classifications of the research. These three classifications were: (a) measuring the values of a group of persons and relating these values to other data collected on these groups; (b) seeking to find the origin and development of values in the individual; and, (c) the influence of an individual's values on his cognitive life.

In (a) above, some of the contributors of theoretical and methodological considerations have been Kluckhohn (1951), Parsons and Shils (1951), Morris (1956), Rokeach (1968, 1974) and Williams (1961, 1968, 1970, 1974). A recent example of investigations of dominant values was the study by Christenson

and Yang (1974) of 3,115 heads of households in North Carolina. This study used Robin Williams' (1970) conceptualization of fourteen dominant values in American society. The values were ranked and the data assessed for differences and similarities of different social and economic groups. The findings indicated a high degree of similarity among all segments of society in most personal and social dominant American values. However differences between white and non-white Americans were found on equality, political democracy and patriotism.

To summarize the variables that have been investigated in the literature in relationship to values would include sex differences, body and personality type, major academic interest, intelligence, aptitude and achievement, vocational interests, friendships, marriage happiness and adjustment, religion, regional, national, and other cultural differences, specific attitudinal differences, and expressive behavior.

H. T. Christensen (1964), a leading contributor to research in family life, has stressed the importance of values as explanations of behavior. The way people perceive a situation determines their action and their values determine how they define a situation. Christensen also suggested that in family studies values could be viewed from three aspects: as a dependent variable where the family shapes values in persons, as an independent variable where values held by family members shape behavior, and as intervening

variables, where values intrude in the interaction of other variables and affect the outcome.

Values of Adolescents. Studies of values of adolescents, how they are shaped and how they change, have been few. McCandless (1970) listed values as one of the four major aspects of adolescent development and adjustment. According to McCandless, status, sociality, sexuality, and values provide a framework for understanding adolescence. "Of these four major adolescent life goals, society is least equipped to guide adolescents in the sexual and moral values areas..." (p. 34-36). Nothing has been more important, according to McCandless, than values in determining the quality of life of adolescents.

Survey studies relevant to adolescent values have tended to focus on the nature of the value system. Older surveys have little relevance except for the sake of comparison to later studies to point out changes (Williams 1974). Descriptive studies for the purpose of understanding adolescent values have been done (Morris 1958; Remmers & Randler 1957; Garrison 1966; Harris 1966; Shepherd 1966). Bales and Crouch (1974) developed a general purpose inventory, The Value Profile, to use in research on interpersonal relations. They collected 872 value statements from a battery of instruments given to Harvard undergraduates. After combining and reducing the 872 items to 143, a factor analysis

was done. Four factors were found, (1) Acceptance of Authority; (2) Need-determined Expressions vs. Value-determined Restraint; (3) Equalitarianism; and (4) Individualism.

Group influence on formation of norms has been studied in an experimental design by Sherif (1936) in which a group in an unstable situation established its own norms and joiners accepted the group's norm. This study was the basis for several later investigations of value formation and value change. The Asch (1955) studies had a profound impact on value formation and change theory. In this series of studies, individuals often were persuaded to conform to group standards in contradiction of their own beliefs. Friesen (1972) concluded that forces in society, other than the youth culture, continue to share significantly in the value structures of modern youth.

The home and family as key influences on value development have been the subject of several studies. Brown and Morrison (1947) found that a democratic atmosphere in the home, interparental relationships and parental attitude toward peer activity, were significant in character development. Munns (1972) found that adolescents were much more influenced by peer group values than by parental values.

Experimental studies of "moral character" have been done in which the correlation is usually made between a subject's stated values and his behavior. The following

studies have been included here because they formed the basis for Kohlberg's research and theory which follows.

A major experimental study of values was Hartshorne and May (1928) in which the attempt was made to identify traits of good and bad character with words which had been used to describe the traits. Words such as honesty were found not to predict behavior over different situations. In fact, even while espousing "honesty" or "moral" behavior, subjects engaged in dishonest or immoral behavior in certain situations. Havighurst and Taba (1949) did the most thorough study up through 1964 of moral beliefs and behavior. Defining such words as honesty, loyalty, responsibility, moral courage, and friendliness, they sought a correlation between stated belief in such value words and character ratings. Only a small correlation ($r = .24$) was found between measures of strength of belief in the virtues listed and character ratings on those virtues. Hendry (1960) found no significant correlation between resistance to cheating or stated unwillingness to cheat.

The "moral character" approach above is more related to specific values than the Freudian (1922) theory. Freud emphasized the avoidance of guilt through conformity to internalized norms. Freudian psychology emphasized the relative nature of values. The development of values was an ego related task. As the ego gains in strength, judgment develops. The reality principle develops finer powers of

distinguishing what should or should not be valued. Freudian theory has not carefully defined the stages for moral development, since it depends on numerous other aspects of development.

The most promising studies of adolescent values in terms of theoretical considerations are those which have attempted to relate their findings to developmental ages or stages. The major theories of moral development have come from Piaget (1932) and Kohlberg (1958, 1964, 1973). Piaget's two stage theory of moral development was linked to cognitive development. The two stages Piaget theorized were heteronomous and autonomous. The heteronomous stage ranged up to age six and was characterized by dependence on adults for rules and sanctions. Behavior was primarily based upon the expected consequences. In the second or autonomous stage which began about age nine, moral decisions were more internally based.

Kohlberg has developed a comprehensive theory of moral development which includes value development. Kohlberg was influenced by the moral character studies of Hartshorne and May and others reviewed above. He theorized that moral judgment varied with cognitive development, as Piaget had said. Kohlberg did his research with case studies of 72 delinquent boys in Chicago. Eventually, he described six invariant stages of moral development which apply universally to mankind. For the present study note should be taken of Kohlberg's

theory of value development and change. Values change as an individual moves, one step at a time, through each stage of development. So far as Kohlberg is concerned, each step is a more "moral" stage than the last in terms of mature value judgment. Kohlberg said:

In the preconventional and conventional levels (stages 1 - 4) moral content or value is largely accidental or culture-bound. Anything from "honesty" to "courage in battle" can be the central value. But in the higher postconventional levels, Socrates, Lincoln, Thoreau, and Martin Luther King tend to speak without confusion of tongues, as it were. This because the ideal principles of any social structure are basically alike, if only because there simply aren't that many principles which are articulate, comprehensive, and integrated enough to be satisfying to the human intellect, and most of these principles have gone by the name of justice. (Simon and Kirschenbaum, 1973, pp. 60-61).

McLellan (1970) used Kohlberg's cognitive stages of moral development to categorize experimental subjects who had been involved in a Rokeach-type value change experiment. He correctly hypothesized that the most highly developed subjects would have the most stable value systems; value systems would become increasingly more content-similar at each successively higher level of moral reasoning and the single value Equality would predict total racial attitude score significantly better at the highest moral level. The overall findings suggested that an extensive study of the relation between stages of moral development and the organization of values would be helpful.

A developmental study of value systems in adolescents was done by Beech and Schoeppe (1974) with 396 boys and 343 girls. Using the Rokeach instruments to measure Terminal and Instrumental values the value systems of males and females were measured for the fifth, seventh, ninth and eleventh grades. Several conclusions were drawn from this study of which a few follow: The most striking result reported was the stability of the rankings over all grades which indicated some core cultural pattern. Sex differences were observed. While certain values such as "honesty", "a world at peace", "freedom" and "loving" were ranked consistently high by both sexes, "salvation", "logical" and "imaginative" were ranked low by both sexes. However, older boys and girls differed on "family security". As girls grow older "family security" decreases in importance while it increases for boys. Boys ranked "social recognition" consistently low while girls increased the rank as they grew older.

Other studies attempting to relate values and development have been done by Douvan and Adelson (1966), and Feather (1970a, 1970b, 1971, 1972a, 1972b, and 1972c). Stein (1972) found that all values do not develop simultaneously but are influenced by sex, grade, and occupational group. Fodor (1971) found that resistance to social influence among adolescents depends upon their level of moral development.

The literature is rather limited in research on values clarification beyond the work of Rath and Simon, its main advocates. Klevan (1957) investigated a methodology for values clarification for its relationship to consistency in thinking, purposefulness and human relations. The experimental subjects did improve more than the control subjects in consistent attitudes and personal purpose. They did not increase in friendliness. This research lacked the controls of an experimental design, although the writer noted personally that he believed the experimental subjects improved a good deal.

Sidney Simon (1958) investigated a methodology of values clarification for use with students who were selected for having a "non-value-based" behavior. Ten teachers were trained to use a values clarification strategy. Each teacher selected one child with whom to work in individual sessions. No change of statistical significance was found. Simon reported that the teachers failed to use the techniques effectively and consistently. Brown (1966) attempted to replicate the Simon study but with elementary school teachers and children. Brown found a marked improvement in the experimental subjects but not in the control. However, the research was not experimental and did not use precise measures.

Raths' (1960) doctoral dissertation studied 13 pairs of underachievers, matched on grade level, sex, I.Q.,

socio-economic class and rank. Six were selected randomly for experimental and the rest for control groups. The experimenter met with the experimental subjects for 20 minutes each week for 15 conversations to clarify values. While there was some improvement in five of the six experimental groups, the improvement was not statistically significant. Another study by Rath (1962a) with 100 elementary students, was to investigate whether values clarification methodologies helped students to improve in asking questions in class, become self-directed in classroom activity, improve attitude toward learning, perseverance, and active participation. At the end of the school year, 88 of 100 students were rated higher on each measure than at the beginning of the year.

Lang (1961) investigated the use of values clarification techniques with college students. The non-value-based behavior in this case was underachievement, apathy, and dissent. Since one weakness of values clarification research had been lack of control for attention, Lang had the control group receive the same amount of attention as the experimental group. The technique worked well with underachievers, but not so well with apathetic or dissenting students. When Lang followed up his research, he found that the improvement by the underachievers had disappeared. He concluded that long term effects in behavior cannot be expected from 16 or less exposures to values clarification.

Jones (1960), Machnits (1960), and Martin (1960) did their research in the same suburban elementary school. Each of them chose one child in his class who exhibited behavior indicative of lack of value clarity. A control child was chosen and matched as far as possible. Both the experimental and control children were judged unlikely to change in the normal course of instruction. Between October and February, each experimenter engaged in one values clarification encounter each day with the subject. All three experiments reported significant improvement in the experimental subject but no marked change in the control subject.

Gullo (1971) investigated the effects of video-taped value-clarification encounters upon alternativism and divergent thinking. His subjects were 120 tenth grade students. The treatments were for three class periods for three consecutive days. No significant improvement was found. Chamberlain (1971) used values clarification strategies in the teaching of earth science. Both boys and girls did show more interest and enthusiasm for the earth science class. They also became more affectively and cognitively involved in the class. Chamberlain concluded that values clarification methodologies may have elicited more enthusiasm from the teacher and in turn from the students. Nevertheless, she called for more research and use of values clarification strategies in the classroom.

Bloom (1969) found that teachers who were more proficient in using the techniques of values clarification were able to produce more results in the classroom. He concluded that the technique of values clarification should be refined and improved ways of teaching it to teachers should be found. Wilson (1971) used values clarification techniques with seventh through twelfth grades for 13 weeks. No statistically significant differences were found from pretest to posttest of self-improvement. However 50% of the subjects reported better self-understanding and 33% reported they understood others better. He concluded that teachers, methods and materials are the key variables.

Crellin (1968) investigated the relationship between the teachers trained in values clarification in workshops and their self-report of the results of using the strategies in the classroom. He found that the teachers were using the strategies and were greatly satisfied with the results. The teachers reported that their students were helped to develop their own personal values as a result. Crellin also concluded that values clarification techniques should be evaluated further.

Lail (1974) instructed teachers in values clarification methods in a two day workshop. The teachers then gave their pupils (fourth through ninth grades) a pretest on attitudes toward teacher and school. After using the values clarification strategies with the children for one grade period

the teachers gave the same test. A control group was included with 221 pupils compared to 311 in the experimental group. He found a statistically significant difference in a positive direction on seven items. The items measured belongingness in the class, liking the class, feeling comfortable in expressing opinion, enjoyment of class discussion, feeling the teacher cared, feeling the teacher was interested, and that the teacher knew the likes and dislikes of the students.

Kohlberg (1972) found a great deal to commend in values clarification techniques since they were practical enough for classroom use with a variety of people and in a wide variety of subject matter. While commending the practical aspects, however, Kohlberg criticized the philosophy that one value may be just as worthy as another. Values theorists, he said, should avoid relativism. Less advanced stages of thinking should be distinguished from more advanced thinking in values. The result would be toward the universal strivings of mankind in matters of value and moral judgment.

Abramowitz (1972) stressed the need of values clarification to give pupils experience in valuing to enable them to answer the questions that really concern them. Thornburg (1973) concluded from an investigation of adolescents' values that many shifts occurred during adolescence which generally incurred guilt. The educational system has a responsibility to direct the pre and post puberty child into appropriate moral and social behavior.

To summarize the values clarification literature, most of the failure or success rested with the interest, ability, and training of the teachers. The conclusion drawn from this was that the teacher is the key to success in values clarification use. A second conclusion drawn from the literature was that while numerous claims for the values clarification methodology have been made, there is little experimental research in favor of the claims. The research that has been done has lacked the controls of experimental design. Finally, the literature contained several recommendations that experimental studies of values clarification strategies be conducted.

The Rokeach Theory. Research related to Rokeach's theory and work has been rather limited. The basis for Rokeach's dissonance theory was the cognitive dissonance theory of Festinger (1957). Festinger's theory has had considerable attention and replication with the result that it has been somewhat refined. Recent studies have indicated that the key to cognitive dissonance is whether the self-concept is enhanced or threatened by cognitions about behavior (Aronson 1968, 1969; Collins 1969). Bramel (1968) in particular argued that when one gets information that implies that he is incompetent, immoral or bad, dissonance occurs. Secord and Blackman (1969) regarded the self-concept as central in stability or change. Congruence or equilibrium between the self-concept and perceptions of self, or

perceptions of others' opinions of the self were held to be essential to stability. Nel, Helmreich and Aronson (1969) investigated dissonance in an experimental design. They correctly hypothesized that dissonance is aroused as a function of discrepancy between the self-concept and the consequences of behavior. Rokeach's work seems well-founded on such studies as those above.

Williams (1974) conceded that the Rokeach theory of value change based on his theory of dissonance is appropriate under the conditions studied so far. Yet he cautioned that replications should be sought in contexts of greater ambiguity, lower levels of information, lesser definiteness of social support, and greater uncertainty concerning severe risks. Williams also suggested that some of Rokeach's main assumptions should be tested. "Is it always the case that individuals seek a total conception of themselves that is internally consistent and that represents the self as 'competent' and 'moral'" (pp. 215-230)? He also questioned whether contradictions between values and self-conceptions will always be resolved so that self-conceptions will be maintained or enhanced. This may be true where there is a high degree of freedom but what happens when the social structure will not allow one to change his values yet holds him to be evil and inferior for holding the wrong values?

From another point of view, Bem (1967) rejected Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance. As a behaviorist

he could not accept an hypothesis deduced from alleged internal states of an organism. Dissonance can be accounted for best by an analysis of the individual's past training history. Furthermore Bem (1970) has suggested that the Rokeach experimental findings were not the result of internal consistency needs. Rather they resulted from social pressure alone. Since the changes brought about in the Rokeach experiment occurred in the "socially desirable direction", Bem regarded them as coming from social pressure.

Penner (1971) experimentally investigated one aspect of the Rokeach theory of dissonance. From this theory he hypothesized that if the value Equality was significantly related to attitudes toward and behavior involving civil rights, then Equality should be significantly related to attitudinal and behavioral indices of interpersonal attraction toward an individual black. He also hypothesized that changes in the importance of Equality should result in changes in attitudinal and behavioral indices of interpersonal attraction toward an individual black person. The conclusions drawn from this research were supportive of both hypotheses.

Conroy, Katkin, and Barnette (1973) recruited 14 heavy cigarette smokers to participate in a clinic to quit smoking. Several tactics to aid in stopping smoking were used. Later the subjects were divided into two groups of 7 experimental and 7 control. Previous research on Rokeach's instrument

showed that two instrumental values distinguished cigarette smokers from cigarette quitters. Smokers ranked broadminded third and self-disciplined eighth, whereas quitters ranked broadminded eighth and self-disciplined first. Then the experimenters gave an interpretation to these findings that people who experienced difficulty quitting smoking were trying to be broadminded about a task that required rigid self-discipline. This information was shown the subjects along with verbal interpretation. Subjects were then invited to compare their own value rankings with those who experienced difficulty quitting smoking and who ranked broadminded high and self-discipline low, and then rate the extent of self-dissatisfaction they felt with this information. Then the subjects did the posttest, reranking the values. The experimental group registered an immediate mean increase of 6.1 units in their rankings of self-discipline. At the end of four days smoking had decreased among the experimental group compared to the control group, the mean difference being significant at the .05 level. This research was important for several reasons. First of all, it seemed to combat Bem's criticism of "social pressure". Secondly, it offered a precedent for an immediate posttest using the Rokeach method.

Feather has used the Rokeach Value Survey in several investigations with adolescents which were cited earlier. He also (1973) investigated whether response anonymity would

affect how school children ranked the values. He found that response anonymity had little or no affect on the ranking.

The review of relevant literature on the Rokeach theory and research indicated a great deal of theoretical basis for his interpretation and refinement of the dissonance phenomena. Several experiments also indicated that behavioral changes have occurred as the result of feedback which aroused dissonance between the self-concept and one's performance in a given situation.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects. The subjects for this study came from a conference of Young Friends (Quakers) held at Guilford College, North Carolina, August 9 through 12, 1974. There were 210 in attendance, 125 girls and 85 boys. Three were black. The ages of the subjects ranged from 14 through 18.

A wide variety of socio-economic backgrounds was noted in the group. Classification of the subjects into well defined categories according to socio-economic data was not done because of the limited time available to gather information as well as the difficulty of defining such classifications in today's society. The decision to classify the data in two categories followed the classic study of the Lynds (1937) of Middletown, U.S.A. This classification is recognized as viable by Cuber (1967) in his catalog of various methods of classification of socio-economic data. Specifically, the Lynds formulated a two-class division, the working class and the business class. Two questions on the questionnaire asked: "Describe your father's occupation", and "Describe your Mother's occupation". The 203 subjects whose data could be classified were arbitrarily judged according to their answers. The "business" class contained 123. The "working" class contained 80.

The majority of the subjects came from the Piedmont Section of North Carolina. There were 19 from rural eastern North Carolina and Virginia.

Experimental and Control Group Assignments. Based upon past experience and attendance at this conference about 300 subjects were expected. Ideally the groups would have been divided into 110 subjects for the Rokeach treatment, 110 for the values clarification treatment, and 80 in the control group. Contrary to expectation the registration only reached 210. The decision had been made to calculate percentages so that the group ratio could be about the same whether the actual attendance was greater or less than expectations. Thus, percentages were calculated and the groups were determined at 77 in the Rokeach and values clarification groups, with 56 in the control group.

Age and sex were controlled by distributing the 14, 15 and 18 year old boys and girls randomly and evenly among the groups. The 16 and 17 year olds were also distributed randomly among the groups. Table 1 shows the ages of the boys and girls in the treatment and control groups. There were 3 black girls in the conference whose race was not known before the group assignments were made.

The size of the groups was too large for ideal teaching and learning conditions. Thus, each treatment group was divided into three subgroups. The subgroups were randomly and equally divided and age and sex ratios were kept as

TABLE 1

Rokeach, Values Clarification and Control Groups,
According to Age and Sex

<u>Group</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Rokeach			
<u>Ages 14-15</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>16-17</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>39</u>
<u>18</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>77</u>
Values Clarification			
<u>Ages 14-15</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>16-17</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>39</u>
<u>18</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>77</u>
Control			
<u>Ages 14-15</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>16-17</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>18</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>56</u>
GRAND TOTAL	85	125	

nearly even as possible in the subgroups. Table 2 shows the number in each subgroup according to age and sex.

Teachers. Three teachers were selected to conduct the groups. A high school teacher of Social Studies from Winston-Salem Public Schools was chosen. She has a B. S. degree from Guilford College and an "A" certificate from the North Carolina State Department of Instruction.

The second teacher was from Alamance County Schools, a middle school guidance counselor. He has a M. Ed. in Guidance Counseling from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

The third teacher was a minister who had considerable experience in working with young people in church groups. He has a Master of Divinity degree from Vanderbilt University School of Theology.

The teachers met two times prior to the conference to receive instructions. Each teacher was given precise instructions (Appendices E, F and G) and directions. Teachers were urged to follow the lesson plans as nearly as possible so that the treatment would have an opportunity to work. At the second meeting the schedule (Appendix H) was given to the teachers. All teacher questions were answered as fully as possible.

The literature contained several examples of teacher problems and teacher differences in presenting the values

TABLE 2

Subgroup Division of Rokeach, Values Clarification,
Control Subjects According to Age and Sex

Rokeach	A1		A2		A3	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Ages 14-15	2	6	1	6	1	5
16-17	6	7	6	7	5	8
18	3	2	3	2	4	3
Total	26		25		26	

Values Clarification	B1		B2		B3	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Ages 14-15	2	5	2	5	1	6
16-17	5	8	5	8	6	7
18	3	2	4	2	3	3
Total	25		26		26	

Control	C1		C2		C3	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Ages 14-15	1	4	1	4	1	4
16-17	4	5	4	5	4	6
18	3	2	4	2	3	1
Total	19		20		19	

clarification materials. Certain controls were designed to control for teacher differences. Each teacher was assigned to conduct one Rokeach subgroup on day one and the same group on day two. Each teacher also had one control subgroup each day and one values clarification subgroup each day. In the data analysis teacher differences could thus be discovered.

The Design. The design of this study was derived from Campbell and Stanley (1964) who listed it as a true experimental design. They referred to it as the "Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design". The design contains subject as a nested factor. This situation occurs when the subjects do not "cross over" or receive the same treatment. Also the design contains three repeated measures on each subject. Two hundred and ten subjects were assigned to one of three treatments, Rokeach, values clarification, or control. The assignment was through stratified randomization(see page 33). Each of the treatment groups was divided into three subgroups. For convenience, the Rokeach subgroups were labeled A1, A2 and A3. The values clarification subgroups were B1, B2 and B3. The control subgroups were C1, C2 and C3. In order to control for time of day the subgroups were rotated so that one Rokeach subgroup, one values clarification subgroup, and one control subgroup met at each period (Appendix H).

On day one each of the Rokeach subgroups met and were given the Rokeach Value Change Instrument which contains both a pretest and posttest. On day two the Rokeach subgroups met again and did some values clarification strategies which did not relate to the values Freedom and Equality which were being investigated. At the end of the second session the Rokeach subgroups were posttested for the second time.

The values clarification subgroups, B1, B2 and B3 were given the pretest and a values clarification treatment in session one on day one. At the end of the session they were given a posttest. On day two the values clarification groups were given a second values clarification treatment and a posttest.

The control groups, C1, C2 and C3, were given the pretest on day one. The treatment given the control group was a values clarification strategy unrelated to the specific values Freedom and Equality. At the end of the session a posttest was given. On day two the control groups met for their second session and were given another values clarification strategy unrelated to the values Freedom and Equality. A posttest was given at the end of each session.

The Instruments. Rokeach designed an instrument for measuring the relative importance to a subject of 18 values. These values called "terminal" values were presented in alphabetical order on a mimeographed sheet. Each value was

given with a defining word or two in parenthesis (Appendix A). Rokeach found the test-retest reliability of this instrument to be .74. This instrument, Value Survey Form E, was used in this study as the pretest and posttest with the values clarification and control groups.

In order to conduct his value change experiments, Rokeach designed a Value Change Instrument (Appendix C). This instrument contained the Value Survey Form E for the pretest. The remainder of the instrument was based on Rokeach's theory of value change. It was designed to stir up dissonance in the minds of subjects who ranked Freedom higher than Equality on the pretest. The posttest used by Rokeach in this instrument was a form like the Value Survey (Appendix A) but he did not ask his subjects to rerank the values. He asked them to indicate whether they were dissatisfied with their pretest rankings.

In the present study, the Rokeach Value Change Instrument was adapted for use with the Rokeach group. Two modifications were made. It was necessary to obtain immediate measures of change at the time of the treatment. Thus, the Value Survey Form E was placed in the Value Change Instrument as the final page instead of Rokeach's indicator of dissatisfaction (Appendix C).

The second modification of the Value Change Instrument was the data which Rokeach arbitrarily calls "Table 1" in

his Value Change Instrument (Appendix C). That data were gathered by Rokeach in research among Michigan State University students. The data in "Table 1" were probably effective in stirring up dissonance due to its relevance as peer group pressure. Thus, for the purpose of influencing the subjects in this study, data were used from a local high school group. The data in "Table 2" of the Modified Rokeach Value Change Instrument (Appendix C), were gathered in a pilot study of local high school students (Appendix I).

The Procedure. At 2:45 p.m. on a Friday afternoon, all teachers and leaders (10 persons in all), met for a briefing on the coming sessions. Leaders were informed that they should carry out the topics they had been assigned in the conference sessions. They were informed that certain topics would be discussed in the experimental sessions having to do with the values of adolescents. Copies of the stories used in values clarification and the Rokeach and control groups were given all leaders. The leaders were asked to avoid these stories and to avoid discussing them until the final treatment group had met on Saturday. Adequate time for any discussion could be given on Saturday and Sunday when the experiment was concluded.

Subjects and teachers met on Friday afternoon at 3:00 p.m. in Duke Memorial Hall at Guilford College. Duke Hall is a

classroom building with an auditorium for large classes. The students were told by their director that they were going to participate in a study of values of adolescents. Their group assignments were given to them along with the classroom and time for each succeeding meeting of the group. Stress was placed upon attendance, promptness and participation in the activities of the group. Finally, the teachers were introduced. The students were dismissed to assemble for their first session.

Appendix H shows the schedule for each of the groups for the experimental sessions. During the time block Friday 3:30 p.m. to 4:45 p.m., one Rokeach subgroup (A1), met, one values clarification, subgroup (B2), and one control group (C3) met. The remaining 2/3 of the subjects were meeting with a young minister discussing the topic: Does the Bible speak to our age? At each successive time block shown on the schedule (Appendix H), the 2/3 of the subjects not in the experimental or control sessions were meeting for discussions and lectures. Besides the topic mentioned above for one session, each subject attended two sessions where "Dreams" was the topic. Each subject also saw the film "Future Shock" based on the book by Toffler by the same title. (This film was produced by Metromedia Producers Corporation and was directed by Alex Grasshoff.)

The experimental and control groups met with teachers in the first session on Friday and the second session with the same teacher on Saturday. At the beginning of the period on Friday, each teacher was instructed to welcome the group and explain the purpose of the session. (Exact instructions for teachers are included in Appendices E, F & G.)

The Rokeach groups in session one were then given pencils and a Rokeach Value Change Instrument (Appendix D) as adapted for this study. Attached to the instrument as the top page was a questionnaire for personal information (Appendix D). The teacher waited for every student to complete the questionnaire, then proceeded to the instrument. The Value Survey was read by the teacher aloud and opportunity given for questions on each item. When the questions were answered the students were directed to perform the operation called for in the item that had been read and explained. About one hour was allowed for the Rokeach treatment and all students finished at the same time.

The Rokeach groups met for a second time, but no treatment related to the variables Freedom and Equality was used. The primary reason for a second meeting was to give a second posttest. The teachers used values clarification strategies worked out for control groups on day one so that the Freedom and Equality variables would not be dealt with. At the end of the second session the Rokeach groups filled out their second posttest (Appendix A).

The values clarification group's first session proceeded exactly as the Rokeach session except the personal information questionnaire was followed by the Value Survey Instrument Form E. When the student finished Form E, it was collected by the teacher. The teacher then presented the story of Cynthia's Baby (Appendix E). The story was written for the purpose of motivating the reader to think about the possible effects of prejudice and lack of equality among human beings. Students were instructed to rank the five characters in the story according to their morality or immorality as evidenced by their behavior in the story. Next, the students gathered in groups of four to compare rankings. Again each student was asked to think of two or three adjectives to describe the most immoral person in the story. Finally, each student was encouraged to write down adjectives that were directly opposite in meaning to the adjective used to describe the most immoral person in the story. The students were told that these last adjectives were descriptive of behavior they valued highly.

The treatments were concluded by a strategy called values voting. The teacher asked the student to use an appropriate hand signal for expressing his agreement, enthusiastic agreement, disagreement or emphatic disagreement with certain values statements. These statements were read and voted upon (Appendix E).

The teacher then passed out the posttest and asked each student to rerank them feeling free to change them if he wished. After collecting the forms, the teacher excused the students until the next session.

The second values clarification session began by welcoming the students and reminding them that it was hoped they would learn more about their values. The teacher then passed out a Values Sheet (Appendix F). The Values Sheet contained a story aimed at motivating the students to think about the value Equality. The teacher read the story aloud and allowed 20 minutes for the students to think and answer four questions on their reaction to the story.

The teacher then asked for volunteers for a Public Interview. The rules for a Public Interview were explained as follows: "A Public Interview is a series of questions which the teacher will ask the student to which he should respond as honestly as he can. If he chooses to answer the question, his answer must be the truth as far as he knows. But, if he does not wish to answer he can say, "I pass." The teacher then interviewed in order, two boys and two girls. The student stood as he was interviewed. There were two series of questions (Appendix F). One boy and one girl answered one series and a different boy and girl answered the second series of questions.

At the end of the session the teacher passed out the Value Survey Form E (Appendix B) and asked each student to rerank the values according to their present feelings. When these were finished the teacher thanked each student for cooperating and expressed the hope that he was more aware of his own values than before.

The control group session one followed the same procedure as the values clarification group except the story of Cynthia's Baby was left out and the Alligator River Story was used (Appendix G). The voting questions were changed so that they focused on values different from the Freedom-Equality values (Appendix G).

The control group session two was also exactly the same as the values clarification session two except that the values sheet and public interviews did not focus on the Freedom-Equality values (Appendix G).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The statistical analysis was done on those subjects who ranked Freedom higher than Equality on the pretest. The minimum acceptable difference between Freedom and Equality rankings was at least two. The selection of those subjects who ranked Freedom at least two steps higher than Equality on the pretest was done without advance knowledge of post-test data.

The total number of subjects whose pretest and post-test scores were scrutable was 205. Those who ranked Freedom at least two steps higher than Equality on the pretest were 95. The Rokeach subjects numbered 72 of whom 35 ranked Freedom two steps higher than Equality. The Values Clarification Group had 76 of whom 38 ranked Freedom two steps higher than Equality on the pretest. The control group had 57 subjects of whom 22 ranked Freedom at least two steps higher than Equality on the pretest.

The percentage of those who ranked Freedom at least two steps higher than Equality on the pretest was 46%. In May of 1974, a pilot study was done to determine the feasibility of this research. One hundred and twenty three high school students were asked to rank the 18 terminal values of the Rokeach Value Survey Form E. Freedom was ranked at least

two steps higher than Equality by 62% of those students. In the light of that study, approximately 60% of the subjects in the current study were expected to rank Freedom at least two steps higher than Equality. Rokeach (1974) reports surveys which indicate 186 fifteen-year olds ranked Freedom two and Equality four. Freedom was reportedly one of the most stable values among adolescents, while Equality tended to rise during adolescence. Possible explanations for the difference in ranking in this research will be given in the latter part of this chapter.

The Analyses. The pretest and posttest data were punched on IBM cards and analyzed by computer using the Statistical Analysis System Package. Separate analyses were performed on the Freedom and Equality variables. For the Freedom variable, a three by two analysis of variance was done. The first classification was technique (Rokeach, values clarification, and control). The second classification consisted of repeated measurements from the pretest to the two posttests.

The hypotheses concerning the Freedom variable was that it would not change for any group or differentially for groups. The data support this expectation. No difference was found between the three groups on the Freedom variable (Table 3). There was no change over time on the Freedom variable. No significant interaction was found between the groups over time. The conclusion to be drawn from the

TABLE 3
 Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance
 on the Freedom Variable

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F
Group	2	69.49	2.36
Subject Within Groups	91	29.43	
Repeated Measures	2	.47	.117
Repeated Measures X Sub- jects Within Groups	182	4.02	
Group X Repeated Measures	4	6.92	1.72
Subjects X Repeated Meas- ures Within Groups	182	4.02	

analysis of the Freedom variable was that no change occurred in the Freedom variable rating for any group or differentially for groups.

The Equality variable was also analyzed by a three by two analysis of variance. The three classifications were technique (Rokeach, values clarification, and control), and repeated measurements (pretest to two posttests). The hypothesis concerning the Equality variable was that both the Rokeach and values clarification groups would increase their ratings of Equality more than the control group. The next hypothesis was that the Rokeach group would change these ratings more than the values clarification group. The expected change in Equality ratings was in the direction of the Freedom rating.

As shown in Table 4, there was a significant difference between the groups on the Equality ratings. The F value was 3.90 ($p < .05$). There was also a significant difference between the groups over time. The F value was 9.15 ($p < .01$). Finally, it is shown in Table 4 that there was no significant interaction between the groups over time. This meant that the groups did change from pretest to posttests, but that all three groups changed approximately the same amount, and in the same direction. Table 3 indicates that all groups moved Equality ratings up toward Freedom.

TABLE 4
 Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance
 on the Equality Variable

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F
Group	2	132.33	3.90*
Subjects Within Groups	91	33.87	
Repeated Measures	2	70.54	9.15**
Repeated Measures X Sub- jects Within Groups	182	7.71	
Group X Repeated Measures	4	14.33	1.86
Subjects X Repeated Meas- ures Within Groups	182	7.7	

*p < .05

**p < .01

The analysis of the difference scores (Table 5) indicated no significant difference between the groups. Equality moved toward Freedom ratings at about the same amount in all groups. The table shows that from pretest to posttests there was a significant difference; however, all groups changed about the same. Table 6 indicates that the Rokeach group pretest score mean difference was 7.06. The first posttest mean difference was 5.51, while the second posttest mean difference was 5.43. The values clarification group pretest score mean difference was 6.92. The first posttest mean difference was 5.02 and the second posttest mean difference was 4.11. The control group pretest score indicated a mean difference of 7.10. The first posttest mean difference in the control group was 7.32 which was greater than the pretest difference. However, the second posttest mean difference dropped from 7.32 to 6.60. The conclusion to be drawn from the analysis of the difference in scores was that the interaction was not significant. Whatever change occurred in one group also occurred in the others.

In summary, the analyses of the data led to the conclusion that Equality did move toward Freedom in each group. The Freedom variable did not change in rating in either group. It cannot be concluded that the groups changed differentially. On the basis of the analyses the three

TABLE 5

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance
on the Difference Scores of the Variables
Freedom and Equality

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F
Group	2	56.29	1.36
Subjects Within Groups	91	41.28	
Repeated Measures	2	82.54	7.027**
Subjects X Repeated Measures Within Groups	182	11.75	
Group X Repeated Measures	4	12.95	1.10
Subjects X Repeated Measures Within Groups	182	11.75	

**p < .01

TABLE 6

Mean Difference between the Three Groups from
Pretest through Posttests 1 and 2

<u>ROKEACH</u>	<u>Freedom</u>	<u>Equality</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Pretest	4.83	11.89	-7.06
Posttest 1	4.11	9.60	-5.51
Posttest 2	4.17	9.60	-5.43
<u>VALUES CLARIFICATION</u>			
Pretest	5.22	12.14	-6.92
Posttest 1	6.05	11.08	-5.02
Posttest 2	6.03	10.14	-4.11
<u>CONTROL</u>			
Pretest	5.77	12.87	-7.10
Posttest 1	5.91	13.22	-7.32
Posttest 2	6.05	12.64	-6.60

hypotheses of this study were dealt with in the following manner:

1. The hypothesis that the ranking of the value Freedom would not change in the Rokeach or values clarification group was accepted.
2. The hypothesis that the ranking of the value Equality would increase toward the ranking of Freedom in both the Rokeach and values clarification groups was rejected.
3. The hypothesis that the ranking of the value Equality would increase toward the ranking of Freedom to a greater degree in the Rokeach group than in the values clarification group was not tested because hypothesis number two was rejected.

Discussion

A number of considerations should be examined at this point. How does this study compare with the Rokeach theory and research? Does this study bring new light on values clarification theory and methodology? What rationale can be given for the findings of this study? What implications are there for further study?

In the first place the present research was neither a replication of the Rokeach experiments nor was it an adequate test for his theory. Rather this was an attempt to select one aspect of Rokeach's work and test it. One of the major problems of Rokeach's work was the lack of clarity

about procedure and method. He tended to lump together the data from several experiments and jointly discuss them. Any replication attempt on the Rokeach work needed first to separate the various experiments and the procedures from each other. Rokeach's reports simply overwhelm the reader. For example, his dependent variables for various studies have been whether or not subjects joined the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The confusion is obvious when one considers that such membership would typically be classified as the independent variable. In another experiment Rokeach's dependent variable was whether subjects chose to major in a particular core curriculum after his treatment. In still another the dependent variable was whether the subjects in a two-year natural science program in junior college chose to go into a social science program in their succeeding college work after the Rokeach treatment.

Another criticism of the Rokeach experiments (which Rokeach admitted, 1973 p. 315) was the lack of random selection and random assignment in his experimental and control groups. This has often been the case when the experimenter used college classes in his experiments.

A weakness that Rokeach did not discuss but which does seem critical was his way of gathering and analyzing the posttest data. The Rokeach Value Change Instrument (Appendix C) was not posttested and he did not ask whether any significant preferential value change occurred at the time

the treatment was given. Instead Rokeach asked the subject whether he was dissatisfied with the way he had ranked the values. Three weeks later, Rokeach attempted to survey the subjects and give a posttest to see if the rankings had changed. In one example he reported that at the end of the three week period the experimental subjects had moved Equality up 1.91 steps while the control subjects had moved the value Equality up .68. According to Rokeach this was highly significant ($p < .01$). On the contrary Rokeach did not report in a concise way how many of his original subjects responded to that survey. This raises the question whether complete confidence can be placed in the findings.

Consequently an investigation of Rokeach's posttests indicated the same weakness. For example, in two experiments Rokeach had his subjects solicited by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). This took place three to five months after the experimental treatment. In one experiment there were 98 experimental and 99 control subjects. The NAACP solicitation brought in 15 new memberships or requests for more information from the experimental group and 8 from the control group. The comparison of the responses according to Rokeach was statistically significant ($p < .05$). However one must remember that only 15 experimental subjects of the original 98 responded to the NAACP letter. In a report of combined studies Rokeach (1974) reported on the solicitation of 366 of his experimental

and control subjects which took place three months and one year after the treatment. A total of 69 responses occurred from this solicitation. The response was 18 percent of the original subjects. It seems apparent that Rokeach was concerned about the magnitude of change in a few of his subjects rather than in the number of subjects who changed behavior.

Kerlinger (1964) discussed the limitations that are placed on research that depends on responses to mail questionnaires. A response rate less than 80 or 90 percent is insufficient in most cases yet such are often less than 40 to 50 percent. While Kerlinger was referring primarily to survey research his criticism applies to the method used by Rokeach to obtain his posttest measures. Campbell and Stanley (1963) listed experimental mortality or differential loss of respondents from the comparison groups as a factor which can seriously jeopardize internal validity.

In order to overcome some of the weaknesses discussed above, the decision was made to give the posttest in the present study at the end of the treatment with the Rokeach Value Instrument and also after a period of one day. Although Rokeach argued (1973) that the more removed a posttest was from an experimental treatment, the more likely the changes were to be genuine, the problems of subject mortality discussed above, as well as problems of history and maturation (Kerlinger 1964, Campbell and Stanley 1963) demand careful controls when the posttest is delayed.

In the present study however the question was asked whether a significant number of those who ranked Freedom at least two steps higher than Equality would change their rankings of Equality toward Freedom as measured by an immediate posttest. The Rokeach treatment group did change significantly but change was nullified by a concomitant change in the control group. This did not give a clear cut "yes" or "no" which would have been helpful. There is still no certainty that the Rokeach treatment does not produce immediate change. Instead there is some basis for saying that the treatment would bring about the desired change if the study were done with adequate controls. Theories of value change when the self-concept is threatened by cognitions about behavior do not predict "when" the change takes place (Aronson 1968, 1969; Collins 1969; Bramel 1968; Secord and Blackman 1969). Indeed the studies which attempt to verify and refine the Festinger (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance (Nel, Helmreich and Aronson 1969) usually posttest immediately. Conroy, Katkin, and Barnette (1973) demonstrated experimentally that cigarette smoking behavior can be modified when self-dissatisfaction is aroused. They measured the value change of their subjects with an immediate posttest. McLellan (1974) also used an immediate posttest to measure the change produced by the Rokeach treatment.

Values clarification has many advocates and many users. The techniques appeal to teachers and the idea of helping

children and adolescents learn skills which will assist them in developing their own values is a good idea. Publishers have begun to advertise values clarification materials with assurance that they have been adequately researched and tested. While these claims have a certain amount of truth in them they cannot be substantiated by research in the literature. A computer search of the ERIC FILE on November 25, 1974 produced only two articles on the subject of values clarification. The remainder of the research on values clarification has been mostly in the doctoral dissertations which have been cited earlier in this paper.

The research and development so badly needed for the training of teachers and testing of the strategies and techniques is precisely what the leading advocates of values clarification do not choose to do. In a letter to all professionals who have participated in values clarification workshops, Kirchenbaum, Harmin, and Simon responded to requests they had gotten for a system, or a structure and some certification procedures for values clarification trainers. In the letter they stated that they did not choose to build a structured system to certify values clarification trainers. They did offer nine general suggestions for any professional who wishes to feel more qualified to lead workshops on values clarification. Yet the review of literature in this research pointed out teachers as key

persons in the success or failure of values clarification (Simon 1958, Chamberlain 1971, Bloom 1969, Wilson 1971).

Kohlberg's critical evaluation of values clarification is relevant:

I think that they have some useful techniques. Values clarification is a very useful component of moral education, and we try to do some of that ourselves. But they really have not defined their objectives. So no one can tell yet whether it works. No one has ever assessed what good their work has done because they have no criteria of what developmental improvement would be. I think they deal with a much broader field than moral values or moral development. Values cover everything under the sun. A lot of what they call values clarification is what other people call psychological education. They talk about feelings, needs, and desires as equivalent to values (1973 p. 63).

This criticism is well-taken. There is no point in providing the teacher with a series of lesson plans unless the goals for their use as well as the expected results have been determined. Only one carefully controlled experiment has reported significant findings with the use of such techniques (Raths 1962a). However, Kohlberg is correct in saying that the need for values clarification in moral education is clear. Both religious and educational institutions need to provide these skills (McCandless 1970, Asch 1955, Kohlberg 1972, Abramowitz 1972).

A serious question to be answered by research is whether the values clarification techniques help the student clarify his own values, whether he is acquiring skills to make him proficient in clarifying his own values, or

whether he is being persuaded to accept the values of his teacher or peers. Indeed it may be that values clarification involves some of all these. Persuasion studies have clearly demonstrated the influence of peer groups on attitudes (Asch 1956, Wright 1966, Sherif 1952). Other conclusions from persuasion studies that relate to values clarification are: (1) students whose opinions are held privately change more easily than those whose opinions are publicly known (Gerard 1964), (2) persuasion is more effective if there is some ground for agreement established before opinion change is attempted (Weiss 1960), and (3) people are persuaded more easily by those they feel alike (Weiss 1957).

The comparison of the Rokeach and values clarification treatments in this study was designed to overcome some of the criticisms of both systems and answer some of the questions. The hypothesized change for the values clarification and Rokeach groups did occur and was measured by the immediate posttest. The control group changed also and confounded the results. There is still no assurance that the Rokeach method produces an immediate change in the value system. Neither is there any assurance that the values clarification strategies have an immediate effect.

The control group change in this study is difficult to account for entirely. To say that it was pure chance is not sufficient, given the statistical significance of the change.

On the other hand, the experimental setting at a conference for adolescents who came with open minds and high expectations accounts for some change. Rokeach (1973) says that some change can be expected simply by putting students in a new social setting, especially an experimental setting where change is expected. These adolescents were not only open for change but likely to change in the direction of more social, humanistic values (Strommer 1974, Williams 1974). Kerlinger emphasized the Hawthorne effect in experimental settings.

Almost any change, any extra attention, any experimental manipulation, or even the knowledge that a study is being done, is enough to cause subjects to change. In short, if we pay attention to people, they respond (1964, p. 318).

While efforts were made to keep the control group from discussing the values Freedom and Equality, the ranking of these values could have changed due to changes in any of the other sixteen values on the test. Due to the ipsative nature of ranking scales, when one item is ranked no other item can receive that rank. Therefore a change in the ranking of any value can conceivably change the ranking of others. Essentially this means that any change in values by the control group could have changed the ratings of Freedom and Equality.

There is good reason to believe that contamination occurred in the control group. Apparently this contamination

took place between the hours of 10:00 p.m. on Friday and 10:00 a.m. on Saturday. Controls for student interaction between the 10:00 p.m. session on Friday and 10:00 a.m. session on Saturday were considered. At the outset the control group subjects were expected to have some limited contact with Rokeach and values clarification subjects at a coke and cookie hour from 10:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. The subjects were to go to their dormitory floor at about 11:00 p.m. They met with the dormitory floor leader (a chaperone) to establish some ground rules for the conference (behavior, etc.). The main purpose of these meetings was to bring the students into the confines of the dormitories where they could be accounted for until they went to their rooms. The subjects also were expected to have an opportunity to mingle at breakfast at 8:00 a.m. on Saturday and during a devotional session at 9:00 a.m.

The decision was made not to instruct the students to avoid discussions of the treatment materials (specifically the Rokeach and values clarification strategies) with their peers. Logical reasons for and against this decision were considered. First of all, the ethical consideration was whether these adolescents could be asked to attend the conference at considerable expense and then suggest that part of them were being "left out". Also, the Youth Director for North Carolina Young Friends strongly opposed asking the students not to discuss the information. A second

consideration was that to arouse the curiosity of the control subjects might cause them to be more determined to find out what went on in the other groups. Clearly there was adequate time and opportunity to find out if they chose to do so. Finally, the teachers and leaders attending the 2:45 p.m. meeting on Friday were instructed to avoid discussions of the Rokeach and values clarification materials if they arose in the group sessions outside the treatment groups.

In retrospect, a contamination of some control group subjects by the discussion of the values clarification stories obviously occurred. Two students from two different dormitories reported that the story of Cynthia's Baby (Appendix E) was discussed in dormitory sessions that went on into the late hours. Such informal sessions are not unusual when adolescents meet in conferences such as this. Generally speaking, conferences such as this tend to create an openness and willingness to discuss things. Furthermore, in such an atmosphere of open and receptive participation, even the youngsters in the control group could be expected to experience some changes in attitude if they knew the direction in which others were changing.

There was no way of determining how widespread these discussions became. The effects can be seen in Table 6. The first posttest score of the control group came on Friday night before the contamination took place. In that measure, the mean difference between Freedom and Equality increased

from 7.10 to 7.32. However, after contamination took place, the second posttest revealed a decrease in the mean difference scores from 7.32 to 6.60.

Unfortunately, the dormitory leaders had not attended the staff meeting at 2:45 p.m. on Friday, and were not aware of the nature of the experiments. On the other hand, there is no assurance that these discussions could have been avoided even if the dorm leaders had been aware of the nature of the experiments. The dormitory sessions were informal and not necessarily organized well enough for a dorm leader to monitor them.

Finally the question arises why did the percentage of subjects who ranked Freedom at least two steps higher than Equality not reach the projected 60 percent? One possible answer is that the two groups were not similar. One was a high school class selected by chance. The other was a larger group of adolescents who were meeting because they shared one commonality: They were all Quakers. One of the fundamental characteristics of the Quaker religion is its emphasis on equality and brotherhood. Conceivably, this could cause some difference between Quakers and other groups on the variable Equality. Strommer (1974) surveyed 7,050 adolescents randomly selected from church groups. He reported that church youth are different from non-church youth in their values more than in any other respect. Strommer says that church related adolescents value people and are more

social action oriented than non-church related adolescents. If this is true, it adds further light as to why the subjects in this study did not rank Freedom at least two steps higher than Equality in the expected percentage. Also there seems to be a national trend toward the rise of Equality in the rankings of values. Williams (1974) said that while our basic values have not changed, the order of their importance has changed. In the past freedom has received great emphasis in this country, but now equality is on the rise.

In summary if the assumption that the control group was contaminated can be accepted the positive aspects of this research may be quite worthwhile. A great deal could be said about the use of values clarification methods with adolescents over a short period of time. The specific techniques used in this research would take on more significance as well. Indeed the total impact of this research would have been different had not the alleged contamination taken place.

Finally, this study has demonstrated the value of experimental design in research. Numerous studies have been published with outstanding results claimed but without the control group design. The presence of the control group in many cases could have strengthened or weakened the confidence with which the results could have been accepted. In the present study the control group provided a safeguard against accepting the hypotheses without further study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this research was to test whether certain values clarification strategies were powerful enough to produce a change in the value system of adolescents. The values clarification strategies were compared to another method of altering the value system designed by Milton Rokeach. This method was based on stirring up dissonance within the cognitive system. A control group was also added making three comparison groups.

The subjects were 210 adolescents who attended a weekend church related conference. Their ages were 14 through 18. The subjects were assigned randomly to one of three groups with age and sex distributions kept even.

The Rokeach group and the values clarification group contained 77 subjects each, while the control group had 56. To attempt to get more ideal class sizes, all the groups were divided randomly into three sub-groups. Again, age and sex differences were divided evenly among the groups.

Three teachers led the groups, each with one Rokeach, one Values Clarification, and one Control. The groups were rotated each day to control for time of day, tiredness.

The Rokeach sub-groups met for two sessions, the first on Friday, the second on Saturday. The first session was

the treatment session. The Rokeach Value Change Instrument was used. The instrument was modified in two ways. First of all, some peer group data called "Table 1" which Rokeach collected from college students at Michigan State University to be used with Michigan State students, was left out (Appendix C). In place of that, some data collected from local high school students were put in as "Table 1" (Appendix D). The second modification was the inclusion of an immediate posttest. The Rokeach Value Change Instrument does not posttest directly, but asks for an indication of the subject's dissatisfaction with his pretest performance.

The second meeting of the Rokeach group was primarily to get a second posttest. The session consisted of some values clarification strategies not related to the variables Freedom and Equality. The posttest was given at the conclusion of the session.

Besides the Rokeach Value Change Instrument (Appendix B), which includes a pretest and a posttest as modified, the other instrument used was Rokeach's Value Survey Form E. This instrument was an alphabetical arrangement of 18 terminal values on a mimeographed sheet (Appendix A). This was used as the pretest and posttest instrument with all groups (Rokeach incorporates it into his Value Change Instrument as a pretest and it was added for the posttest in this research).

The values clarification sub-groups met two times, once on Friday and once on Saturday. There were two values clarification strategies reportedly very powerful, used in the session. The strategies were designed to motivate the student to reflect on how he felt about the value Equality (Appendix F). The first session included both a pretest and a posttest. The second session was concluded by a posttest.

The control sub-groups met once on Friday and once on Saturday exactly as did the treatment groups. The control sub-groups were given values clarification strategies which were unrelated to the variables Freedom and Equality (Appendix G). The pretest and posttest were given in session one while the second posttest was given at the close of session two.

Three hypotheses were formulated and tested by this research. Each hypothesis and the results are listed below:

1. The ranking of the value Freedom will not change in the Rokeach or values clarification group. This hypothesis was accepted.

2. The ranking of the value Equality will increase toward the ranking of Freedom in both the Rokeach and values clarification groups. This hypothesis was rejected due to the change which occurred in the control group concomitant to changes in the Rokeach and values clarification groups.

3. The ranking of the value Equality will increase toward the ranking of Freedom to a greater degree in the Rokeach group than in the values clarification group. This hypothesis was not tested due to the fact that the major hypothesis, number two, was rejected.

The conclusions drawn from this study were as follows:

1. The value of an immediate posttest to measure the dissonance or self-dissatisfaction which the Rokeach treatment reportedly stirs up is not supported. The theory of Rokeach seems to be a theory of the magnitude of change in a small number of his subjects, rather than a measurable change in a significant number of subjects as measured immediately after treatment.
2. The use of powerful values clarification strategies for short term change in value systems was not supported. The literature generally agrees with these findings. There is no research at present in which values clarification strategies have produced change in a relatively short time.
3. Further research is needed with better control for contamination. If the study were replicated with care taken to keep the control group from contact with the treatment groups, the conclusions might be very different. If the controls were

sound and the control group still changed, the conclusions could be stated with more confidence.

The implications for further research drawn from this study were:

1. That there is still a need for research on the methods and techniques of values clarification. Advocates of this method continue to arouse high expectations among educators about the results of values clarification methods. Since these techniques have been growing in popularity in schools and churches, there should be some scientific data on what kinds of results can be expected, when, how.
2. In developmental terms, there should be some research on the age or stage during which certain approaches work best in helping children and adolescents clarify and change their values.
3. The Rokeach theory should be tested in experimental research. His theory is not only interesting, but also alarming to a degree. His work does not seem to have been recognized in social psychology enough for replication and wide discussion. Williams (1974) pointed out that the burden of proof now rests with those who wish to challenge or discount the Rokeach theory. To be more specific, the Rokeach theory should be tested in

a situation in which more of the experimental subjects are included in the behavioral change measures. Secondly, the theory should be tested with persons whose values are deviant from the values of society in general. Finally, it should be tested in circumstances where there is some risk or cost to the subject when he changes his value system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramowitz, M. W. Values clarification in junior high school. Educational Leadership, 1972, 29, 7, 621-626.
- Aronson, E. Dissonance theory: progress and problems. In R. Abelson et al. (Eds.), Theories of cognitive consistency: a sourcebook. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.
- Aronson, E. The theory of cognitive dissonance: a current perspective. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Asch, S. E. Opinions and social pressure. Scientific American, November 1955.
- Asch, S. E. Studies of independence and conformity: I. A minority of one against a unanimous majority. Psychological Monographs, 1956, 416, 70-79.
- Bales, R. F. and Couch, C. The value profile: a factor analytic study of value statements. Sociological Inquiry, 1974, 39, 3-17.
- Beech, R. P. and Schoeppe, A. Development of value systems in adolescents. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 644-656.
- Bem, D. J. Self-perception: an alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. Psychological Review, 1967, 74, 183-200.
- Bem, D. J. Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks, Cole, 1970.
- Bloom, R. L. Development of competency in the use of the value-clarification techniques by masters of arts in teaching interns. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1969.
- Bond, D. J. An analysis of valuation strategies in social science education materials. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1971.
- Bramel, D. Dissonance, expectation, and the self. In R. P. Abelson, et al. (Eds.), Theories of cognitive consistency: a sourcebook. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968.

- Brown, A. W., Morrison, J. & Couch, G. B. Influence of affectional family relationships on character development. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1947, 42, 422-428. Cited in W. F. Dukes, Psychological studies of values, Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 24-50.
- Brown, G. J. An investigation of a methodology for value clarification: its development, demonstration, and application for teachers of the elementary school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, N.Y.U., 1966.
- Brubaker, D. L. Normative value judgments and analysis. Social Education, 1968, 32, 489-492.
- Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J. C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1971.
- Cantril, H. General and specific attitudes. Psychological Monographs, 1932, 42, No. 5. Cited in W. F. Dukes, Psychological studies of values. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 24-50.
- Chamberlain, V. M. A description of the use of a value clarification approach in the teaching of earth science classes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.
- Christensen, H. T. The intrusion of values in value studies. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.), Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.
- Christenson, James A. & Yang, Choon. Dominant values in American society. Unpublished manuscript, North Carolina State Extension Service, Raleigh, N. C., 1974.
- Coffin, T. E. A three component theory of leadership. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1944, 39, 63-83. Cited in W. F. Dukes, Psychological studies of values. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 24-50.
- Collins, B. E. The effect of monetary inducements on the amount of attitude change induced by forced compliance. In A. Elms (Ed.), Role playing, reward and attitude change. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1969.

- Conroy, W. J., Katkin, E. S., & Barnette, W. L. Modification of smoking behavior by Rokeach's self-confrontation technique. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association in New Orleans, April 7, 1973: Cited in M. Rokeach, The nature of human values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Crellin, D. W. Learning and attitude change during an inservice workshop in value clarification. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, 1968.
- Cuber, J. F. Sociology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- Douvan, E. A. & Adelson, J. The adolescent experience. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Dukes, W. F. Psychological studies of values. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 24-50.
- Feather, N. T. Educational choice and student attitudes in relation to terminal and instrumental values. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1970, 22, 127-144. (a)
- Feather, N. T. Value systems in state and church schools. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1970, 22, 299-313. (b)
- Feather, N. T. Organization and discrepancy in cognitive structures. Psychological Review, 1971, 78, 355-379. (a)
- Feather, N. T. Value similarity and school adjustment. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1972, 24, 193-208. (a)
- Feather, N. T. Value similarity and value systems in state and independent secondary schools. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1972, 24, 305-315. (b)
- Feather, N. T. Value system and education: the Flinders programme of value research. Australian Journal of Education, 1972, 16, 136-149. (c)
- Feather, N. T. Effects of response anonymity on assessment of own and school value systems and satisfaction with school. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 43, 140-150.
- Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1957.

- Fodor, E. M. Resistance to social influence among adolescents as a function of level of moral development. Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 85, 121-26.
- Freud, S. Group psychology and the analysis of the ego. New York: Liveright, 1949 (orig. pub. 1922).
- Friesen, D. Value orientations of modern youth: a comparative study. Adolescence, 1972, 7, 26, 265-275.
- Garrison, K. C. A study of the aspirations and concerns of ninth-grade pupils from the public schools of Georgia. Journal of Social Psychology, 1966, 69, 245-252.
- Gerard, H. B. Conformity and commitment to the group. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 209-211.
- Gullo, J. F. Effects of video-taped value-clarification encounters upon tests of alternativism and divergent thinking. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1971.
- Harris, L. The teen-agers. Newsweek, March 21, 1966, 57-72.
- Hartshorne, H. & May, M. A. Studies in the nature of character. Vol. I Studies in deceit. New York: Macmillan, 1928.
- Havighurst, R. J. & Taba, H. Adolescent character and personality. New York: Wiley, 1949.
- Jonas, A. H. A study of the relationship of certain behaviors of children to emotional needs, values, and thinking. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, N.Y.U., 1960.
- Kerckhoff, R. Value stance in family life education. The Family Coordinator, 1970, 19, 3, 253-259.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.
- Kirshenbaum, H. Beyond values clarification. In Simon, S. & Kirshenbaum, H. (eds.) Readings in values clarification. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.
- Klevan, A. An investigation of a methodology for value clarification: its relationship to consistency in thinking, purposefulness, and human relations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, N.Y.U., 1957.

- Kohlberg, L. The development of modes of moral thinking and choice in the years ten to sixteen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.
- Kohlberg, L. The child as a moral philosopher. Psychology Today, 9, 1968.
- Kohlberg, L. An exchange of opinion between Kohlberg and Simon. In Simon, S. & Kirshenbaum, H. (Eds.) Readings in values clarification. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973. (b)
- Kohlberg, L. Moral and religious education in the public schools: a developmental view. (Collected writings). In L. Kohlberg (ed.), Collected papers on moral development and moral education. Spring, 1973. (a)
- Lail, W. Research report on values workshop. April 5, 1974, The North Carolina Advancement School, Winston-Salem, N. C.
- Lang, M. An investigation of the relationship of value clarification to underachievement and certain other behavioral characteristics of selected college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, N.Y.U., 1961.
- Lynd, R. & Lynd, H. Middletown. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1929.
- Machnits, E. A study of the relationship of certain behaviors of children to emotional needs, values, and thinking. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, N.Y.U., 1960.
- Martin, D. A study of the relationship of certain behaviors of children to emotional needs, values, and thinking. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, N.Y.U., 1960.
- McCandless, Boyd R. Children behavior and development. (2nd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- McClure, G. & Tyler, F. Role of value in the study of values. Journal of General Psychology, 1967, 77, 217-235.
- McGuire, W. J. The nature of attitudes and attitude change. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology, Vol. 3. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

- McLellan, D. D. Values, value systems, and the developmental structure of moral judgment. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Michigan State University, 1970.
- McLellan, D. D. Level of moral development and feedback of information as determinants of value and attitude change. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973.
- Munns, M. The values of adolescents compared with parents and peers. Adolescence, 1972, 7, 28, 519-524.
- Nel, E., Helmreich, R., & Aronson, E. Opinion change in the advocate as a function of the persuasibility of his audience: a clarification of the meaning of dissonance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 117-124.
- Osman, J. D. The use of selected value clarifying strategies in health education. Journal of School Health, 1974, 44, 21-25.
- Penner, L. A. Interpersonal attraction toward a black person as a function of value importance. Personality, 1971, 2, 175-187.
- Phillips, I. Moral values in early education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Texas at Austin, 1955.
- Piaget, J. The moral judgment of the child. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1932. Moral development as intellectual process of developmental stages. He observed two distinct stages of moral development.
- Pintner, R. & Forlano, G. Dominant interests and personality characteristics. Journal of General Psychology, 1939, 21, 251-260. Cited in W. F. Dukes, Psychological studies of values. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 24-50.
- Raths, J., Harman, M. & Simon, S. Values and teaching. Columbus: Merrill, 1966.
- Raths, J. An application of clarifying techniques to academic underachievers in high school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, N.Y.U., 1960.

- Raths, J. Clarifying children's values. The National Elementary Principal, XLII, No. 2 (November 1962a) 35-39.
- Rescher, N. What is valuing? Penneys Forum, 1972, Spring/Summer.
- Rokeach, M. Persuasion that persists. Psychology Today, 9, 1971.
- Rokeach, M. The nature of human values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Secord, P. F. & Blackman, W. An interpersonal approach to personality. In B. A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Shepherd, J. The Look youth survey. Look, September 26, 1966, 44-49.
- Sherif, M. Social factors in perception. In Swanson, Newcomb & Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Henry Holt, 1952.
- Sherif, M. The psychology of social norms. New York: Harper, 1936. Cited in W. F. Dukes, Psychological studies of values, Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 24-50.
- Simon, S. Value-clarification: methodology and tests of an hypothesis in an inservice program relating to behavioral changes in secondary school students. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, N.Y.U., 1958.
- Simon, S. & Kirschenbaum, H. (Eds.). Readings in values clarification. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.
- Smith, H. C. Psychometric checks on hypotheses derived from Sheldon's work on physique and temperament. Journal of Personality, 1949, 17, 310-320. Cited in W. F. Dukes, Psychological studies of values. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 24-50.
- Stein, S. L. Changes in personal and interpersonal values by sex and occupational groups in grades 9 through 12. Journal of Educational Research, 1966, 3, 135-141.
- Strommen, Merton P. Five cries of youth. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

- Thornburg, Hershel O. Behavior and values: consistency or inconsistency. Adolescence, 1973, 8, 513-520.
- Weiss, W. Opinion congruence with a negative source on one issue as a factor in influencing agreement on another issue. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 54, 180-186.
- Weiss, W. Emotional arousal and attitude change. Psychological Reports, 1960, 6, 267-280.
- Williams, R. M. Values. In E. Sills (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Williams, R. M. American society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.
- Williams, R. M. Review of M. Rokeach, The nature of human values. Political Science Quarterly, 1974, 89, 2, 399-401.
- Wilson, E. B. A proposed curriculum model for the development of a process of valuing at the secondary school level. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1971.
- Wright, P. Attitude change under direct and indirect interpersonal influence. Human Relations, 1966, 19, 199-211.
- Ziegler, W. R. If we do not speak out on behalf of mankind, who will? Penneys Forum, 1972, Spring/Summer.

APPENDIX A

THE ROKEACH VALUE

SURVEY FORM E

Appendix A

VALUE SURVEY

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

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

Below is a list of 18 values in alphabetical order. We are interested in finding out the relative importance of these values to you.

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, etc. The value which is least important should be ranked 18.

When you have completed ranking all the values, go back and check over your list. Feel free to make changes. Please take all the time you need to think about this, so that the end result truly represents your values.

_____ 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)

APPENDIX B

THE ROKEACH VALUE

SURVEY FORM E

POSTTEST

Appendix B

NAME _____ Values Survey

Please study the list of values again and rerank them. If you have changed your opinion since the last time you were asked to rank them, feel free to rank them according to your present feelings.

- _____ 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)

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX C

THE ROKEACH VALUE
CHANGE INSTRUMENT

Appendix C

Name _____ Sex: Male _____ Female _____
 Birthdate _____ City and State of Birth _____

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

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

Below is a list of 18 values in alphabetical order. We are interested in finding out the relative importance of these values to you.

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, etc. The value which is least important should be ranked 18.

When you have completed ranking all the values, go back and check over your list. Feel free to make changes. Please take all the time you need to think about this, so that the end result truly represents your values.

- _____ 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)

- _____ 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)

When you finish this page, go right on to the next page.

Now we are interested in knowing how you feel about the way you ranked these 18 values in general. Please circle one number on the following scale:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

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

It does not make much difference which order I put them in.

Below you will find the same 18 values listed again. This time, rank them in the order you think MSU students on the average would rank them.

- _____ 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)

You have now completed Part 1 of the Value Survey.
When you finish this page, go right on to the next page.

VALUE SURVEY - PART 2

Please do not sign your name!

Now copy your answers from the value scale on Page 1
(your own value rankings) onto this page.

MY OWN VALUE SYSTEM

- _____ A comfortable life
- _____ An exciting life
- _____ A sense of accomplishment
- _____ A world at peace
- _____ A world of beauty
- _____ Equality
- _____ Family security
- _____ Freedom
- _____ Happiness
- _____ Inner harmony
- _____ Mature love
- _____ National security
- _____ Pleasure
- _____ Salvation
- _____ Self-respect
- _____ Social Recognition
- _____ True friendship
- _____ Wisdom

When you have finished this page:

1. Hand in Part 1.
2. Wait for further instructions. DO NOT GO ON TO
THE NEXT PAGE.

Now, I would like to tell you some things we have already found out about the value systems of Michigan State students. I am sure that many of you would like to know what they are.

This same value system scale was filled out by 298 students in Psychology 151. The responses of these students were obtained and averaged together. The table below shows the results.

TABLE 1. RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE TO
298 MICHIGAN STATE STUDENTS

- 13 A comfortable life
- 12 An exciting life
- 6 A sense of accomplishment
- 10 A world at peace
- 17 A world of beauty
- 11 Equality
- 9 Family security
- 1 Freedom
- 2 Happiness
- 8 Inner harmony
- 5 Mature love
- 16 National security
- 18 Pleasure
- 14 Salvation
- 15 Social Recognition

4 Self-respect

7 True friendship

3 Wisdom

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

Feel free to spend a few minutes comparing your own rankings on the preceding page with those of the 298 students, shown in Table 1. After doing that, please stop and wait for further instructions. DO NOT GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

We have one other finding which we think is unusually interesting. In order to make this finding more meaningful and relevant to you personally, you should first answer honestly the following question on civil rights:

Are you sympathetic with the aims of the civil rights demonstrators?

_____ Yes, and I have personally participated in a civil rights demonstration.

_____ Yes, but I have not participated in a civil rights demonstration.

_____ No.

The 298 students who participated in the previous study of value systems were asked this same question. They were divided into three groups, according to how they responded. Table 2 shows the average rankings of Freedom and Equality for each of these three groups.

TABLE 2. AVERAGE RANKINGS OF FREEDOM AND EQUALITY BY MSU STUDENTS FOR AND AGAINST CIVIL RIGHTS.

	Yes, and Have Participated	Yes, But Have Not Participated	No, not sympathetic to Civil Rights
FREEDOM	6	1	2
EQUALITY	5	11	17
DIFFERENCE	+1	-10	-15

Notice in Table 2 that:

1. Pro and anti-civil rights students all value Freedom relatively highly. Of 18 values, all groups rank Freedom among the top six.

2. Students who are strongly for civil rights value Equality rather highly--they ranked it 5; but those against civil rights place a much lower value on Equality--they ranked it 17 in importance. Those who are sympathetic but non-participants ranked Equality 11.

The distance between Freedom and Equality is +1 for the strong civil rights group, -10 for the middle group, and -15 for the anti-civil rights group.

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

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

(Please circle one number)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
I agree strongly with this inter- pretation.					I'm not sure.			I disagree strongly with this interpre- tation.		

Before you go on to the last part of this questionnaire, please spend a few minutes comparing your own rankings from the first page with these results. Then go on to the next page.

We would now be most interested to find out how you feel about the method we have used to teach you something about the value systems of Michigan State students.

Did you find it thought-provoking?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Extremely
thought-provoking

Extremely
boring

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Yes, very
much

No, not
at all

Do you feel that your responses were somewhat hypocritical?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Yes, very
hypocritical

No, not at all
hypocritical

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Extremely
satisfied

Extremely
dissatisfied

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

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

I am satisfied with my ranking of:

I am dissatisfied with my ranking of:

A comfortable life

An exciting life

A sense of accomplishment

A world at peace

A world of beauty

Equality

Family Security

Freedom

Happiness

Inner Harmony

Mature love

National security

Pleasure

Salvation

Self-respect

Social recognition

True friendship

Wisdom

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

_____ Yes

_____ No

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

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

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX D

THE MODIFIED ROKEACH VALUE

CHANGE INSTRUMENT

Appendix D

Name _____ Birthdate _____ Sex M _____ F _____

Address _____

What school did you attend last year? _____

Describe your father's occupation _____

Describe your mother's occupation _____

Please check the most applicable answer in the following questions.

1. How many children in your family?

_____ (1)

_____ (2)

_____ (3)

_____ (4)

_____ (5)

_____ More than 5

2. What is your position in the family?

_____ Only child

_____ Firstborn

_____ Second

_____ Third

_____ Fourth

_____ Fifth or beyond

3. Are your parents ages

_____ under 45 years?

_____ over 45 years?

4. Who makes the decisions in your family most of the time?

_____ Father

_____ Mother

_____ Father and mother equally

5. In rearing you do you think your parents were

_____ extremely strict?

_____ mildly strict?

_____ not strict?

_____ not strict enough?

6. Which would your parents be most likely to vote for as President?

_____ George Wallace (conservative)

_____ George McGovern (liberal)

VALUE SURVEY - PART I

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

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

Below is a list of 18 values in alphabetical order. We are interested in finding out the relative importance of these values to you.

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, etc. The value which is least important should be ranked 18.

When you have completed ranking all the values, go back and check over your list. Feel free to make changes. Please take all the time you need to think about this, so that the end result truly represents your values.

- _____ 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)

When you finish this page, go right on to the next page.

Now we are interested in knowing how you feel about the way you ranked these 18 values in general. Please circle one number on the following scale:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

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

It does not make much difference which order I put them in.

Below you will find the same 18 values listed again. This time, rank them in the order you think students your age on the average would rank them.

- _____ 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)

You have now completed Part 1 of the Value Survey.

When you finish this page, go right on to the next page.

VALUE SURVEY - PART 2

Now copy your answers from the value scale on Page 1
(your own value rankings) onto this page.

MY OWN VALUE SYSTEM

- _____ A comfortable life
- _____ An exciting life
- _____ A sense of accomplishment
- _____ A world at peace
- _____ A world of beauty
- _____ Equality
- _____ Family security
- _____ Freedom
- _____ Happiness
- _____ Inner harmony
- _____ Mature love
- _____ National security
- _____ Pleasure
- _____ Salvation
- _____ Self-respect
- _____ Social recognition
- _____ True friendship
- _____ Wisdom

When you have finished this page you have completed Part I.

DO NOT GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE

Wait for instructions

Now, I would like to tell you some things we have already found out about the value systems of local High School students. I am sure that many of you would like to know what they are.

This same value system scale was filled out by 123 students in North Carolina. The responses of these students were obtained and averaged together. The table below shows the results.

TABLE 1. RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE TO STUDENTS IN N. C.

<u>15</u>	A comfortable life
<u>13</u>	An exciting life
<u>12</u>	A sense of accomplishment
<u>4</u>	A world at peace
<u>14</u>	A world of beauty
<u>11</u>	Equality
<u>8</u>	Family security
<u>3</u>	Freedom
<u>5</u>	Happiness
<u>10</u>	Inner harmony
<u>7</u>	Mature love
<u>18</u>	National security
<u>16</u>	Pleasure
<u>2</u>	Salvation
<u>17</u>	Social recognition

9 Self-respect

1 True friendship

6 Wisdom

One of the most interesting findings shown in Table 1 is that the students, on the average, felt that freedom was very important--they ranked it 3; but they felt that equality was considerably less important--they ranked it 11. Apparently, students value freedom far more highly than they value equality. This suggests that students in general are much more interested in their own freedom than they are in freedom for other people.

Feel free to spend a few minutes comparing your own rankings on the preceding page with those of the 123 students, shown in Table 1. After doing that, please stop and wait for further instructions. DO NOT GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

We have one other finding which we think is unusually interesting. In order to make this finding more meaningful and relevant to you personally, you should first answer honestly the following question on civil rights:

Are you sympathetic with the aims of the civil rights demonstrators?

 Yes, and I have personally participated in a civil rights demonstration.

 Yes, but I have not participated in a civil rights demonstration.

 No.

298 Michigan State University students who participated in a previous study of value systems were asked the same questions. They were divided into three groups, according to how they responded. Table 2 shows the average rankings of Freedom and Equality for each of these groups.

TABLE 2. AVERAGE RANKINGS OF FREEDOM AND EQUALITY BY MSU STUDENTS FOR AND AGAINST CIVIL RIGHTS

	Yes, and Have Participated	Yes, But Have Not Participated	No, Not Sympathetic to Civil Rights
FREEDOM	6	1	2
EQUALITY	5	11	17
DIFFERENCE	+1	-10	-15

Notice in Table 2 that:

1. Pro- and anti-civil rights students all value freedom relatively highly. Of 18 values all groups rank freedom among the top six.
2. Students who are strongly for civil rights value equality rather highly--they ranked it 5; but those against civil rights place a much lower value on equality--they ranked it 17 in importance. Those who are sympathetic but nonparticipants ranked equality 11.
3. The distance between freedom and equality is +1 for the strong civil rights group, -10 for the middle group, and -15 for the anti-civil rights group.

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

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

(Please circle one number)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

I agree strongly
with this inter-
pretation.

I'm not
sure.

I disagree
strongly with
this interpre-
tation.

Before you go on to the last part of this questionnaire, please spend a few minutes comparing your own rankings from the first page with these results. Then go on to the next page.

We would now be most interested to find out how you feel about the method we have used to teach you something about the value systems of Michigan State AND high school students in North Carolina.

Did you find it thought-provoking?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Extremely
thought-provoking

Extremely
boring

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Yes, very
much

No, not
at all

Do you feel that your responses were somewhat hypocritical?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Yes, very
hypocritical

No, not at all
hypocritical

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Extremely
satisfied

Extremely
dissatisfied

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

Now look again for a moment at your own rankings on the first page. Please rank the values again as your final response on this survey.

- A comfortable life
- An exciting life
- A sense of accomplishment
- A world at peace
- A world of beauty
- Equality
- Family security
- Freedom
- Happiness
- Inner harmony
- Mature love
- National security
- Pleasure
- Salvation
- Self-respect
- Social recognition
- True friendship
- Wisdom

Do you have any other comments you wish to make about this study? Please comment in the space below. Remember

everything in this questionnaire is absolutely confidential,
and to be used only for scientific purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS
OF ROKEACH GROUP

Appendix E

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS OF ROKEACH GROUP

SESSION 1

A. Welcome the class and introduce yourself again to them. Explain that there are two purposes which you have for the class. The first purpose is to gather scientific information about the values of young people. It is also important to discover how young people form their own values and how they change them. You may say something like this: "In the course of the group meetings today and tomorrow you will be able to clarify your value system. You may also decide to change the order of importance to you of certain values as you think about them. As a result, you may expect to learn something about yourself in these sessions. By your cooperation in the group meetings and following instructions, we take it that you are willing to take part in a scientific study."

B. Each student should then be given a pencil and a modified Rokeach Value Change Instrument (Appendix D). The students are asked to fill in the blanks of the personal information sheet.

C. The teacher should read the instructions for each section of the Instrument and answer questions before the students proceed. The Instrument is self-explanatory and no instruction other than those to clarify will be necessary. "Table 1" and "Table 2" will need to be discussed. The

information in "Table 2" and the explanation which precedes and follows it are crucial as you have already been told. Please be certain that everyone understands the implications of "Table 2" if you can.

D. Thank the students for their cooperation and explain that they should return at the proper time the next day for a second session.

SESSION 2

The teacher welcomes the students and asks them if they have learned anything so far about their own values. After the discussion the students are introduced to the "Alligator River" story. The procedure is to tell or read the story. Some of the details are important so the teacher should be familiar with it. It is best if the teacher not attempt to judge or reflect his (her) own opinions or values upon the characters.

ALLIGATOR RIVER

Once upon a time there was a woman named Abigail who was in love with a man named Gregory. Gregory lived on the shore of a river. Abigail lived on the opposite shore of the river. The river which separated the two lovers was teeming with man-eating alligators. Abigail wanted to cross the river to be with Gregory. Unfortunately, the bridge had been washed out. So, she went to ask Sinbad, a river

boat captain, to take her across. He said he would be glad to, if she would consent to go to bed with him preceding the voyage. She promptly refused and went to a friend named Ivan to explain her plight. Ivan did not want to be involved at all in the situation. Abigail felt her only alternative was to accept Sinbad's terms. Sinbad fulfilled his promise to Abigail and delivered her into the arms of Gregory.

When she told Gregory about her amorous escapade in order to cross the river, Gregory cast her aside with disdain. Heartsick and dejected, Abigail turned to Slug with her tale of woe. Slug, feeling compassion for Abigail, sought out Gregory and beat him brutally. Abigail was overjoyed at the sight of Gregory getting his due. As the sun sets on the horizon, we hear Abigail laughing at Gregory (Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum 1972, pp. 290-294).

Ask the students to number 1 through 5 on a paper and rank the 5 characters in the story. The best, most moral person should be ranked 1, while the worst, most immoral person should be ranked 5. When the ranking is done, the teacher has the students meet in groups of 4 to compare rankings. Some of the students will think it necessary to come to some agreement, but the teacher should urge students to give their reasons for ranking them as they did, rather than to agree too quickly with their peers.

After a few minutes of discussion, the students are asked to think of two or three adjectives to describe the behavior of the person they ranked fifth or worst. Next, they should place beside each of these adjectives one that is exactly opposite in meaning. The teacher can point out that these last adjectives are descriptive of behavior that the students approve and value highly.

The teacher then says, "Here are some questions on which you can vote your values. If you vote yes, signal with your upraised arm and thumb. If you vote yes enthusiastically, move your signalling hand up and down. If you vote no, turn your hand and thumb downward. If you vote no emphatically, you can move your signalling hand up and down.

1. If you have a really good reason, it is sometimes o.k. to do the wrong thing.
2. When a person who has hurt my feelings gets his feelings hurt, I really do enjoy his misery.
3. There is no use in getting involved in lovers' quarrels. You can't help them.
4. If you truly love someone, you will forgive him for being untrue.

The Values Survey is passed out and each student is asked to put his name in the appropriate place. The teacher explains that this is the same list of values he has ranked

before; however, they should look them over again, then rerank them according to the way they feel now about their relative importance. Each student should know that the teacher regards this as important enough for him to take adequate time.

The students are excused after being thanked for cooperating. The teacher should say that it is hoped that they have learned something about their own values and beliefs from these sessions.

APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS OF
VALUES CLARIFICATION GROUPS

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS OF
VALUES CLARIFICATION GROUPS

SESSION 1

A. Welcome the class and introduce yourself again to them. Explain that there are two purposes which you have for the class. The first purpose is to gather scientific information about the values of young people. It is also important to discover how young people form their own values and how they change them. You may say something like this: "In the course of the group meetings today and tomorrow, you will be able to clarify your value system. You may also decide to change the order of importance to you of certain values as you think about them. As a result you may expect to learn something about yourself in these sessions. By your cooperation in the group meetings and following instructions, we take it that you are willing to take part in a scientific study."

B. Each student fills out the personal information questionnaire (Appendix C). This questionnaire is attached to the pretest (Appendix A).

C. The teacher should read the paragraph on the pretest aloud and give time for questions. After this the students rank the values.

D. The teacher will take up the forms and proceed with the first strategy which is the story of "Cynthia's

Baby", below. The teacher may read the story or tell it from memory. The details are important in the story in that each teacher should repeat the same approximate story in the same words.

CYNTHIA'S BABY

John and Mary were desperate because after seven years of marriage they still had no children. They felt strange as an upper-middle class white couple because most of their friends were well on their way toward raising a family.

One day John was feeling unusually blue as he sat in his favorite bar and poured out his story to the bartender. A dark-skinned young man sitting nearby overheard John and soon came over and began to talk to John. The stranger introduced himself as Sonny. He seemed very friendly and very well dressed and made quite an impression on John. Sonny just happened to have some friends who knew how to help. He explained to John that there were lots of people who had babies who did not want them, or did not have the money to take care of them properly. Sonny's friends sometimes could arrange for such unwanted children to get into the "proper hands" of those who did want them. Sonny explained that this was expensive but worth it since technically it broke the law.

Later that night, John and Mary discussed the pros and cons of Sonny's proposition. Knowing that they were

breaking the law while at the same time hoping they could do some good for an otherwise unwanted child, they finally decided to call Sonny's friend, Vince. Vince was the real black market operator. He gladly paid Sonny and other contact people \$100 for every couple they sent to him for a baby. Vince would then pay all the medical expenses to expectant mothers who for some reason did not wish to keep their baby. Vince explained to John and Mary that his expense and risk were great and the cost to them would be \$500 at the time of agreement. When the baby was delivered another \$2500 must be paid, making the total \$3,000.

Cynthia was a 19 year old, fun-loving girl who had become pregnant. At first she thought she would drop out of her secretarial course and have her baby. She also hoped that her boyfriend, Al, would now propose to marry her and help her with the baby. But Al was not ready. He pleaded with Cynthia to give up the baby so that she could continue with her active life after it was born. Al even made contact with Vince and had him over to talk with Cynthia. When Cynthia was faced with the two arguments, she gave in and agreed to let Vince "place" her child.

At the appropriate time, Vince called John and Mary and met them in the park at 10:00 p.m. After counting the \$2500 in cash, Vince handed Mary the bundle, a squealing baby that had been born to Cynthia a few days before.

Very early the next morning, John rang the doorbell of the local orphanage. Before anyone answered, he rushed away in his car. When the attendant opened the door, he found the bundle. It was Cynthia's squealing black baby.

E. Ask the students to number 1 through 5 on a paper and rank the 5 characters in the story. The best, most moral person should be ranked 1, while the worst, most immoral person should be ranked 5. When the ranking is done, the teacher has the students meet in groups of 4 to compare rankings. Some of the students will think it necessary to come to some agreement, but the teacher should urge students to give their reasons for ranking them as they did, rather than agree with their peers. After a few minutes of discussion, the students are asked to think of two or three adjectives to describe the behavior of the person they ranked fifth or worst. Next, they should place beside each of these adjectives one that is exactly opposite in meaning. The teacher can point out that those last adjectives are descriptive of behavior that the students approve and value highly.

F. Next the teacher says: "Here are some questions on which you can vote your values. If you vote yes, signal with your upraised arm and thumb. If you vote yes enthusiastically, move your signalling hand up and down. If you

vote no, turn your hand and thumb downward. And if you vote no emphatically, you can move your signalling hand up and down."

1. I agree that all laws should be obeyed even if they promote or produce inequities for people.
2. I think dating and marriage of people of different races is o.k.
3. I wish my parents had adopted a child of another race for my brother or sister.
4. Since blacks and Indians have been treated unfairly for many years, they should now be given better opportunities than whites in order to help them catch up.

G. The Values Survey is passed out and each student is asked to put his name in the appropriate place. The teacher explains that this is the same list of values he has had them rank before; however, they should look them over again, then rerank them according to the way they feel now about their relative importance. Each student should know that the teacher regards this as important enough for him to take adequate time. The students are excused until the next session.

SESSION 2

A. The teacher welcomes the students and asks if they have any questions or comments about what has happened

so far in the conference. After a brief discussion, the teacher passes out the Value Sheet #1 (pp. 131-132). The incident and questions in the Values Sheet should be read aloud by the teacher. Then the students are allowed to write down a comment or so on each question. The students should be allowed to make comments on the incident. The teacher should encourage the students to express their reactions.

B. The next part of the strategy is the Public Interview. The Public Interview (Raths, Harmin, Simon, 1966) is a series of questions which the teacher will ask the student. The student agrees to answer as openly and honestly as he can. If the student does not wish to answer a question, he can say, "I pass." When the interview is over, the student, at his own choice, is allowed to ask the teacher for his answers to any of the same questions. Two boys and two girls are asked to volunteer for the Public Interview. The person being interviewed stands during the interview. There are two series of questions below. One series is used with a boy and a girl and the second series is used with a boy and a girl.

PUBLIC INTERVIEW #1 (Interview one boy and one girl)

1. Do you believe that all people are created equal?
2. Do you treat all people equally?
3. Should all women be allowed to hold jobs in our society?

4. Should mothers be allowed to place children in day care centers and take jobs even if they don't need the money?
5. Should a woman work and support the family while her husband keeps house?
6. Should women be given equal pay as men and be allowed to take any job for which they apply and are qualified?
7. Should women and men receive equal treatment as far as possible?
8. Would you vote for a woman President of the United States?

PUBLIC INTERVIEW #2 (Interview one boy and one girl)

1. Do you believe all people are created equal?
2. Do you believe all people should be treated equally?
3. Is it possible to treat all people equally?
4. How do you protest when you think someone you care about is getting a raw deal?
5. Do you protest in the same way when someone you don't know very well is getting a raw deal?
6. Do you agree with the statement that no one man can be free until all men are free?
7. Do you think inequality is the result of prejudice toward minorities or laziness on the part of minority people?
8. Have you ever known an American Indian personally?

9. Have you ever known a migrant worker personally?
10. Have you ever known a black person personally?
11. Have you ever known a Mexican American personally?
12. Did you feel this person was hurt in any way because of racial discrimination?

The teacher may allow the students to comment on the Public Interview if there is interest. The teacher should express his hope that each student is now more aware of his own values than before. The session should be closed by passing out the Posttest (Value Survey Form E) and asking the students to rerank the values according to their present feelings about them. The teacher should thank the students for their cooperation as they finish the survey and leave.

VALUES SHEET #1 (Values Clarification)

Dr. Howard Thurman, Negro minister, author and grandson of slaves, spent the first years of his life in Florida and Georgia. In his book, The Luminous Darkness, he recalls an incident which illustrates the scars left deep in his spirit by racial segregation and prejudice.

When I was a boy I earned money in the fall of the year by raking leaves in the yard of a white family. I did this in the afternoon after school. In this family, there was a little girl about six or seven years old. She delighted in following me around the yard as I worked. One of her insistences was to scatter the piles of leaves in order to find a particular shape to show me. Each time it meant that I had to do my raking all over again. Despite my urging, she refused to stop what she was doing. Finally, I told her that I would report her to her father when he came home. She stopped, looked at me in anger, took a straight pin out of her pinafore, ran up to me, and stuck me with the pin in the back of my hand. I pulled back my hand and exclaimed, "Ouch, have you lost your mind?" Whereupon, she said, in utter astonishment, "That did not hurt you--you can't feel."

In other words, I was not human, nor was I even a creature capable of feeling pain.

1. How do you think you would have felt if you had been in the place of Thurman?

2. How do you think the little girl felt?

3. Have you ever felt you were being treated as less than human?

4. Does this make you more aware of the need for equal treatment of all human beings?

APPENDIX G

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS
OF CONTROL GROUPS

Appendix G

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS
OF CONTROL GROUPSSESSION 1

A. Welcome the class and introduce yourself again to them. Explain that there are two purposes which you have for the class. The first purpose is to gather scientific information about the values of young people. It is also important to discuss how young people form their own values and how they change them. You may say something like this: "In the course of the group meetings today and tomorrow, you will be able to clarify your value system. You may also decide to change the order of importance to you of certain values as you think about them. As a result, you may expect to learn something about yourself in these sessions. By your cooperation in the group meetings and following instructions, we take it that you are willing to take part in a scientific study."

B. Each student fills out the personal information questionnaire (Appendix C). This questionnaire is attached to the pretest (Appendix A).

C. The teacher should read the paragraph aloud from the pretest and give time for comments and questions from the students. Next the students rank the values.

D. The teacher will take up the forms and proceed with the first strategy, which is the Alligator River Story (Appendix E).

ALLIGATOR RIVER

Once upon a time there was a woman named Abigail who was in love with a man named Gregory. Gregory lived on the shore of a river. Abigail lived on the opposite shore of the river. The river which separated the two lovers was teeming with man-eating alligators. Abigail wanted to cross the river to be with Gregory. Unfortunately, the bridge had been washed out. So she went to ask Sinbad, a river boat captain, to take her across. He said he would be glad to if she would consent to go to bed with him preceding the voyage. She promptly refused and went to a friend named Ivan to explain her plight. Ivan did not want to be involved at all in the situation. Abigail felt her only alternative was to accept Sinbad's terms. Sinbad fulfilled his promise to Abigail and delivered her into the arms of Gregory.

When she told Gregory about her amorous escapade in order to cross the river, Gregory cast her aside with disdain. Heartsick and dejected, Abigail turned to Slug with her tale of woe. Slug, feeling compassion for Abigail, sought out Gregory and beat him brutally. Abigail was overjoyed at the sight of Gregory getting his due. As the sun sets on the horizon, we hear Abigail laughing at Gregory.

E. The students are asked to number 1 through 5 on a paper and rank the 5 characters in the story. The best, most moral person should be ranked 1, while the worst, most immoral or objectionable person should be ranked 5. Ask the students to get into groups of four to compare their rankings. After a few minutes of discussion, the students are asked to think of two or three adjectives to describe the person they ranked worst or fifth. Then the students are asked to think of adjectives which are the exact opposite of the two or three they have written above. When this is done, the teacher explains that these last adjectives are descriptive of behavior the student values highly.

F. Next, the teacher says: "Here are some questions on which you can vote your values. If you vote yes, signal with your upraised arm and thumb. If you vote yes enthusiastically, move your signalling hand up and down. If you vote no, turn your hand and thumb downward. If you vote no emphatically, you can move your signalling hand up and down.

1. If you have a really good reason, it is sometimes o.k. to do the wrong thing.
2. When a person who has hurt my feelings gets his feelings hurt, I really do enjoy his misery.
3. There is no use in getting involved in lovers' quarrels. You can't help them.

4. If you truly love someone, you will forgive him for being untrue.

G. The Values Survey is passed out and each student is asked to put his name in the appropriate place. The teacher explains that this is the same list of values he has ranked before; however, they should look them over again, then rerank them according to the way they feel now about their relative importance. Each student should know that the teacher regards this as important enough for him to take adequate time.

H. The students are excused until the next session.

SESSION 2

A. The teacher welcomes the students and asks if they have any questions or comments about what has happened so far in the conference. After a brief discussion, the teacher passes out the Values Sheet #2 (pp. 141-142). The incident and questions in the Values Sheet should be read aloud by the teacher. Then the students are allowed to write down a comment or so on each question. The students should be allowed to make comments on the incident. The teacher should encourage the students to express their reactions.

B. The next part of this strategy is the Public Interview. The Public Interview (Raths, Harmin, Simon, 1966) is a series of questions which the teacher will ask the

student. The student agrees to answer as openly and honestly as he can. If the student does not wish to answer a question, he can say, "I pass." When the interview is over, the student at his own choice, is allowed to ask the teacher for his answers to any of the same questions. Two boys and two girls are asked to volunteer for the Public Interview. The person being interviewed stands during the interview. There are two series of questions below. One series is used with a boy and a girl and the second series is used with a boy and a girl.

PUBLIC INTERVIEW #1 (Use with one boy and one girl)

1. Have you ever witnessed cheating on an important test?
2. Did it bother your sense of right?
3. Can you imagine circumstances under which it is right to cheat?
4. Would you be willing to report cheating if you saw it?
5. How do you decide whether to report someone who is dishonest (steals or cheats)?
6. Are students almost forced to cheat because of the intense pressure that is attached to good grades?
7. Do you ever do things simply because you know people expect you to?

8. Do you always go to the aid of strangers when they are hurt or in some trouble?

PUBLIC INTERVIEW #2 (Use with one boy and one girl)

1. Have you ever seen anyone cheating on an important test?
2. Does cheating bother your sense of right?
3. Do you always report cheating when you see it or do you sometimes let it pass?
4. Is cheating just as wrong as stealing or lying?
5. Would you be willing to steal medicine for your sick mother if there was no other way to get it?
6. Do you think most politicians tell the truth in their campaigns?
7. Do you think most politicians refuse gifts and offers of money in exchange for political favors?
8. From your observation and experience, would you say that your generation will be more honest in their middle age than the present generation of middle-aged people?

The teacher may allow the students to comment on the Public Interview if there is interest. The teacher should express his hope that each student is now more aware of his own values than before. The sessions should be closed by passing out the Posttest (Value Survey Form E) and asking the students to rerank the values according to

their present feelings about them. The teacher should thank the students for their cooperation as they finish the survey and leave.

VALUES SHEET #2 (Control Group)

A Student's Report of a Campus Incident

Someone was caught cheating on an exam in an advanced biology class. The teacher tried to take the paper away, but the boy held on to it. When the teacher finally got hold of the test, several index cards fell out from between the pages. The boy screamed that they were not his. To make a long story short, the teacher informed the student that this would have to be reported to the authorities. The boy threatened to kill the teacher, and they scuffled until other teachers came to get the boy away. The boy had been accepted by a medical school, and this incident meant no med-school for him. His actions were explained by a weak personality cracking under the system. But what amazed me was the reactions of other pre-med students. Their near joy was hard to hide. How awfully sadistic. Or was their joy a sign of relief for not having been caught themselves (Raths, Harmin, and Simon 1966)?

1. What is your first, most immediate reaction? (Use free association. Don't write sentences, just put down words).

APPENDIX H
SCHEDULE

Appendix H

SCHEDULE

Time	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher 3
<u>FRIDAY</u>			
3:30 p.m. to 4:45 p.m.	Group A1 (Rokeach)	Group B2 (Values Clarification)	Group C3 (Control)
6:00 p.m. to 7:45 p.m.	Group C1 (Control)	Group A2 (Rokeach)	Group B3 (Values Clarification)
8:00 p.m. to 9:45 p.m.	Group B1 (Values Clarification)	Group C2 (Control)	Group A3 (Rokeach)
<u>SATURDAY</u>			
10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.	Group A1 (Rokeach)	Group B2 (Values Clarification)	Group C3 (Control)
1:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.	Group C1 (Control)	Group A2 (Rokeach)	Group B3 (Values Clarification)
3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.	Group B1 (Values Clarification)	Group C2 (Control)	Group A3 (Rokeach)

APPENDIX I

123 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' AVERAGE
RANKING OF ROKEACH'S 18 TERMINAL
VALUES

Appendix I

123 HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' AVERAGE RANKINGS OF ROKEACH'S18 TERMINAL VALUES

1. True Friendship	5.59
2. Salvation	6.58
3. Freedom	6.04
4. A World of Peace	7.40
5. Happiness	7.65
6. Wisdom	8.10
7. Mature Love	8.41
8. Family Security	9.36
9. Self-respect	9.62
10. Inner Harmony	9.75
11. Equality	10.10
12. A Sense of Accomplishment	10.24
13. An Exciting Life	10.56
14. A World of Beauty	10.63
15. A Comfortable Life	11.03
16. Pleasure	11.36
17. Social Recognition	13.37
18. National Security	13.88
Total Ranking Freedom Higher	86
Total Ranking Equality Higher	<u>37</u>
Total Subjects	123