VALUE ORIENTATION AND RECALL

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
DEBORAH F. HOTCH
1976

Z-210

ABSTRACT

VALUE ORIENTATION AND RECALL

By

Deborah F. Hotch

In this research subjects' free recall of twenty value based items was investigated. Three variables were examined: message value orientation (prescriptive or proscriptive), personal value orientation (prescriptive or proscriptive), and type of rating scale used (value or non-value). Subjects ranked twenty value based items of prescriptive and proscriptive orientation (e.g., works hard"; "is irritable") on one of two five-point scales. A group testing procedure was used. To manipulate the activation of value set, half the subjects were asked to rank the items using bad-good, a value dimension while the others used unusual-usual a nonvalue dimension. Four forms of the item list were created to provide a check for effects due to the order and orientation of the items. It was hypothesized that: (1) prescriptive items would be the easier to recall; (2) subjects with prescriptive value orientations would recall more prescriptive items than proscriptive items; (3) use of the

value rating scale would enhance recall of the items in general and would enhance recall of prescriptive items in particular; (4) prescriptive subjects who used the value rating dimension would recall more prescriptive items than would proscriptive subjects using this dimension. Results showed a significant effect for message orientation. However, contrary to prediction, subjects more frequently recalled the proscriptive items. Use of the evaluative rating scale enhanced recall somewhat, however, this effect was not statistically significant. Subjects' personal value orientation did not emerge as a significant factor in the study, nor did it interact significantly with any variable in the design. It was suggested that the value based stimuli used in the rating-recall task elicited evaluation even from subjects assigned to use the nonvalue dimension. This as well as the possibility that a value set may have been created simply by rating an item regardless of the rating dimension used may have been responsible for the failure to find differences between subjects as a function of the rating scale manipulation. The absence of a relationship between personal value orientation and the variables studied was considered in terms of the sample, the reliability of the measure of value orientation, and the possibility that the recall process overrode any idiosyncratic influences stemming from value orientation. Speculation concerning social factors which could lead to the development of the recall pattern observed was made in an attempt to explain the results obtained.

VALUE ORIENTATION AND RECALL

By

Deborah F. Hotch

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1976

To my parents

With love and appreciation

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For their help and participation as committee members many thanks are due Dr. Gordon Wood and Dr. Elaine Donelson. To Dr. John Paul McKinney who chaired my committee and provided assistance, encouragement, and friendship, particular thanks are warranted. As a teacher and as a person there are few as praiseworthy.

I am grateful too to Bob Wilson whose excellent statistical consulting saved me countless hours of calculation and aggravation. Thanks also go to Sue Weesner and Sherry Lott for their prompt and careful typing of materials and manuscript drafts.

To my family and friends, especially Irene, for their enthusiasm and support I am extremely grateful. And to Gus, who with unceasing encouragement, has now accompanied me through two degrees--very special thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Writers in a number of disciplines have directed their attention to describing and discussing the nature of values (e.g., Rescher, 1969, in philosophy; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, in anthropology, and Rokeach, 1973, in psychology). The study of values has continued to be intriguing because a fruitful conceptualization of this "peculiarly human" dimension (Rokeach, 1973) has important implications for better understanding social life and individual development in the social context.

A molecular conceptualization is typical of the social scientific approach to values. Rokeach's (1973) theory and research, and the earlier work of Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey (1960) are among the best known examples of this approach in psychology. Within this paradigm values appear as "special modes of conduct or end-states of existence which are preferable to opposite modes of conduct or end-states of existence" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 5). As such, values are finite in number, universally held, and variable in the strength with which they are held and in the

order in which they may be ranked. "A world of peace," "happiness," "self-resect," "honesty," and "obedience" are among the 36 values Rokeach has circumscribed for study. Research with this paradigm has focused on individuals' rank ordering the values along a single dimension. Any variations in rank orderings are said to reflect variations in the value system or value organization.

Rokeach has been careful to distinguish his concept of value system from the cultural anthropological concept of value orientation (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961) which is also based on rank ordering but which employs rankings within five value dimensions. Thus, Rokeach suggests that the conceptualization of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck might more rightly be called philosophical, rather than value, orientation. It should be noted here, that the present research also employs the term value orientation, but in a context and with a meaning very different from either Rokeach's value system or the anthropological concept of value orientation. This usage will be detailed in the second segment of this chapter.

A marked contrast to the above molecular views of moral patterns appears in moral development research and literature. Kohlberg's (1963) work, which is cognitively and developmentally based, established the theoretical and research paradigm in the area and is still the most frequently cited. Moral development is viewed in terms of stages which are purported to reflect the individual's

level of cognitive development and the sophistication of his/her perceptions of the social world. Categorizing or schematizing specific values in an hierarchical (or any other) form is not of primary interest. Thus Kohlberg's emphasis reflects a more molar conceptualization. Individuals are of interest insofar as they exemplify or do not exemplify the cognitive development which is characteristic of a given stage or level of moralization. Research based on Kohlberg's approach to moral development has typically been concerned with the invariance of the stages, the relation between the stages of moral development and the stages of cognitive development, and the effects of variations in social interactions with parents and peers (Hoffman, 1970).

While currently among the most frequently cited the cognitive developmental theorists and researchers have not been alone in thinking about moral development. Psychoanalytic and social learning theorists have also approached the area. As distinguished from the cognitive, stage-based view, however, a dual process model is typically conceptualized by these writers (McKinney, 1971). The duality is generated by recognizing that "bad" behaviors are punished while "good" behaviors are rewarded. Specific values are thus seen as growing from an individual's life-long contacts with such rewards and punishments.

A Four-Fold Interpreation of Value Development

In contrast to the unidimensional two-level (pride-guilt) models of value development which stem from the psychoanalytic and social learning conceptualizations outlined above, McKinney (1971) suggests a four-fold process. In this model, values develop with respect to two dimensions: reinforcement (reward-punishment) and behavioral orientation (doing good-doing bad). The two-fold value development process of the psychoanalytic and social learning theorists is subsumed in this extended framework. That is, values are still conceived as developing as the result of punished bad-doing and rewarded good-doing. But, two other means by which values may develop are generated by the bi-dimensional, four-fold model. Specifically, punishment for failure to do what is good, and reward for avoiding doing what is bad are two additional (sub) processes by which values may develop.

Two terms, borrowed from the sociological distinction between two types of norms, refer to the doing-good and doing-bad levels of the behavioral orientation dimension. Proscriptive behaviors are those which ought not be performed. These behaviors thus reflect bad-doing, i.e., "thou shalt not" behaviors. Prescriptive behaviors are those which ought to be performed, i.e., "thou shalt" behaviors.

By combining the prescriptive-proscriptive orientation dimension with the two level (reward-punishment)

reinforcement dimension, a theoretical basis for the development of individual value orientation is generated. Individuals would be most likely to develop a prescriptive, good-doing based value orientation if they were characteristically rewarded for doing good and/or punished for not doing good. Conversely, individuals would be most likely to develop a proscriptive value orientation if typically rewarded for not doing what is bad or if punished for doing what is bad.

Noting that the prescriptive-proscriptive distinction has been a central one in sociological studies of norms, but unexamined as a psychological variable, McKinney (1971) studied individual differences with respect to this distinction. One purpose of the initial research in the area was thus to determine if indeed individuals differed in the degree to which prescriptive and proscriptive conceptualizations predominated in their value organizations. A sentence completion test, designed to elicit value responses, was found to reliably differentiate 67 undergraduate university students with respect to their degree of prescriptive value orientation. Further, as suggested by the four-fold model, subjects with high prescriptive scores were found to perceive their parents as more rewarding and as less punishing than those with lower scores. These findings revealed two important considerations: First, individual values apparently develop along a prescriptive-proscriptive dimension which can be assessed

as a meaningful individual difference variable. Second, individuals' perceptions of parental rearing patterns suggest that differences in parents' styles lie at the base of differences in value orientation.

McKinney and Olejnik (1973) clarified the nature of parent-child relationships as these relate to value orientation and value related behavior. Generosity in nursery school children was studied as it related to childrens' and parents' value orientations. Both the predicted associations were confirmed. That is, prescriptively oriented children were more generous than proscriptive oriented children, and prescriptive oriented parents were found significantly more often to have children who were generous in the test situation. Importantly, the relationship between parental orientation and the child's generosity held whether the parents' characteristically used a reward based or a punishment based disciplinary style. A prescriptive value orientation rather than use of reward or punishment thus appeared to be the critical dimension with regard to rearing generous children.

McKinney and Olejnik suggested that the apparent superiority of the prescriptive orientation for teaching generosity lies in its providing specific direction. Prescriptively oriented reward (i.e., reward for doing what is good) or punishment (for not doing what is good) is attached to what ought to be done. Parents who utilize such approaches would thus be expected to tell their

children, for example, "It's good that you are sharing your toys"; or "It's not good that you are not sharing your toys," and then reward or punish respectively. This form which clearly specifies what ought to be done, stands in contrast to a proscriptive emphasis which specifies only what one ought to avoid. Proscriptive parents when rewarding the child would relate, "This reward is because you were not selfish today," or when punishing, "This punishment is because you were selfish today."

The Present Study

Unlike the previous studies of the prescriptive-proscriptive orientation dimension which have focused on rearing and behavior concomitants, the present study was designed to begin examining the issue of how these behaviors come to be performed. As a first step to this end, the present work focused on the processing of information based on values. Recall was selected as the dependent variable. The recall process, intervening between an individual's receiving value related information and his/her performance appeared to be essential and was chosen for this reason.

Specifically, subjects' free recall of prescriptively and proscriptively phrased items, describing behavioral values, was measured. It was reasoned that if individuals are most attuned to instructions and messages which enable them to avoid punishment and gain reward by doing what is "good" and learning what constitutes "good," then the

greater specificity of prescriptive messages would make these easier to recall. This was the basis of the first hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1: When provided with both types of items, subjects will recall more prescriptive than proscriptive items.

It has been suggested that individuals, possibly owing to past experience and/or personality, differ with regard to characteristic schemata (e.g., Bartlett, 1932; Rapaport, 1967). Such schemata have been said to underlie differential styles of information processing as well as idiosyncratic patterns of recall. This suggests that if such schemata are involved in recall, then prescriptive and proscriptive value orientations as individual differences would be associated with differences in the recall of prescriptive and proscriptive value items. The present study was designed to investigate this and thus the second hypothesis tested was formulated as follows.

Hypothesis 2: Subjects characterized by a prescriptive value orientation will show greater recall of prescriptive items than will proscriptive subjects.

Research conducted in the 1940s and 1950s illustrated the importance of attitudes as personality linked factors in influencing the amount and content of subjects' recall. In these studies prose material or statements, which either supported or opposed the subjects' attitudes was presented to them (Levine and Murphy, 1943; Alper and Korchin, 1952; Taft, 1954; Jones and Kohler, 1958). Such

investigations can be cited as support for the idea that schemata as dimensions of the personality have a critical impact on the individual's selection of stimuli during learning and recall. By the 1960s, however, other researchers (e.g., Waly and Cook, 1966; Greenwald and Sakumura, 1967; Brigham and Cook, 1969) attempted and failed to replicate the long established findings. Thus, Brigham and Cook (1969) were forced to conclude that "The attitude-memory relationship, if it exists at all, applies only under certain conditions. It is evident that the specific nature of these conditions is not as yet understood "(p. 243).

Importantly, the frustrating results of the recent attitude-memory research do not necessarily obviate the prediction of the value orientation-memory relationship hypothesized in the present study. The present research differs from the above social psychological research in that it does not focus upon attitudes which are molecular and variable. Rather, the focus is on prescriptive and proscriptive value orientations which are molar, non-situationally variable constructs.

Recent memory resarch (e.g., Wood, 1976) has used an incidental learning paradigm to manipulate the sets subjects use to process information. Recall of a list of words is tested without warning after subjects have rated the items on a dimension manipulated by the researcher. The amount of recall has been found to be affected by the

nature of the rating task employed, suggesting the nature of the sets used to process the material influences the amount of recall.

In the present study an incidental learning paradigm was used to test recall and, as in the study noted above, the rating task was varied across subjects. Half the subjects rated twenty prescriptive and proscriptive value items such as "works hard" and "does not overeat" using bad--good, an evaluative (value) dimension. The others used unusual--usual, a nonevaluative (nonvalue) dimension. This manipulation was used to provide a means for activating value schemata among subjects. Thus, it was predicted that the operation of different schemata would be evident in the greater item recall of subjects who had previously rated the recall items using the value dimension. Such evidence for the involvement of schemata in the recall of value related items could be used in support of the argument that individual differences in recall are schema based. With support for this argument there would then be grounds for interpreting a finding that prescriptive subjects recall more prescriptive items than proscriptive subjects as indicating that individuals who differed with respect to value orientation, organize information differently as a function of different schemata.

The above prediction stating that use of the value scale would enhance recall together with the predictions of

greater recall for prescriptive items (Hypothesis 1), suggested the third hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: Individuals who use the value rating dimension (bad--good) will recall more items and more prescriptive items than will those who use the nonevaluative dimension (unusual--usual).

The reasoning underlying Hypotheses 2 and 3 provides a basis for suggesting that an interaction between subjects' value orientation and the type of rating scale used would also occur. Specifically, prescriptive subjects using the value scale would recall more prescriptive items than would proscriptive subjects using the same scale. Hypothesis 4 was thus formulated as follows:

Hypothesis 4: Subjects characterized by a prescriptive value orientation, and who use the value rating dimension (bad--good) will recall more prescriptive messages than will proscriptive subjects who use the same dimension.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were 120 male and female undergraduate students in introductory psychology classes at Michigan State University. All received course credits for their participation in the study. Fifteen subjects were randomly assigned to each of eight groups in the study.

Rating-Recall Task

The content, and in many instances the exact wording, of the twenty prescriptive and proscriptive items in the rating-recall task were drawn from McKinney's (1973) factor analytic study of behavioral values among a similar group of university students. This pool of valued behaviors was used to insure that the rating-recall task was composed of authentic value constructions. Through written instructions, subjects were told the items were chosen from a list of self-descriptions of typical university students (Appendix C).

Four constructions, reflecting the behavior-value orientations in McKinney's four-fold conceptualization of value organization, were used to select and design the

twenty behavior messages from the pool of valued behavior items. Table 1 below illustrated the basis on which the messages for the rating-recall task were constructed.

Table 1.--Basis for the Construction of Items for the Rating-Recall Task.

Orientation of the Item		Type of Behavior	
		Negative	Positive
Prescriptive	Item:	Does not work hard	Works hard
	Value Message:	Not doing what is good	Doing what is good
Proscriptive	Item:	Is lazy	Is not lazy
	Value Message:	Doing what is bad	Not doing what is bad

Negative and positive behaviors were balanced across the twenty items in the rating-recall task. Prescriptive and proscriptive items were thus either affirmatively or negatively phrased. "Works hard" is an affirmatively phrased prescriptive message while "is not lazy" is the negatively phrased, proscriptive message comparable in meaning. Both describe the same positive behavior although the latter is oriented in terms of a proscribed value. Negative behaviors demand reversals of value orientation and grammatical construction. Thus, since "is lazy" is affirmatively phrased and describes a negative behavior, it is necessarily proscriptive in value orientation. To

express a negative behavior prescriptively, a negative construction (e.g., does not work hard) must be used.

The first column of Appendix A contains a listing of ten prescriptive and ten proscriptive, affirmatively phrased, items based on McKinney's (1973) listing of behavioral values of college students. For the reasons outlined above these prescriptive and proscriptive items represent ten positive and ten negative behaviors respectively. Ten of these items were selected at random and then rephrased in the negative form thus generating five positive and five negative prescriptive items, and five positive and five negative proscriptive items. To provide a check for an effect due to the order of the items, two random orderings of this list were then created producing Form A and Form A' (Appendix B).

In addition, a check for an effect attributable to the orientation of the items was also included. This was done by rephrasing every prescriptive item on Form A into its proscriptive form and every proscriptive item into its prescriptive form. Form B was thus generated (Appendix B). In this way, by comparing recall performance on Form A and Form B it was possible to determine if recall was influenced by the content of the item (i.e., the behavior described) rather than strictly the item's prescriptive or proscriptive orientation. For example, "is not lazy" (proscriptive) appeared on Form A. "Works hard" (prescriptive) appeared in the same position on Form B.

The items on Form B' matched those on Form B in wording but were arranged in the order of the items on Form A'. Thus Form A' differed from Form A only in the order of the items as did Forms B and B'. Forms A and B (and Forms A' and B') were identical in the order of the items but each item on one form was opposite in orientation to the corresponding item on the other form. Stated differently, forms which were alike in letter but differed in superscript (e.g., A and A'; B and B') were identical except for the order of the items. Forms which differed in letter but were the same with respect to superscript (e.g., A and B; A' and B') were lists with items that were opposite in orientation but alike in the order of the items.

Subjects were instructed, with written directions on the first page of their booklet (Appendix C), to rate each of the twenty items on the form of the task they received. This rating procedure insured that all subjects attended to the items presented. In addition, for the reasons previously detailed, by manipulating which rating scale subjects used, it was possible to control how the information on the lists was processed. That is, an attempt was made to create different (value-nonvalue) sets between groups of subjects.

Both rating dimensions used five-point scales. The bad--good or value dimension required subjects to use an evaluative criterion when processing the items. The intention was to create a value set and thus to test the

hypothesis that such a set would enhance the recall of the items among subjects who used this scale. A nonevaluative rating dimension was selected by consulting Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum's (1971) work The Measurement of Meaning. In comparison to the bad--good scale which loaded most highly on an evaluative factor (loading: 1.00) unusual-usual was selected because its loading was very low on this dimension (loading: -.04).

The four forms of the rating-recall task and the two types of rating dimension generated eight groups to which subjects were randomly assigned. Table 2 illustrates how these groups were formed.

Table 2.--Rating-Recall Task Group Designations.

Group	Form	Rating Dimension
1	A	Value
2	A	Nonvalue
3	A'	Value
4	A'	Nonvalue
5	B	Value
6	B	Nonvalue
7	B'	Value
8	B'	Nonvalue

Sentence Completion Form

The sentence completion form (McKinney, 1971) consists of 28 open-ended stems. Subjects were given written instructions to complete each one as quickly as possible and "according to their own true feelings." Fourteen of the stems are designed to assess value orientation (e.g., "My father gets angry with me when _____;" "I am satisfied with myself when _____"). The remaining fourteen are filler items (e.g., "When an older person tells me about his life _____"). McKinney (1971) found the odd-even reliability of this simple assessment procedure to be fairly high ($r = .64$[1]). This measure in the current research, however was not as reliable ($r = .58$[1]).

Materials

All subjects received four-page test booklets numbered with a subject number (1-120) and a group number (1-8). The booklets consisted of a blank cover page, an instruction page (Appendix C), one of the eight forms of the rating-recall task (Appendix B) and a page containing the sentence completion form to test value orientation (Appendix D).

---

[1]Corrected with the Spearman-Brown formula.

Design

Four variables were incorporated into a factorial design which included repeated measures on the first factor. The factors were: message orientation (prescriptive or proscriptive), rating scale (value or nonvalue), subject's value orientation (prescriptive or proscriptive), and form of the rating-recall task (A, A', B, or B'). As noted previously, fifteen subjects were randomly assigned to each of the eight possible combinations of the two rating scales and the four task forms.

Procedure

All but three subjects were tested in groups. The mean number of subjects per session was 5.7. Subjects' instructions directed them to use the accompanying scales to rate each of the twenty items that was listed on the following page. Half the subjects were directed to give items a rating of 1 if they felt the item described a very bad way for people to be. The others were directed to give a rating of 1 if they felt the item described a very unusual person. Items which subjects felt described very good (or very usual) people were to be given ratings of 5. Five minutes were allowed for completing the rating task.

After the five minutes had elapsed, subjects were instructed to close their test booklets with the blank cover page facing them. They were then asked to write, on the blank page, as many of the twenty items they had just

rated as they could remember. Seven minutes were allowed for this. Subjects were then told to turn to the sentence completion task on the last page of the booklet and to follow the instructions written at the top of the page. They worked at their own pace; most finished the completions within 15 minutes. When all had completed the test, the purpose of the study was explained and the subjects were cautioned not to discuss the procedure or study with anyone who might be participating at a later time.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Scoring

For the rating-recall task, items listed as recalled by each subject were scored for the number of prescriptive items exactly recalled and the number of proscriptive items exactly recalled.

On the sentence completion form, a subject's score is computed as the percentage of the fourteen target stems completely prescriptively. Unscorable responses (i.e., items completed neither prescriptively nor proscriptively or those completed both prescriptively and proscriptively) are not included in the basis of the percentage. Subjects whose scores fall above the median are considered prescriptively oriented; those whose scores fall below are considered proscriptively oriented. Twelve of the 120 subjects were excluded from further analysis because their scores fell at the median point ($\underline{Mdn}=64, \bar{X}=64.2, \underline{S.D.}=13.4$).[2] The remaining 108 were evenly divided between the

---

[2]For McKinney's (1971) sample: $\bar{X}=65.7, \underline{S.D.}=15.6$.

prescriptive and proscriptive classifications ($\bar{X}_{pre}$=75.6, S.D.=7.6; $\bar{X}_{pro}$=52.8, S.D.=6.3). Their data were analyzed as is described below.

Analysis

To determine if differences in recall exist as a function of message, processing and subject differences, an analysis of variance, with repeated measures on the two level message factor was performed. The distribution of subjects' value orientation scores did not generate an even distribution of subjects within the cells of the analysis. Consequently, an analysis capable of handling unequal cell frequencies was used. A multivariate analysis of variance computer analysis package (MULTIVARANCE) was easily adapted for this univariate design (Finn, 1968; Sheifley and Schmidt, 1973). To analyze data such as those involved in the present study, the MULTIVARANCE package generates a least-squares analysis.

The four factors previously discussed in terms of the design of the study were analyzed as independent variables. To recapitulate, these were: message orientation (prescriptive or proscriptive), subjects' value orientation (prescriptive or proscriptive), rating scale (value or nonvalue), and form of the rating task (A, A', B, B'). Means of the total number of items recalled and of the number of prescriptive and proscriptive items recalled are provided in Table 3.

Table 3.--Mean Number of Items Recalled: Total, Prescriptive, and Proscriptive.

Factor	$\bar{X}$ Total Items Recalled	$\bar{X}$ Prescriptive Items Recalled	$\bar{X}$ Proscriptive Items Recalled
Message Orientation (*S* w/message)	4.66	2.05	2.61
S Orientation			
Prescriptive	4.81	2.18	2.63
Proscriptive	4.50	1.91	2.59
Scale			
Value	4.96	2.23	2.73
Nonvalue	4.33	1.85	2.48
Form			
A	5.00	2.37	2.63
A'	3.93	2.04	1.89
B	4.84	1.88	2.96
B'	4.87	1.90	2.97

The ratio of male to female subjects (approximately 2:5) as well as the absence of predictions concerning sex differences precluded inclusion of sex as a fifth factor in the design and analysis. To have included this factor would have generated several empty cells in the analysis. However, Chi-square analyses revealed sex was not related to either subjects' value orientation or to differences in recall (X^2_{orient}=1.12,p=n.s.; X^2_{recall}=.19,p=n.s.).

Tests of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Prescriptive messages were predicted to be the more frequently recalled across all subjects and regardless of the scale or form used. Thus, a significant main effect for the repeated factor (i.e., message orientation) was predicted by Hypothesis 1. Such an effect was obtained (F=13.30,df=1/92,p=.0005) but importantly, proscriptive messages were the more frequently recalled ($\bar{X}_{pre}$=2.05; $\bar{X}_{pro}$=2.61).

Hypothesis 2 and 4

Subjects assessed as prescriptive on the basis of their scores on the sentence completion test were expected to recall more prescriptive messages than would proscriptive subjects, regardless of the rating scale used (Hypothesis 2). This led to the prediction of a significant subject orientation X message orientation interaction. This effect

was not obtained (F = .60, df = 1/92, p = .44). Further, neither a significant main effect for subject's value orientation nor any interactions with this variable were found. Thus, Hypothesis 4, predicting that prescriptive subjects using the value rating dimension would recall more prescriptive messages than proscriptive subjects using the same scale was not supported. That is, the three-way interaction between subjects' orientation, message orientation and rating scale, was not significant (F = 1.68, df = 1/92, p = .20).

Hypothesis 3

The evaluative rating scale (bad--good) was hypothesized to facilitate recall of the value based stimuli subject were asked to rate. A significant main effect for rating scale was thus expected. This effect was also not significant (F = 2.40, df = 1/92, p = .12). The pattern of results obtained, however, was in the direction predicted.

The third hypothesis in addition predicted that use of the rating scale would enhance recall for prescriptive items. Thus a significant interaction between message orientation and scale was expected. This too failed to receive support (F = .24, df = 1.92, p = .62).

The nonsignificant results obtained using exact recall as the dependent variable in this research prompted a reconsideration of the data with an alternative dependent measure. An identical analysis of the number of prescriptive

and proscriptive items listed by the subjects as recalled (regardless of accuracy with regard to the stimulus list) was thus performed. In this case an almost identical pattern of nonsignificant results emerged. The only difference was the absence of a significant effect for the message factor.

An unexpected significant interaction between the four level form factor and the two level (repeated) message factor was obtained ($F=3.79$, $df=3/92$, $p=.01$). The Newman-Keuls test of differences between treatment means revealed that the mean number of proscriptive items recalled by the group which received Form A' ($\bar{X}_{A'}=1.89$) was significantly lower than the mean for groups receiving Forms B and B' which differed from Form A in the orientation of the items ($\bar{X}_B=2.96$; $\bar{X}_{B'}=2.97$, $p<.05$). However, the mean for the group receiving Form A' did not differ significantly from the mean obtained for Form A which was alike in item orientation but different in the order of the items ($\bar{X}_A=2.63$; $\bar{X}_{A'}=1.89$). Further, the means for groups receiving Forms A, B, and B' did not differ significantly from each other ($\bar{X}_A=2.63$; $\bar{X}_B=2.96$, $\bar{X}_{B'}=2.97$).

The absence of a significant difference when contrasting Form A with Forms B and B' suggests that the orientation differences which distinguish Forms A and A' from Forms B and B' are probably not responsible for the observed differences in Form A' vs Forms B and B'. The absence of a difference between Forms A and A', and B and B'

suggests that difference in the order of the items probably did not influence differential recall across the groups. The finding of a significant message X form interaction thus appears to be spurious.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The results of this research suggest that prescriptively or proscriptively phrasing a message does influence the ability of subjects to recall it. In the present experimental situation proscriptive messages were more accurately recalled by the subjects. Originally, however, because of the greater directiveness they convey, prescriptive messages were hypothesized to emerge as favored in the recall task. Had this pattern held it could have been interpreted as suggesting that greater recall of prescriptive messages is advantageous in that these provide clearer instructions than proscriptive messages and thereby minimize an individual's potential for transgression or rule infraction.

The finding that proscriptive stimuli are the more easily recalled does not challenge the usefulness of social factors as central considerations in an interpretation of the results. The present findings suggest that while recall patterns may have developed to enhance obedience to social-moral dictates, this recall is evidently not facilitated

when the communications are conveyed prescriptively. In this society where a general proscriptive bias seems characteristic, facile recall of proscriptive messages could be the logical outcome of past history and present circumstance. (It can be noted, for example, that the majority of the Ten Commandments are proscriptively worded.) Thus, a study like the present one but conducted in a prescriptive culture could well result in subjects' illustrating the opposite pattern of recall. That is, there would be a marked facility in the recall of prescriptive items.

In view of the failure to find a relationship between personal value orientation and any of the variables studied in the present research, it is possible that, for this sample, the sentence completion measure of value orientation was not sensitive enough to differentiate subjects accurately with respect to prescriptive and proscriptive orientation. The low reliability obtained with the measure for the present sample suggests this may well be the case (coefficient alpha= .47, odd-even [corrected by Spearman-Brown formula] r= .58). This is in contrast to the higher reliability obtained when the measure was originally designed and administered (odd-even [corrected by Spearman-Brown formula] r= .64).

The population of students from which the present sample was drawn, while from the same university and drawn using the same selection procedure as the initial sample,

may have been more homogeneous with respect to value orientation--even though the test, possibly due to its reduced reliability, did not reflect this. (Note similarity of the standard deviations for the two groups reported on page 15.) Dichotomizing such a sample on the basis of scores on the sentence completion form could thus have been artificial and not have provided a meaningful reflection of differences between individuals.

Anecdotal observation as well as recent research provide some support for the idea that the contemporary student population is fairly homogeneous, at least with regard to certain specific attitudes and values (Yankelovitch, 1974; McKinney, Hotch, and Truhon, in press). Whether there was indeed more heterogeneity five years ago when the test was developed cannot be said with certainty, but informal observations suggest that formerly university students were characterized by a greater variety of concerns, attitudes, and specific values.

A third consideration which can be made in an attempt to explain the present failure to find a relationship between value orientation as a personality variable and individual patterns of recall is the nature of the recall process which was studied. Possibly the mechanism involved (whether it is rooted in social, cognitive, neurological or a combination of processes) is so universal that it can override any idiosyncratic influence which might stem from individual differences in value orientation.

To attempt to address these issues, a study similar to the present one could be conducted with two samples presumed to differ markedly with respect to individual value orientation. A comparison of a delinquent and nondelinquent group would be one way of determining the sensitivity of the instrument as well as investigating the relationship between personal value orientation and recall of value based communications. An important problem with such a study, however, would be in the design of the messages. It does not seem likely that value based messages, at least for the two groups suggested above, would be identical, or even comparable.

In view of past successes (e.g., Wood, 1976) the present failure to create a strong influence on subjects recall patterns by manipulating set suggests the rating scale manipulation used was not strong enough. Value sets or schemata may have been activated simply by rating an item regardless of the dimension used. A threshold may thus have been crossed such that the difference between using an evaluative rating scale and a presumably non-evaluative rating scale was too slight to generate clearly marked differences.

A related issue must also be considered. The content of the items may have precluded finding pronounced differences between subjects as a function of the rating scale they used. The value based items used in the recall

task may have made it impossible for subjects not to have processed the items evaluatively.

In Perspective

This research was undertaken with the intention of beginning to study how value orientations of individuals and the value related communications they are given come to influence behavior. Previous research (Olejnik and McKinney, 1973) presented evidence that a relationship does exist. Notably children's performance of a value related behavior (generosity) was found to be associated with their own and their parents' value orientations. Recall for value based communications was selected for study here since this process seemed to be a necessary and intermediate one in an individual's transformation of direction into performance.

Given the present culture, the observed greater recall of proscriptive messages may be the most efficient way for an individual to become fluent in his/her recitation or rote knowledge of norms as they are taught. Structuring value related information and using these norms to guide behavior may, however, involve additional processes. Thus, if organizing value related information and using this information to guide behavior is a multifaceted process, exact recall seems likely to reflect only the recitation component. The present research which studied only subjects' exact recall, therefore, may not have provided a suitable means for investigating this issue. To the extent

that the recall process which intervenes between value communication and behavior develops from and relies on more than recitation knowledge, future investigators would be best advised to employ a different type of recall as the dependent variable, or to use a multivariate approach. By using a multivariate design, several dependent variables could be studied. It would then be possible to determine if more than one aspect is involved in the recall of value oriented information.

Summary

In summary, results indicated that, contrary to expectations, proscriptive items were recalled more often than were prescriptive items. Although use of a value rating scale did appear to somewhat facilitate subjects' recall of the value based items used in the task, this effect did not reach statistical significance. Value orientation as a personality dimension was not found to be related to any of the variables studied. Possible explanations for the results were discussed in terms of characteristics of the subjects, task, and measures used. In addition, speculation concerning social factors which could lead to the development of the recall pattern observed was also made in an attempt to explain the results obtained.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, G. A study of values. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1960.

Alper, T. G., & Korchin, S. G. Memory for socially relevant material. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 25-37.

Bartlett, F. C. Remembering. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932.

Brigham, J. C., & Cook, S. W. The influence of attitude on the recall of controversial material: A failure to confirm. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 240-243.

Finn. J. Multivariance, version 4, June 1968.

Greenwald, A. G., & Sakumura, J. S. Attitude and selective learning: Where are the phenomena of yesteryear? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7, 387-397.

Hoffman, M. Moral development. In P. Mussen (Ed.) Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology (Vol. 2). New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970.

Jones, E. E., & Kohler, R. The effects of plausibility on the learning of controversial statements. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 57, 315-320.

Kohlberg, L. The development of children's orientation toward a moral order: I. Sequence in the development of moral thought. Vita Humana, 1963, 6, 11-33.

Kluckhohn F., & Strodtbeck, F. L. Variations in value orientation. Evanston, Ill.: Row & Peterson, 1961.

Levine, J. M., & Murphy, G. The learning and forgetting of controversial material. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1943, 38, 507-515.

McKinney, J. P. The development of values--prescriptive or proscriptive? Human Development, 1971, 14, 71-80.

McKinney, J. P. The structure of behavioral values of college students. Journal of Psychology, 1973, 85, 235-244.

McKinney, J. P., Hotch, D. F., & Truhon, S. A. The organization of behavioral values during late adolescence: Change and stability across two eras. Developmental Psychology, in press.

Olejnik, A. B., & McKinney, J. P. Parental value orientation and generosity in children. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8, 311.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Rapaport, D. Emotions and memory. New York: International Universities Press, 1967.

Rescher, N. Introduction to value theory. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

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

Scheifley, V., & Schmidt, W. Jeremy Finn's Multivariance-Univariate and multivariate analysis of variance, covariance, and regression modified and adapted for use on the CDC 6500. Unpublished manuscript, 1973.

Taft, R. Selective recall and memory distortion of favorable and unfavorable material. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 23-28.

Waly, P., & Cook, S. W. Attitude as a determinant of learning and memory: A failure to confirm. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 280-288.

Wood, G. Mémoire et traitement sémantique. In S. and E. Tulving (Eds.). La Mémoire Sémantique. Paris: Bulletin de Psychologie, 1976.

Yankelovitch, D. The new morality: Profile of American youth in the '70's. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DESIGN OF THE RATING-RECALL TASK

APPENDIX A

DESIGN OF THE RATING-RECALL TASK

Items used in the construction of the Rating-Recall Task

Affirmative	Negative
prescriptive	proscriptive
1. works hard*	1. is not lazy
2. helps out a friend*	2. does not ignore a friend
3. finishes work on time	3. does not dawdle with work
4. often leads others	4. is not always a follower
5. gets good grades	5. does not get poor grades
6. is well accepted*	6. is not unpopular
7. is true to self	7. is not phony
8. honors commitments*	8. does not neglect commitments
9. watches weight*	9. does not overeat
10. achieves a goal	10. does not fail at a goal
proscriptive	prescriptive
11. is irritable	11. is not pleasant
12. lies*	12. is not truthful
13. makes ridiculous errors	13. is not careful
14. gets drunk*	14. does not stay sober
15. disappoints family*	15. does not make family proud

Affirmative	Negative
proscriptive	prescriptive
16. is jealous*	16. is not trusting
17. hurts someone's feelings*	17. is not considerate of someone's feelings
18. neglects schoolwork	18. does not do schoolwork
19. is critical of others	19. does not support others
20. is two-faced	20. is not honest with people

*Indicates the ten items selected at random to appear in negative form on the preliminary form (Form A) of the rating-recall task.

APPENDIX B

FORMS OF THE RATING-RECALL TASK

APPENDIX B

FORMS OF THE RATING-RECALL TASK

Form A (Task for Group 1)

1.	is true to self	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
2.	does not overeat	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
3.	often leads others	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
4.	is not lazy	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
5.	does not stay sober	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
6.	achieves a goal	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
7.	does not make family proud	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
8.	is not considerate of someone's feelings	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
9.	is irritable	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
10.	is two-faced	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
11.	is not unpopular	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
12.	is not truthful	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
13.	does not ignore a friend	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
14.	gets good grades	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
15.	neglects schoolwork	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
16.	finishes work on time	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
17.	makes ridiculous errors	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
18.	is critical of others	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
19.	does not neglect commitments	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
20.	is not trusting	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

Form A (Task for Group 2)

1.	is true to self	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
2.	does not overeat	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
3.	often leads others	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
4.	is not lazy	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
5.	does not stay sober	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
6.	achieves a goal	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
7.	does not make family proud	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
8.	is not considerate of someone's feelings	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
9.	is irritable	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
10.	is two-faced	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
11.	is not popular	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
12.	is not truthful	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
13.	does not ignore a friend	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
14.	gets good grades	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
15.	neglects schoolwork	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
16.	finishes work on time	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
17.	makes ridiculous errors	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
18.	is critical of others	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
19.	does not neglect commitments	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
20.	is not trusting	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual

Form A' (Task for Group 3)

1.	does not ignore a friend	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
2.	is irritable	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
3.	does not stay sober	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
4.	finishes work on time	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
5.	often leads others	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
6.	does not neglect commitments	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
7.	achieves a goal	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
8.	is not trusting	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
9.	is not truthful	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
10.	is not considerate of someone's feelings	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
11.	does not make family proud	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
12.	is true to self	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
13.	makes ridiculous errors	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
14.	is not unpopular	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
15.	neglects schoolwork	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
16.	is critical of others	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
17.	does not overeat	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
18.	is not lazy	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
19.	gets good grades	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
20.	is two-faced	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

Form A' (Task for Group 4)

1.	does not ignore a friend	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
2.	is irritable	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
3.	does not stay sober	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
4.	finishes work on time	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
5.	often leads others	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
6.	does not neglect commitments	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
7.	achieves a goal	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
8.	is not trusting	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
9.	is not truthful	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
10.	is not considerate of someone's feelings	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
11.	does not make family proud	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
12.	is true to self	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
13.	makes ridiculous errors	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
14.	is not unpopular	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
15.	neglects schoolwork	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
16.	is critical of others	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
17.	does not overeat	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
18.	is not lazy	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
19.	gets good grades	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
20.	is two-faced	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual

Form B (Task for Group 5)

1.	is not phony	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
2.	watches weight	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
3.	is not always a follower	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
4.	works hard	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
5.	gets drunk	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
6.	does not fail at a goal	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
7.	disappoints family	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
8.	hurts someone's feelings	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
9.	is not pleasant	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
10.	is not honest with people	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
11.	is well-accepted	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
12.	lies	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
13.	helps out a friend	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
14.	does not get poor grades	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
15.	does not do schoolwork	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
16.	does not dawdle with work	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
17.	is not careful	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
18.	does not support others	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
19.	honors commitments	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
20.	is jealous	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

Form B (Task for Group 6)

1.	is not phony	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
2.	watches weight	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
3.	is not always a follower	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
4.	works hard	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
5.	gets drunk	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
6.	does not fail at a goal	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
7.	disappoints family	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
8.	hurts someone's feelings	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
9.	is not pleasant	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
10.	is not honest with people	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
11.	is well-accepted	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
12.	lies	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
13.	helps out a friend	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
14.	does not get poor grades	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
15.	does not do schoolwork	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
16.	does not dawdle with work	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
17.	is not careful	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
18.	does not support others	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
19.	honors commitments	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
20.	is jealous	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual

Form B' (Task for Group 7)

1.	helps out a friend	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
2.	is not pleasant	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
3.	gets drunk	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
4.	does not dawdle with work	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
5.	is not always a follower	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
6.	honors commitments	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
7.	does not fail at a goal	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
8.	is jealous	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
9.	lies	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
10.	hurts someone's feelings	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
11.	disappoints family	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
12.	is not phony	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
13.	is not careful	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
14.	is well-accepted	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
15.	does not do schoolwork	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
16.	does not support others	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
17.	watches weight	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
18.	works hard	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
19.	does not get poor grades	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good
20.	is not honest with people	bad	1	2	3	4	5	good

Form B' (Task for Group 8)

1.	helps out a friend	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
2.	is not pleasant	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
3.	gets drunk	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
4.	does not dawdle with work	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
5.	is not always a follower	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
6.	honors commitments	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
7.	does not fail at a goal	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
8.	is jealous	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
9.	lies	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
10.	hurts someone's feelings	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
11.	disappoints family	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
12.	is not phony	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
13.	is not careful	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
14.	is well-accepted	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
15.	does not do schoolwork	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
16.	does not support others	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
17.	watches weight	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
18.	works hard	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
19.	does not get poor grades	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual
20.	is not honest with people	unusual	1	2	3	4	5	usual

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE RATING-RECALL TASK

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE RATING-RECALL TASK

Instructions (Administered to subjects who used the value rating scale; Groups 1, 3, 5, and 7).

Please write male or female to indicate your sex on the cover of this booklet. Remember not to look ahead or back in the booklet at any time or to turn any pages of the booklet until specifically directed to do so. When you turn a page, please be sure it is firmly creased in back of the booklet so that only one page faces you.

On the next page is a list of 20 phrases which were chosen from a list of self-descriptions given by typical university students. Next to each one is a five-point scale like this one: bad 1 2 3 4 5 good. You'll have five minutes to rate each phrase on the scale from bad to good by circling the appropriate number. Give an item a rating of 1 by circling the 1 if you think the phrase describes a very bad person. Give an item a rating of 5 if you think the phrase describes a very good person. Use the points in the middle for items you think are not as bad or as good as those you give ratings of 1 and 5. Try to use all the

ratings about the same number of times. If you finish before the time is up check your ratings.

Once you have read and understood these instructions please look to the front of the room and wait for the coordinator's signal to begin.

Instructions (Administered to subjects who used the nonvalue rating scale; Groups 2, 4, 6, and 8).

Please write male or female to indicate your sex on the cover of this booklet. Remember not to look ahead or back in the booklet at any time or to turn any pages of the booklet until specifically directed to do so. When you turn a page, please be sure it is firmly creased in back of the booklet so that only one page faces you.

On the next page is a list of 20 phrases which were chosen from a list of self-descriptions given by typical university students. Next to each one is a five-point scale like this one: unusual 1 2 3 4 5 usual. You'll have five minutes to rate each phrase on the scale from unusual to usual. Give an item a rating of 1 if the phrase describes a very unusual person. Give an item a rating of 5 if the phrase describes a very usual person. Use the points in the middle for items that are not as unusual or usual as those with ratings of 1 and 5. Try to use all the ratings about the same number of times. If you finish before the time is up, check your ratings.

Once you have read and understood these instructions please look to the front of the room and wait for the coordinator's signal to begin.

APPENDIX D

SENTENCE COMPLETION FORM

APPENDIX D

SENTENCE COMPLETION FORM

Sentence Completion Form (Administered to all subjects to assess value orientation)

Please finish the following sentences according to your own true feelings. Work as quickly as possible but be sure to finish each sentence.

1. I am satisfied with myself when
2. If I show my teacher my work
3. If a little child meets me on the street
4. My teacher helps me when
5. If a person likes me
6. Whenever I ask my mother for a favor
7. My parents would be pleased if
8. My father gets angry with me when
9. When an older person tells me about his life
10. I get angry with myself whenever
11. I enjoy being with my best friend when
12. My father is happy with me when
13. I would be ashamed of myself if
14. I disappoint my teacher when
15. I call my friend on the telephone when
16. As soon as I meet a new boy
17. I feel good about making a new friend when
18. My mother is disappointed in me whenever
19. Whenever I help a friend in trouble
20. I disappoint my friend when
21. My teacher trusts me when
22. When my friend looks to me for help
23. I am proud of myself when
24. My parents get upset with me when
25. My mother would be satisfied with me if
26. My friend would be pleased with me if
27. If I put my teacher on a pedestal
28. As soon as I meet a new girl