

ANALYSIS BY A CONSTRUCTED TYPOLOGY OF
FAMILY MEMBERS' VALUES EVIDENT IN MANAGERIAL
DECISION SITUATIONS

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Esther A. Martin
1965



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Analysis by a Constructed Typology of Family Members' Values
Evident in Managerial Decision Situations

presented by

Esther A. Martin

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Home Management

Stan Dora Schuster
Major professor

Date December 9, 1965

~~OCT 1 1967~~ ~~SEP 1 1967~~ 047

~~JUN 1 1967~~ 101

~~OCT 30 1969~~ 105 ~~JUN 2 1992~~

~~NOV 12 1968~~ 111 105

~~JUN 23 1971~~ 175 ~~MAY 0 1993~~

~~ST 30 1972~~ 305 152

~~JUL 14 1973~~ 190

~~JUL 18 1973~~ 0223

~~SEP 23 1973~~ 750

~~OCT 20 1973~~ 143

~~JAN 27 1974~~ 113

~~MAR 1 1974~~ 196
113

ABSTRACT

ANALYSIS BY A CONSTRUCTED TYPOLOGY OF FAMILY MEMBERS' VALUES EVIDENT IN MANAGERIAL DECISION SITUATIONS

by Esther A. Martin

This study was performed as Phase II of a Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station project of the Department of Home Management and Child Development of Michigan State University entitled "Values Underlying Managerial Decisions in the Family." Phase I explored the values of groups of wives, using a projective story completion instrument to gather data and a constructed typology as a conceptual system to identify and classify values. The present study, Phase II, explored the values of the entire family, using the same projective device and conceptual system developed in Phase I.

The projective stories, built around a set of family decision situations, were administered to 51 families comprised of husband, wife and children between the ages of 12 and 18. Simultaneously, in their own homes, respondents from each family wrote completions to the stories. Questions at the end of each story, "What should be done?" and "Why?" guided respondents to express their "conceptions of the desirable which affect choices among possible courses of action"--the definition of values chosen for the master project to distinguish values from a host of related concepts.

Values identified and classified by the constructed typology consisted of four value types: traditional, social, autonomous, and change-prone, which were developed for twelve themes. The classified values were used to construct a composite value profile for each respondent. The values were further analyzed by type and by family role for stories and themes and by commonality in the family.

On a continuum of composite value profiles ranging from traditional to autonomous, husbands' profiles were about equally distributed in each direction from the center point, but wives' profiles were largely at the autonomous end. Sons' and daughters' profiles fell toward the center point, with sons' tending toward traditional and daughters' toward autonomous. More younger sons had predominantly traditional profiles than had any other age group of any role. Husband-daughter and wife-daughter pairs had the most profiles alike and wife-son pairs, the fewest. Husband-wife pairs had the fewest predominantly traditional profiles and husband-son pairs, the most.

Of total values coded, 42 percent were traditional and 54 percent autonomous; only 4 percent were social and less than 1 percent change-prone.

Themes predominantly traditional were control of child's behavior (for all roles); social organization (for wives and daughters); mobility, mode of child's control, and form of response (for sons and daughters); and scope of wife's time alternatives (for husbands only).

Themes predominantly autonomous were division of work (for all roles); control of adult son and emphasis (for all roles but sons); mobility and mode of child's control (for husbands and wives); kinship and material possessions (for wives and daughters); and scope of wife's time alternatives (for daughters only).

Patterns of commonality varied among families in quantity and in roles holding common values.

Consequences of holding different types and holding common or disparate values are yet to be investigated. A conclusion may be drawn that no one person can be the indicator of values for the entire family since each role appears to have characteristically different value types. Numerous hypotheses are suggested by this exploratory investigation. To mention a few: Husbands, wives, sons and daughters tend to have characteristically different value profiles. Quantity of value expression is a function of role and of type. The higher the level of education, the more autonomous values an individual will hold.

Values and other related concepts such as interests, preferences and desires are conceptually distinct entities. Operationally maintaining this distinction is important in value research.

ANALYSIS BY A CONSTRUCTED TYPOLOGY OF FAMILY MEMBERS' VALUES
EVIDENT IN MANAGERIAL DECISION SITUATIONS

By

Esther Alice Martin

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Home Management and Child Development

1965

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To all of the people contributing suggestions, interest and help in the development and execution of this study, the writer wishes to express gratitude. Among these are the responding families, many of whom canceled other activities to be together as a family to cooperate with the study.

Grateful acknowledgment goes to the members of the guidance committee: Dr. Alice C. Thorpe, Dr. Beatrice Paolucci, Dr. Jay W. Artis, and especially to Dr. Jean D. Schlater, chairman of the committee, for guidance, encouragement and patience throughout the study.

Mrs. Jan Fliss and Miss Carol Engebretson merit recognition for their work in coding. And to Miss Engebretson, who executed Phase I of the study, the writer wishes to express appreciation for the stimulating discussions and for her interest in Phase II.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION. | 1 |
| Relationship between Values and Home Management | 1 |
| Assumptions and Objectives. | 6 |
| Selected Definition of Values | 7 |
| II. RELATED RESEARCH. | 12 |
| Homemaker's Values. | 12 |
| Family's Values | 17 |
| Other Related Research. | 28 |
| III. METHODOLOGY AND ITS CONCEPTUAL BASIS. | 33 |
| Definitions of Terms. | 33 |
| Selection of Sample | 34 |
| Rationale | 34 |
| Criteria. | 35 |
| Mechanics | 35 |
| Collection of Data. | 37 |
| The Incomplete Stories. | 37 |
| Collection Procedure. | 41 |
| Analysis of Data. | 42 |
| The Constructed Typology. | 42 |
| Coding the Responses. | 46 |
| Analytical Procedure. | 46 |
| IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE | 56 |
| Size and Composition of the Families. | 56 |
| Occupation of Husbands and Family Income. | 58 |
| Occupation of Wives Before and After Marriage | 58 |
| Formal Education of Husbands, Wives, Sons, and Daughters. | 60 |
| Non-Respondents | 60 |
| V. FINDINGS. | 63 |
| Frequency of Coded Values by Role and Type. | 63 |
| Composite Value Profiles. | 65 |
| By Mean Coded Values. | 66 |
| By Role | 66 |

| Chapter | Page |
|--|------|
| By Age. | 70 |
| By Income | 73 |
| By Education. | 73 |
| By Occupation | 73 |
| By Paired Roles | 76 |
| Story Analysis. | 84 |
| Coded Values by Type and by Story | 88 |
| Coded Values by Type, by Story, and by Role | 88 |
| Theme Analysis. | 89 |
| Three Theme Categories. | 91 |
| Coded Values by Type and by Theme | 93 |
| Coded Values by Type, by Theme, and by Role | 93 |
| Analysis of Common Family Values. | 96 |
| VI. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS. | 109 |
| Summary | 109 |
| Comparison of Findings Between Phase I and Phase II | 115 |
| Limitations of the Study. | 118 |
| Implications for Further Study. | 119 |
| Implications for Home Management. | 123 |
| LITERATURE CITED. | 125 |
| APPENDIX. Directions for Administering the Incom- plete Stories, the Incomplete Story Instrument, and Samples from Coding Manual. | 129 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 4.1. Composition of families by size and role. . . | 57 |
| 4.2. Ages of husbands and wives. | 57 |
| 4.3. Gainful occupations of husbands | 59 |
| 4.4. Gainful occupations of wives before and after marriage | 59 |
| 4.5. Education of husbands and wives | 61 |
| 4.6. Reasons given by non-respondents for refusal to cooperate in the study. | 61 |
| 5.1. Number of coded values per respondent by role | 64 |
| 5.2. Coded values by type and by role. | 65 |
| 5.3. Mean coded values by composite value profiles | 66 |
| 5.4. Families by composite value profiles. | 67 |
| 5.5. Role by composite value profiles. | 69 |
| 5.6. Ages of husbands and wives by their composite value profiles | 71 |
| 5.7. Ages of sons and daughters by their composite value profiles | 72 |
| 5.8. Family incomes of husbands and wives by their composite value profiles | 74 |
| 5.9. Education of husbands and wives by their composite value profiles | 75 |
| 5.10. Gainful occupations of husbands by composite value profiles | 76 |
| 5.11. Gainful occupations of wives before and after marriage by composite value profiles | 77 |
| 5.12. Comparison of husbands' composite value profiles with their wives' composite value profiles | 79 |

| Table | | Page |
|-------|--|------|
| 5.13. | Comparison of husbands' composite value profiles with their sons' composite value profiles. | 80 |
| 5.14. | Comparison of husbands' composite value profiles with their daughters' composite value profiles | 81 |
| 5.15. | Comparison of wives' composite value profiles with their sons' composite value profiles . | 82 |
| 5.16. | Comparison of wives' composite value profiles with their daughters' composite value profiles. | 83 |
| 5.17. | Coded values by type and by story | 85 |
| 5.18. | Coded values by type, by story, and by role . | 86 |
| 5.19. | Coded values by type and by theme | 90 |
| 5.20. | Coded values for form of response, emphasis and all other themes by type and by role . . | 92 |
| 5.21. | Coded values by type, by theme, and by role . | 94 |
| 5.22. | Coded values common to entire family by type and by story with related themes | 97 |
| 5.23. | Husbands by percentages of their coded values held in common with other roles. | 99 |
| 5.24. | Wives by percentages of their coded values held in common with other roles. | 100 |
| 5.25. | Sons by percentages of their coded values held in common with other roles. | 101 |
| 5.26. | Daughters by percentages of their coded values held in common with other roles . . . | 102 |
| 5.27. | Total coded values for each role by type held in common with other roles equally represented in the sample | 104 |
| 5.28. | Total coded values for ten families by those held in common with four, three, two, and no roles | 106 |
| 5.29. | Common value patterns for ten families composed of husband, wife, son, and daughter. . | 107 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Man differs from other animals in that he can think and express himself symbolically, can store ideas and conceptions in his mind and, through imagination, can think of the future and what it should be and organize his life toward bringing it about. Man is also social and interacts with the society in which he lives. His closest relationships are with his family, a small group which interacts within the home as well as with the larger society. How do values relate to the nature of man and the management of his home?

As early as 1938, Frank said:

If we are to gain an understanding of home management, we must see homemaking in the context of the family life to which it is primarily oriented. . . . Homemakers can be helped to discover the ideas and the concepts and the values which they will attempt to realize as members of the family.¹

Relationship Between Values and Home Management

The field of home management is concerned with the family and its present and future oriented, purposive

¹Lawrence K. Frank, "The Philosophy of Home Management," Home Management Papers, Seventh International Management Congress (Washington, D.C.: National Management Council, 1938), p. 3.

behavior. The formulation of family goals, and the selection and organization of resources and courses of action to attain these goals, are all key decision-making activities of home management. Underlying all management is a set of values. Management causes action to take place and values of the family are closely related to directing and controlling that action.

Home management is distinguished from other areas of management primarily by its concern with the family. The values of all the family group influence the goal formation and creation of ways and means to achieve goals. The Cornell Value-Study Group says that "values appear as the criteria against which goals are chosen, and as the implications which those goals have in the situation."¹

Since the family is composed of individuals, the values of the family may include, not only those ascribed to by the entire family, but also values held solely by individual family members. The realization of values through decision-making and action determines the well-being of the family. Woodruff says:

. . . the determination of what constitutes well-being is a function of the concepts of the individual and especially of his value concepts. In any situation the individual will attempt to satisfy his needs in a manner designed to promote to the fullest those conditions of living which he deems

¹Glenn H. Beyer, Housing and Personal Values, Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Memoir 364 (Ithaca, New York, July, 1959), p. 4.

essential to his well-being.¹

Perhaps the most important and inseparable relationship of values to home management is their function in choice-making or decision-making, an integral part of all management. Values influence choice of goals (ends), choice of resources (means) to use in achieving goals, and also the choice of ways (modes) of carrying out the action. Values function as criteria or normative standards by which these family choices are evaluated and, as such, bring about recognition of the implications of the situation and the range of means and ends that are acceptable to choose from. Smith writes about this cognitive quality of values which leads to choice and commitment, yet permits flexibility in use:

Values characterized by what I am calling self-requiredness . . . are standards that may be implicit, but, in any case, are accessible to conscious formulation. They are actively embraced by the person and thus become constituents of the self, part of what the person feels himself to be and to stand for. Characteristically their application involves . . . finely differentiated cognitive discriminations . . . and they can therefore be applied with more flexibility, appropriateness, and rationality. . . . Since they are integrated in the self rather than sealed off in an infantile form, they are open to progressive modification and elaboration. They are sustained by the individual's active commitment to them as the values that he chooses to live by.²

Management depends upon the ability of the person

¹Asahel D. Woodruff, "The Concept-Value Theory of Human Behavior," Journal of General Psychology, XL (1949), p. 152.

²M. Brewster Smith, "Personal Values in the Study of Lives," The Study of Lives, ed. Robert W. White (New York: Atherton Press, 1963), p. 338.

to consciously recognize his objectives, in fact, to choose them, and to devise ways and means of achieving them which are compatible with his values and then to adapt his ways and means flexibly as situations change, but in harmony with his values. Perhaps even the objectives change as the situation changes. The most stable element in the management situation would seem to be the values to which the individual is committed.

Since the home is the place where socialization of the child begins, usually a goal of management is to arrange for experiences that develop and perpetuate values. Smith describes some of the limitations and possibilities that values impose upon carrying out this goal:

If you want to persuade someone to value something as you do, you can follow one of at least two strategies: First, you can try to open his eyes to new ways of seeing things--increase the range of possibilities of which he is aware, create the conditions for differentiations and restructurings in his experience from which it is possible (not necessary) that, seeing things like yourself, he may come to value them likewise. Or, second, you can give him evidence that the position he takes on a particular value has consequences for other values to which he is also committed. For the fact that values rest on a personal option does not make them arbitrary in the sense of being detached from cause or consequence. . . . Since values rest on personal option, no argument is conclusive, though many can be persuasive, and appropriately so.¹

Since the present study concerns the values of the family and its individual members, some discussion of the

¹M. Brewster Smith, "Mental Health Reconsidered: A Special Case of the Problem of Values in Psychology," American Psychologist, XVI (June, 1961), p. 302.

need for study of family values follows.

In the field of home management, belief prevails that choices in decision-making situations in the family are based on common values in the family. As Henle points out:

The family is a little hearth around which values center. The family is an intimately integrated group of people among whom there must be an acceptance of values, to a large extent, of common values.¹

Coyle also supports the existence of a family value system which influences the behavior of the group:

The value system is the pattern of values that evolves out of the group's life. It determines the norms of behavior for group members and for the group as a whole. . . . Each person has a system of values as part of his heritage, values he has taken on largely from his own family, from prestige figures, and from his social environment.²

Inasmuch as decision-making is the core of management, it is of utmost importance to know more about the family value system influencing decision-making within the family. Deacon and Bratton emphasize the need to recognize and appreciate the family value system:

Since evaluation of relative success in the process of management depends upon a clear conception of the goal or goals to be achieved, the recognition and appreciation of the underlying individual or family values has considerable significance. From a management standpoint, it might be

¹R. J. Henle, S.J., "Intellectual Elements in Home Economics Education," Journal of Home Economics, LII (January, 1960), p. 10.

²Grace L. Coyle, "Concepts Relevant to Helping the Family as a Group," Social Casework, XLIII (July, 1962), p. 353.

hypothesized: Individuals or families who have developed or recognized a system of values which provides a basis for selection among attainable goals will experience more satisfaction in their management activities than those who have not.¹

This research was conducted as Phase II of a Michigan Experiment Station project of the Department of Home Management and Child Development at Michigan State University. The master project is entitled "Values Underlying Managerial Decisions in the Family." The general purposes of this project were to carefully select a definition of values that would distinguish them from a host of related concepts and to attempt to identify family values. In Phase I, Engebretson² developed a projective story completion instrument to gather data and constructed a typology as a conceptual system to identify and classify values. She explored values of groups of wives, using these instruments. Phase II, using the same projective device and conceptual system, explored the values of the entire family.

Assumptions and Objectives

Assumptions

This study is based upon the assumptions that:

1. The decision situations in the incomplete

¹Ruth E. Deacon and Esther Crew Bratton, "Home Management: Focus and Function," Journal of Home Economics, LIV (November, 1962), p. 763.

²Carol L. Engebretson, "Analysis by a Constructed Typology of Wives' Values Evident in Managerial Decision Situations" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Home Management and Child Development, Michigan State University, 1965).

stories will evoke value responses.

2. The selected decision situations in the instrument will not presume to elicit the entire value system of a respondent or family.

Objectives

Three objectives were formulated to give direction to the study:

1. To elicit values of individuals in the family and of the entire family by means of a story completion instrument.
2. To identify values and determine value types of family members by means of a constructed typology and compare values and types within the family and among the total group of families.
3. To explore further: (a) the story completion instrument as a productive device to elicit values, both quantitatively and qualitatively; and (b) the typology as a conceptual system used to identify, structure and analyze value responses.

Due to the meager knowledge available in this area of study, formulating hypotheses would not be meaningful at this stage of the investigation. However, the research is expected to generate hypotheses as an outcome.

Selected Definition of Values

Values are conceptions of the desirable which

obligate and commit the person or group who holds them; as such, they may be considered normative standards and rules, or pattern principles which guide selection and choice among perceived alternatives. As conceptions, they are expressed symbolically by word or act. They are involved in defining purpose, in guiding action, and in evaluating results.

The foregoing view of the relation of values to action is in harmony with the views of a number of writers from the fields of sociology, philosophy and psychology. According to Kluckhohn:

A value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action.¹

And Jacob and Flink state that values are:

The normative standards by which human beings are influenced in their choice among the alternative courses of action which they perceive.²

Thus, they show a point at which the influences take place and imply that the courses of action are limited or controlled by the perception of the actor as well.

Although Kluckhohn expresses the cognitive and the

¹Clyde Kluckhohn and others, "Values and Value Orientations in the Theory of Action," Toward a General Theory of Action, eds. Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1954), p. 395.

²Phillip E. Jacob and James J. Flink with the collaboration of Hedvah L. Shuchman, "Values and Their Function in Decision-Making," Supplement to the American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. IX, No. 9 (May, 1962), p. 10.

affective in his phrase "conception of the desirable," Williams is more explicit in this respect and yet includes the idea of a standard for action: "Values are meaningful, affectively invested pattern principles that guide human conduct."¹

Smith brings in the idea of commitment and, in addition, reconciles the social origin of values with the possibility of individuality:

We have values, in the sense of personal standards of desirability and obligation. We see them, now, as committing choices that people make (often unwittingly) in the interplay of cultural tradition and individual experience. . . . [Although] values are social products, they rest, ultimately, on personal commitment.²

From the field of philosophy, Taylor makes a contribution with a point of view somewhat different from the view, often taken by philosophers, that values are absolutes:

When 'value' is used as a substantive and we talk of a person's 'values,' I suggest that the word refers to three sorts of things--the value judgments and prescriptions accepted by the person as being justified (whether or not he has ever in fact tried to justify them); the standards and rules which the person would appeal to if he were asked to justify his value judgments and prescriptions; and all other standards and rules which constitute the value systems the person has adopted, consciously or unconsciously. Thus a person's values include all the standards and rules which together make up his way of life. They define his ideals and life goals (to fulfill the standards; to follow the rules). They are standards and rules according to which he evaluates things and prescribes

¹Robin M. Williams, "Value Orientations in American Society," Social Perspectives on Behavior, ed. Herman D. Stein and Richard A. Cloward (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958), p. 289.

²Smith, "Mental Health Reconsidered," op. cit., p. 302.

acts, as well as the standards and rules he tries to live by, whether or not he is aware of them.¹

Stein and Cloward cite the many areas of pertinence of values as well as reiterating their conceptual property and their relationship to action:

Values determine the choices men make, and the ends they live by. What is considered good and what is evil; what is right and wrong, success and failure, what is important and unimportant, desirable and undesirable, beautiful and ugly, all are value questions. Whether the values lie in the realm of ethics, economics, aesthetics, or religion, they exist as they are experienced in human minds and translated into human action.²

Although human activity, the area in which values apply, is sometimes considered difficult to investigate scientifically, values are researchable. Eames expresses it:

In the case of a valuational situation . . . concern is with human activity . . . which is directed toward what shall or should or ought to be done. . . . The same kind of logical determinations of definition, classification, discrimination, and symbolization apply to valuational behaviors as to other scientific subject matters.³

For this study, as in Phase I, conducted by Engebretson,⁴ values are considered to be conceptions of the

¹Paul W. Taylor, Normative Discourse (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1961), p. 297.

²Herman D. Stein and Richard A. Cloward (eds.), Social Perspectives on Behavior (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958), p. 263.

³Morris S. Eames, "Valuing, Obligation, and Evaluation," Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, XXIV (March, 1964), p. 323.

⁴Engebretson, op. cit.

desirable which affect an individual's choices among possible courses of action. As conceptions, they are experienced in the minds of individuals but may be socially shared. They are often implicit. As conceptions of the desirable, they have cognitive and affective qualities as well as commitment and so pertain to beliefs of what ought or should be. As normative standards which guide conduct they influence choice, not only of ends of action, but also of means and modes of action.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

Research reviewed in this section will be divided into three categories: homemaker's values, family's values, and other related research.

Homemaker's Values

Three studies with homemakers as respondents were conducted by Ketchum,¹ Dyer,² and Kohlmann.³

Ketchum's general purpose was "to gain some degree of knowledge about the level of homemaker's awareness of the value content in their everyday lives." More specifically, she wanted to compare the homemakers' values as reflected in reasons given for their daily activities with their ranking of twelve selected values to see whether they had the same hierarchical pattern. Values were considered

¹Frances N. Ketchum, "A Study of Homemaker's Values as Reflected in Time Used for Family and Personal Activities" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Home Management and Child Development, Michigan State University, 1961).

²Doris M. Dyer, "Students' Wives Values as Reflected in Personal and Family Activities" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Home Management and Child Development, Michigan State University, 1962).

³Eleanore L. Kohlmann, "Development of an Instrument to Determine Values of Homemakers" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Home Economics Education, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, 1961).

"directors of managerial choices." Her sample consisted of homemakers with families who were volunteers from a Home Demonstration Group.

She used both rank order and forced choice tests to determine the relative importance to the individual homemaker of twelve selected values, namely: security, influence, recognition, helpfulness, freedom, new experience, friendship, family life, religion, orderliness, wealth, workmanship.

The homemakers' activities, reasons for these activities and statements concerning their satisfactions with these activities were obtained by two open-end questions: "How did you use your time yesterday--from the time you got up until you went to bed?" and "Why did you use your time this way?"¹

The number and kinds of values reflected in the reasons were categorized by the researcher, and relationship between these and the rank ordering and forced choice were compared, using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient. High correlation found between the rank order and forced choice tests leads one to assume that they may be used interchangeably. However, the coefficient of correlation between values reflected through reasons given for activities and values selected in the forced choice test was much lower, perhaps due to the difficulty mentioned by Ketchum in classifying reasons according to the selected

¹Ketchum, op. cit., p. 20.

value categories and also by the somewhat limited ability of the homemakers to verbalize reasons for their use of time. Nevertheless, this investigation contributes knowledge and research techniques to family value study.

Dyer¹ also proposed to explore and identify the values of homemakers through their expressed reasons for their day-to-day family activities and by comparison of the hierarchy of their values by three research techniques. Her sample consisted of student wives. To bring the values chosen for study to the level of awareness, she used a rank order test. Nine values similar to Beyer's² were included: health, family centrism, aesthetics, economy, education, religion, freedom, friendship, and prestige. These values were defined and made explicit by reference to family activities. Nine projective stories were developed from descriptive statements concerning each of the values. The statements were classified into value categories by three graduate students working independently before they were incorporated into the stories. Each story concerned what a homemaker did, why she did it and some of her feelings and beliefs about her management.

In addition, the homemaker was asked to record her day-to-day activities with reasons for doing each. Nine envelopes were labeled for the nine values and the homemaker

¹Dyer, op. cit.

²Beyer, op. cit.

was asked to place her activities and their accompanying reasons in the envelope in which she thought they belonged. Having the homemaker herself categorize her reasons overcame a limitation reported by Ketchum: the difficulty the researcher encountered in classifying the responses in value categories. The validity of results may also have been increased by this device.

The Spearman Rank Order Correlation indicated the highest correlation between projective stories and categorized reasons, and the lowest correlation between rank order test and categorized reasons. Categorized reasons were ranked by the quantity the homemaker placed in each category, whereas the rank order test and the projective stories were ranked by the homemaker's selected ordering. Dyer came to the conclusion that the more projective the instrument, the more likely it is to reveal values underlying the homemaker's behavior.

Kohlmann¹ developed a forced choice instrument to determine the values of homemakers. She agreed with the definition given by Kluckhohn² and accepted it for her study. From an extensive list of values investigated in previous studies, she selected eight values deemed to be consistent with the definition; however, there seemed to be no explanation as to how they met the criteria of the

¹Kohlmann, op. cit.

²Kluckhohn, op. cit., p. 395.

definition. Behavioral descriptions of homemakers, believed to reflect the eight values, were developed from professional and non-professional literature, from talking to professionals who worked with homemakers, and from actual observations of homemakers. Each descriptive item was directed toward one of the values included in the study. Four judges sorted the items according to the values believed to be represented and discarded ones on which three of the four judges failed to agree, thus insuring a greater degree of validity.

Social acceptability of items was controlled by having graduate students rate the items on a five-point scale, after which items were paired so that each value was paired an equal number of times with each other value and that the two items in a pair had as nearly equal social acceptability as possible. Although the number of values investigated was limited, an effort was made to have as many phases of the homemaker's behavior related to each value as possible in the eighty-four paired items.

To this researcher it seems that the directions given in the introduction to the paired statements would not assure value responses in keeping with the chosen definition. The questionnaire asks, "Which of these two statements most nearly describes what you actually do or would do if you had the opportunity?" Thus an expression of preference is given, rather than of the "preferable" or "desirable," as Kluckhohn's definition specifies. Kohlmann's thesis contains an excellent and extensive review of literature.

Family's Values

Studies of family values include five in which parents and one or more of their children of varying ages were respondents and two studies with teen-age respondents.

One of the first research studies to investigate similarity of values among family members was conducted by Fisher.¹ Questionnaires were answered by college students in the classroom and then students were asked to take copies for their parents to answer on a voluntary basis. Relatively few parents returned completed questionnaires, so only about half of the men and women students had data from both parents. No family represented had children of both sexes.

Both the terms value and attitude were used and distinguished thus by Fisher:

The words attitude and value will be used merely to designate the two different sets of data from the two inventories used [Watson Survey of Public Opinion and Allport-Vernon 'Study of Values']. . . . The use of the two terms does not reflect a contention on my part that fundamentally different neuropsychic entities are involved. If any distinction is to be made, the term value might be taken to refer to the more generalized trait, or the neuropsychic organization itself, while the term attitude would refer to the positive or negative motor (or 'mental') orientation toward objects or events of the class with which the organization is concerned. Values could not be observed directly; they would of necessity be reconstructed

¹Sara C. Fisher, Relationships in Attitudes, Opinions, and Values Among Family Members, University of California Publication in Culture and Society, II (1948), 29-100.

from observed attitudes and choices.¹

However, the findings from the Allport-Vernon "Study of Values" test seem most pertinent to review in relation to the present study. Scores represented measures of relative strength of six types of values: theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious. Differences in values by sex were about equal in magnitude to differences by age. Mothers and daughters exceeded fathers and sons in aesthetic, social, and religious values, while the men exceeded the women in theoretical, economic, and political values. With religious values, sex differences surpassed age differences. With respect to correlations, of the five relationship pairs (father-mother, father-son, mother-son, father-daughter, mother-daughter), mothers and daughters showed the highest degree of correspondence. Son-mother resemblance was lowest. Daughters resembled both parents more than sons did, and at the same time sons resembled fathers slightly more than they did mothers.

Although the Allport-Vernon test measures consistently expressed preferences which may or may not be convictions of the preferable, it contributes valuable information about the resemblance of preference behavior among family members.

Few value studies have included all members of the

¹Ibid., pp. 31, 33.

family as respondents. A study by Cutler¹ included all children over ten years of age as well as other persons living in the household from three social prestige levels varying in composition from those with single women to those with parents and one to ten children. Her aims were to develop a self-teaching home values test which would aid in discovering and thinking through the values of functional importance to the individual in choice of a home. Definition of a home value was, "a condition of the home which offers an individual or a family maximum enhancement of home life." The ten values which she selected for use in her research included beauty, comfort, convenience, location, health, personal interests, privacy, safety, friendship, activities, and economy.

These were described as if each were an isolated entity in order to facilitate comparison of that value with every other value. Comparison was made of: (1) "first thought" rank order placement of the ten values, called verbalized values for convenience; and (2) rank order placement of the values resulting from preferences in paired comparisons, called functional values.

The family met together as a unit and in the presence of the researcher each person aged 10 years or over worked independently in completing a copy of the home

¹Virginia F. Cutler, Personal and Family Values in the Choice of a Home, Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 840 (Ithaca, New York, November, 1947).

values test. Questions and comments were encouraged.

The wives had the highest correlation between verbalized and functional values; the lowest correlation was in the group 12 years and under. Husbands, teen-agers, and the group as a whole had middle-range correlations. Cutler suggests that differences would be expected at different levels of maturity.

Due to the heterogeneity of the family compositions, the comparison of values seems to be between husbands, wives, and children of dissimilar ages grouped by sex or age but not related to their own families.

However, the family ties were maintained in the value pattern profiles Cutler made for each family, showing the relative importance of the separate values of an individual and the position of each of his values in relation to those of the other members of his family. She found that family members were more likely to agree on the most important and on the least important values than on the ones in between. She believes this test is sensitive to individual differences and identifies each member by role.

The family groups compared were husbands and wives, fathers and children, and mothers and children in each of the social classes. The correlations between verbalized and functional values for the husbands and wives were .36, .38, and .55 from the upper class to the lower class. For the fathers and children they were .11, .35, and .31 for

upper, middle and lower classes respectively. And for the mothers and children the correlations were .39, .42, and .37. Other comparisons were made between those with the same role but in different classes and between nonkinship groups.

Conner, Greene and Walters¹ sought to find the extent of agreement among family members on conceptions of "good" parent and child roles. If "good" is equivalent to "desirable," then their research can be considered a value study. Respondents were tenth grade high school students and both parents of these students. Each subject was asked to choose five statements from a set of 10 for each of three categories, describing the "good" father, mother, and child. The set of 10 statements were derived from replies of college women and their parents to an open-end questionnaire asking, "What are five things a good mother (father, child) does?" Each family member's conception of a good mother, a good father, and a good child was classified as traditional, intermediate, or developmental, using Duval's designation of traditional if it was "what used to be expected" or was rigidly conceived, and developmental if it emphasized growth and development rather than specific behavioral conformities. These classifications have points in common with the traditional and

¹Ruth Conner, Helen F. Greene, and James Walters, "Agreement of Family Member Conceptions of 'Good' Parent and Child Roles," Social Forces, XXXVI (1958), pp. 353-358.

autonomous value types (see pp. 50-51) in the present study.

Their findings supported observations in clinical experience, that: (a) members of the same family have different conceptions of what constitutes "good mother," "good father," and "good child," roles, (b) greater agreement exists between the conceptions of husbands and wives than between fathers and their children, and (c) greater agreement exists between conceptions of mothers and their children than between fathers and their children. The authors state that the data fail to support an earlier observation that women tend to be more developmentally oriented than men.

Values of other family members as well as the homemaker were sought in Kohn's study¹ in which father, mother and fifth grade child were interviewed. Unfortunately, data concerning the child do not appear in the report. Kohn selected Kluckhohn's value definition² as a basis. A card listing 17 characteristics of a child considered highly desirable by other parents was offered the respondents. They were asked to choose those few which they considered most important for a child of a given age. The characteristics selected are interpreted by the researcher as indicating values of the person selecting them. The

¹Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (January, 1959), pp. 337-351.

²Kluckhohn, op. cit., p. 395.

father's values were similar to those of the mothers, with few exceptions. Kohn plausibly says that limiting the respondents' choice to particular characteristics denied them the opportunity to select others they might consider more desirable. In answer to the question of whether it is wise to accept the parent's assertion of a value, he says that if we can ascertain that parents act in reasonable conformity to the values they assert, we gain confidence in assertions as indicators of values. However, his research did not presume to test this hypothesis.

Motz¹ devised a role conception inventory as a tool for research in social psychology. Her study focused on the way married student couples conceived husband and wife roles. It has bearing on value research because the statements in the instrument were intended to be presented in such a form as to permit judgment of value rather than fact. She says that persons with decidedly different conceptions may agree on statements of fact whereas they probably would not agree on desirables. The statements were developed from preliminary interviewing with an open-ended questionnaire and participant observation. All but six of the 24 statements had "should" as a key word. Without the "should," the remaining six might elicit responses

¹Anabelle B. Motz, "The Role Conception Inventory: A Tool for Research in Social Psychology," American Sociological Review, XVII (August, 1952), pp. 465-471.

indicative of mere preference or desire rather than of the desirable, or values as defined in the present study. This distinction, important to the present study, is not always made by value researchers and theorists. However, if values are "conceptions of the desirable which influence action" and normative standards by which choices are evaluated, inclusion of the words "should" and "ought" will make more certain that statements will elicit value-laden material.

Motz used an inventory rather than a scale to study contradictory or confused role conceptions which could hardly be ascertained were scalability the aim. The respondents' conceptions of role were limited to the statements presented. Scoring indicated the relationship of numbers of statements indicating belief in companionship husband-wife roles to numbers of statements indicating traditional husband-wife roles. Further differentiation was made between the public (applying to all husbands and wives) and the personal (applying to responding pair only) conceptions of role. These classifications were empirically devised. This Role Conception Inventory seems adaptable into a useful tool for value research.

Teen-agers responded to questions about their family life to provide data for a study by Slocum and Stone¹ to develop a method for use in evaluating the extent of

¹W. L. Slocum and Carol L. Stone, "A Method for Measuring Family Images Held by Teen-Agers," Marriage and Family Living, XXI (August, 1959), pp. 245-250.

the influence of selected family values, standards, and interaction patterns upon the attitudes and conduct of teenagers.

In construction of an instrument for measuring family images held by teenagers, statements were assembled relevant to four aspects of family life: (1) the extent to which democracy is used in the family, (2) the extent of cooperation in the home, (3) the fairness of discipline in the home, and (4) the degree of affection existing in the family. Then judges evaluated the classification of items into the four categories. But it is the next step, intended to ascertain the acceptability ratings of the statements used in the test, that seems to ascertain values as well and is therefore pertinent to value research as defined in this study. The directions given to a cooperating eighth grade group were:

The following is a list of items which describes various traits of family life. We are asking for your help in finding out how desirable or undesirable you think each of these traits is for a wholesome American family. Please rate each item according to the following scale:

1. Very desirable
2. Somewhat desirable
3. Somewhat undesirable
4. Very undesirable¹

The items so rated were used in a questionnaire from which students chose the statements which described their families as they saw them, resulting in the family

¹Ibid., pp. 246, 247.

image held by the teen-ager. Comparison of these findings with a delinquent behavior scale showed a relationship between the images which teen-agers have of their families as reference groups and conduct. Had they compared with what they felt a family "should" be, the findings no doubt would be values comprised in the family image.

A Puerto Rican study¹ focused upon three themes to explore the question: "To what extent have the family values of Puerto Rico changed from values like those of other Latin Americans to more Americanized values?" A Mexican study by Diaz Guerrero² represented the Latin American values. Values were stated rather than defined. By American values, the authors meant emphasis upon commercial and economic pursuits, increased competitive individualism, more equalitarian relationships between the sexes, and espousal of political and social democracy.

According to Diaz Guerrero, family values in Mexico were based upon:

The unquestioned and absolute supremacy of the father and the necessary and absolute self-sacrifice of the mother . . . these two fundamental propositions in the family derive from the general

¹Ramon Fernandez-Marina, Eduardo D. Maldonado-Sierra, and Richard D. Trent, "Three Basic Themes in Mexican and Puerto Rican Family Values," The Journal of Social Psychology, XLVIII (1958), pp. 167-181.

²Rogelio Diaz Guerrero, "Neurosis and the Mexican Family Structure," American Journal of Psychiatry, CXII (1955).

existential value orientations, or better, generalized sociocultural assumptions which imply an undubitable, biological and natural superiority of the male.¹

Data were collected from a sample of Puerto Rican teen-agers, all of whom were unmarried freshmen at the University of Puerto Rico.

The three primary themes selected for study included: (1) family affectional patterns, (2) family authority patterns and (3) the differential evaluation of the status of the sexes. The latter two may have points in common with two themes in the present study, control of child's behavior, and social organization.

The ten open-end questions used in the Mexican study were adapted and extended to 123 declarative sentences to be answered by yes or no. There was some confusion both in the questionnaire and in the discussion between what "is" and what "ought to be." Only part of the questions and statements seemed to be couched in the value language of "should" and "ought" so there is some question as to whether this instrument consistently elicits values as defined in the present study.

The researchers suggest that differences in findings between the two studies may be due to dissimilar samples rather than real differences in belief. This might be amended to say that real differences in belief may exist

¹Ibid., p. 411.

but between the samples rather than the countries. Possibly differences were also due to difficulty in accurately comparing the results of the two instruments.

However, they found that Puerto Ricans still tended to hold the concept of male superiority and male dominance. Also, there seemed to be a clash between mainland American and Latinized family values in Puerto Rico, and a trend toward more Americanization of beliefs. Fewer Puerto Ricans than Mexicans agreed with the statement that the place of women is in the home; but over two-thirds said that men should "wear the pants in the family." Even so, there seemed to be a trend toward believing the family should be more democratic. In the area of children's control, Puerto Ricans did not agree that strict parents made good children, yet more than half said children should be obedient to their parents.

Other Related Research

A long list of preference studies could be cited. But since people often prefer what is preferable and desire what is desirable, the distinction between the two is not always made and both are sometimes labeled value studies. However, the distinction is necessary in the definition of values accepted for this study. An important part of the definition is its focus on conceptions of the desirable that affect an individual's choices. Smith¹ speaks of the

¹Smith, "Personal Values in the Study of Lives," op. cit., p. 332.

"objective" requiredness of the desirable (ought) as compared with the merely desired (want).

Morris and Jones' cross-cultural study appears to gather preference data. They did use value language of "should" and "ought" in describing the "Ways to Live" which, as they said, "represent conceptions of the desirable life as embodied in the main religious and ethical traditions." However, their directions call for an expression of preference. They instruct:

Remember that it is not a question of what kind of life you now lead, or the kind of life you think it prudent to live in our society, or the kind of life you think good for other persons, but simply the kind of life you personally would like to live.¹

Value analysis of unstructured material is necessary in some value research. It serves to organize material elicited by a projective type test. Benner² used a special technique for this purpose. The analyzer expressed the values found in the response in phrases and sentences and then classified them under large headings, such as, family, education, occupation, money and saving, religious and moral issues, recreation, interpersonal relations, and other. To check the validity of the values expressed by the

¹Charles Morris and Lyle V. Jones, "Value Scales and Dimensions," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, LI (1955), pp. 523-535.

²Norma Benner, "The Development and Use of a Projective Type Test to Determine Values of Students from Varying Social Classes" (unpublished Master's thesis, School of Home Economics in the Graduate School, Southern Illinois University, 1963).

analyzer, a 5 percent random sample of the value-analyses were submitted to a jury of three graduate students trained in the value analysis technique.

In order to compare values there must be some uniformity of expression. Heal's¹ research shows a reason for material being noncomparable. Heal asked students in two eleventh grade classes of two socio-economic groups to give their definitions of value and to list at least 10 specific values they considered most important as a guide in their daily living. Their definitions varied widely, falling into the following groupings: (1) stuff that the minister says is good, (2) what a man gets for his crops, (3) the labor union, and (4) important things in life. Although many of the same specific values were listed, the meaning and importance of these were not the same for the two groups. For example, faith ranked high in both groups but the lower socio-economic group was divided about equally between faith in a Higher Power and faith in a certain individual. In the other group faith meant faith in God. Categories for the replies were devised from the empirical data. One might question how the values could be compared since the value definitions of the individuals who gave them varied widely.

A study coherent in theory, definition of value,

¹Florence L. D. Heal, "Values in a Group of Lower Socio-Economic Students," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (November, 1960), pp. 370-372.

data collection and analysis was executed by Scott to assess the values of three different groups: adults in a university community, students in the university, and students in a minority sect religious college. Scott¹ used an open-end method of data collection because "it had the advantage of permitting expression of a limitless variety of values, so that the researcher can determine empirically just what standards of 'goodness' or 'rightness' are expressed voluntarily by members of a given population."² Thus it was an appropriate instrument to explore values defined as "an individual's concept of an ideal state of affairs or relations among people, which he uses to assess the 'goodness' or 'badness,' the 'rightness' or 'wrongness' of actual relations which he observes."³ Scott also called values an "abstract standard for judging concrete actions."

From categories of values developed from the first fifty interviews, a set of eighteen traits the subject admired in other people was selected and described to form a typology for coding data of this study. Reliability was assessed: (1) from the extent to which two different coders agreed in inferring a particular value from a response, and (2) by the degree to which respondents mentioned the

¹William A. Scott, "Empirical Assessment of Values and Ideologies," American Sociological Review, XXIV (June, 1959), pp. 299-310.

²Ibid., p. 301.

³Ibid., p. 301.

same value in two successive interviews. Scott used the typological method to categorize and simplify complex data.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND ITS CONCEPTUAL BASIS

In this chapter are definition of terms; selection of sample; collection of data including the instrument and its administration; and the analysis of data including the typology, coding and analytical procedures.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study and to be consistent with the first phase of the project, the terms were defined in this manner:

Values are conceptions of the desirable which affect an individual's choices among possible courses of action and refer to an individual's coded responses to the incomplete stories by position on the typology.

Story refers to one of the ten incomplete stories.

Type refers to one of the four large categories of the typology: traditional, social, autonomous, or change-prone.

Theme refers to the twelve subject matter content classes of the typology: two of which were general and coded from every story response and ten of which were specific and coded only where this content was evident in the story responses.

Typology refers to the descriptions of the forty-eight value positions organized by type and by theme constructed for analyzing the responses to the incomplete stories.

Composite value profile refers to the calculated symbolic representation of an individual's total values showing the proportionate strength of each type coded in the individual's responses. The details of calculation are explained on pages 47 and 48.

Family refers to the related husband, wife, and child respondents.

Role refers to husband, wife, son, or daughter. Although it is recognized that husbands and wives are also fathers and mothers to their sons and daughters, for simplicity they are designated in one capacity only.

A value held in common or common value refers to a value coded identically for two or more family members from the story completion responses.

Selection of Sample

Rationale

For this exploratory study, a non-probability sample was used. The sample consisted of 51 families with husband, wife and children between the ages of 12 and 18, from an area in the vicinity of Lansing. The prevalence of well-educated, professional people in this area increased the probability that they would be especially able to express their thoughts in writing. The lower age limit for

the children was 12, an age at which it seems reasonable to expect ability to complete a written response and to be concerned with the decision situations presented. Eighteen was the upper age limit, to ensure that the child still would be an intact member of the family group.

Choice of a community with similar socio-economic levels and limiting the age range of the child respondents decreased the number of variables, thus increasing the homogeneity of the sample.

Criteria

The sample chosen met these specifications: (1) that the families be unbroken, that is, both parents living at home, (2) that each family include one or more children between the ages of 12 and 18, (3) that families be willing to cooperate with the study and able to be at home together to respond at the same time, (4) that at least 50 families complete responses. In addition, an attempt was made to have approximately the same number of children of each age and sex.

Mechanics

The school principal in the selected area allowed use of the school records to obtain names, addresses and telephone numbers of parents and the birth dates of children in grades seven to twelve which included both junior and senior high school. Care was taken to have boys and girls of each age from 12 to 18 represented about equally.

Other than meeting the criteria for the sample, the names were taken in alphabetical order from each grade, starting at the beginning of the alphabet for two grades, at the end for two and in the middle for two. For the twelfth grade, it was necessary to take all the 18-year-old boys to have a margin for refusals. One hundred fifty names were drawn to ensure responses from at least 50 families.

Names were arranged according to the age and sex of the child, rather than by grade, making 14 categories. Beginning with the first names on the lists, the families were contacted by telephone in order to explain the study and make an appointment for an interview with those families agreeing to cooperate. As different ages of sons or daughters were needed to balance the number in each category, they were called in the order they appeared on the list.

Ninety-two of the 150 families were called before 51 agreed to participate. In the 51 families were 24 sons and 27 daughters from the names drawn from the school records. In addition, in these same families, there were 21 more sons and 19 more daughters in the specified age range, bringing the total sample of children to 45 sons and 46 daughters. Because of selectivity, the ages and sexes were fairly evenly divided with not less than six nor more than eight in each age and sex. Together with the 51 wives and 51 husbands, a total of 193 respondents resulted.

Collection of Data

The Incomplete Stories

Data were collected by presenting to the respondents a set of 10 incomplete stories, each of which described a family situation requiring decision-making. The respondents were directed to write completions to the stories, including in them their own conceptions of what should be done and why. The stories were devised by Engebretson¹ to meet these criteria: (1) the decisions concern the whole family, (2) the decisions be major ones which most families might face, (3) the situations be meaningful to the respondents, and (4) the decisions require deliberation. And further, variables were reduced by constructing the stories about a single hypothetical family as it progresses through stages of its life cycle. The stories may be found in the Appendix.

Inasmuch as values are conceptions and are not directly observable, they must be expressed before they can be identified by a researcher. Also, an effort must be made to get an expression of implicit as well as explicit values. The incomplete stories are a projective instrument encouraging the respondents to judge the decision situations and express their beliefs about desirable courses of action. When they appear in writing they are not always explicit; the researcher must often infer values from their symbolic expressions. Goldschmidt and Edgerton support the inference

¹Engebretson, op. cit.

of values from symbols:

If expressions of behavior are considered symbolic, then that which they symbolize is considered present. The participant in a culture does not ordinarily make the decision between the symbol and reality.¹

Another research problem is to elicit values in such a manner that they may be classified and compared. Home management studies have attempted to elicit values by grouping questions around resources² and around reasons for activities.^{3,4}

Wheelwright and Eames point out the need for connection of values to the situation in which they occur, giving reason for centering research around common situations so that responses may be comparable:

To make values explicit is to give them a relatively abstract formulation; they still, however, derive concrete significance from their imagined exemplifications. . . . Values cannot be reduced to a common denominator. . . . Family happiness . . . in spite of the identical words by which our linguistic poverty forces us to describe it, does not always mean the same thing. Family happiness may mean any number of things; so may success, and honor--although these different meanings have, of course, an intelligible bond of unity . . . the

¹Walter Goldschmidt and Tobert B. Edgerton, "A Picture Technique for the Study of Values," American Anthropology, LXIII (February, 1961), p. 26.

²Pamelia Lott Millar, "A Pilot Study of Patterns in Home Management over a Period of Three Generations in a Selected Group of Families" (unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Home Management and Child Development, Michigan State University, 1959).

³Dyer, op. cit.

⁴Ketchum, op. cit.

abstract values that serve as the logical ground of the comparison are continuous with, and interactive with, the concrete particulars that serve as its starting point.¹

The connection of an event to its conditions and consequences is important in all fields of scientific study, including the field of value.²

Closely connected with controlling the research situation so that comparable results may be obtained is the danger of limiting the responses. Scott suggests a solution:

. . . an open-question measure . . . has the advantage of permitting expression of a limitless variety of values, so that the researcher can determine empirically just what standards of "goodness" or "rightness" are expressed voluntarily by members of any given population.³

The wide range of responses to a uniform situation may then be categorized for analysis and later may serve as a basis for formulation of a more concise type of questionnaire which would be easier to administer, suitable to a more varied group of respondents, and more quickly analyzed for larger samples.

The incomplete stories served as a projective device allowing freedom to express a quantity and range of values, but they did not presume to elicit the entire value system. By providing uniform stimuli they were expected

¹Philip Wheelwright, A Critical Introduction to Ethics, Third Edition (New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1959), p. 8.

²Eames, op. cit., p. 325.

³Scott, op. cit., p. 301.

to cover similar parts of the respondents' value systems and to elicit values in such a manner that they could be classified and compared. By connecting the responses to real situations, values operating in daily life are more apt to be expressed.

Care must be taken in value research to elicit responses indicating the "desirable" and not merely the "desired." Concern is with the desirable as each individual or group of individuals see it for themselves. This is more than what they desire, an expedient or emotive want; it is a more general class serving as a criterion or standard which includes cognitive as well as emotive aspects and by which desires may be measured and inhibited or promoted. Therefore, the questions at the end of each story, "What should be done?" and "Why?" were included to lead the respondent to express his conceptions of the desirable rather than what he or his family have done or felt would be possible in the situation.

The story completions were used by Engebretson¹ with homemakers. She attempted to test the reliability of the stories as a device to elicit values by asking some of the same homemakers to complete the same stories a few months after the first test. Depth interviews were conducted with a part of the sample in an effort to test validity. She judged that validity and reliability were

¹Engebretson, op. cit.

satisfactory for an exploratory study of this type. The present study should provide a further test.

Collection Procedure

After making a telephone appointment for a time when the family, including the husband, wife and children between the ages of 12 and 18 could be at home at the same time, the researcher visited each home to administer the incomplete stories. Following an introduction and explanation of procedure, the family members separately, but simultaneously, wrote completions to the stories. The 10 mimeographed stories were placed two on a page with equal space for completing each story. Family members chose where they wished to sit to write their responses, e.g., around the dining room table, on the floor next to a coffee table, in an easy chair, etc. Either the husband or the wife, whoever finished writing first, filled out a separate form about family demographic data (Appendix, p. 131).

The stories took about 45 minutes to complete. From one to three interviews were scheduled per day at any time of day convenient to the family. Two per day was the goal, until a total of 51 families was interviewed. Data collection lasted from January 30 to March 18, 1964. The childrens' after-school activities and the parents' away-from-home activities in the evening limited the choice of days and influenced the ease of scheduling interviews.

In nearly all cases, the wife in the family made the interview appointment. Some wives were able to make

the appointment at the time of the first telephone call but the majority had to consult their families before they could be certain of a time when all members of the family could be together for the time required.

Conditions for collecting the data were standardized by these provisions: (1) the same researcher visited all the families, (2) the families all responded to the same set of stimuli, and (3) the researcher made appointments and presented the story completion instrument according to a planned form. Most of the families seemed interested in the decision-making situations in the stories and many of them wished to discuss the situations and their own responses after completing them.

Analysis of Data

The Constructed Typology

The unstructured data from the incomplete stories were organized and analyzed by means of a typology constructed by Engebretson.¹ According to Doby,² a constructed typology "is a purposive planned selection, abstraction, combination and accentuation of a set of criteria that have empirical referents and that serve as a basis for comparison of empirical cases." Constructed types are analytical tools. Becker describes the evolution of a constructed

¹Engebretson, op. cit.

²John T. Doby (ed.), An Introduction to Social Research (Harrisburg: The Stackpole Company, 1954), p. 10.

typology:

The process begins with a vaguely defined problem, the framing of a hypothesis, selective observation (and all observation is selective in some sense) with reference to it, and eventual construction of a type, or a battery of them, that aids in further research.¹

Engebretson hypothesized that an individual's values are organized in a system which will correspond generally to one of four types: traditional, social, autonomous, or change-prone.² She developed her typology by working back and forth from empirical data to relevant theory stemming mainly from Becker³ and Diesing.⁴ She noted that the four organizing principles from Becker (interpreted from Thomas and others) of man's search for: (1) security, (2) response, (3) recognition, and (4) new experience were similar in design to Diesing's orders of decision and their underlying principles. From these she constructed the traditional type around productivity and security; the social type around shared experience and response; the autonomous type around economic concerns, recognition and achievement; and the change-prone type around new experience and play.

¹Howard Becker, Through Values to Social Interpretation (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1950).

²Engebretson, op. cit., p. 8.

³Becker, op. cit., pp. 3-92.

⁴Paul Diesing, Reason in Society: Five Types of Decisions and their Social Consequences (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1962).

Values comprising these types were developed for a set of family themes common to the four types, by specifying the distinguishing values for each type and theme.

The typology includes two general themes and ten specific themes. The general themes, form of response and emphasis, characterize the structure and content of the responses. Form of response refers to kinds of "ought" or "should" statements (logical, prudential, categorical), the range of alternatives considered, the universals present, and the relation of means to ends. More detailed explanations of logical, prudential, and categorical statements as well as of means, modes, and ends, as developed by Engebretson, appear on pages 54-55. Each of the value types has its characteristic description of conceptions of the desirable for emphasis. In the traditional type, production, duty, rights and responsibilities, and security are seen as being desirable. In the social type, affection, love, solidarity, and loyalty are of prime importance. The autonomous type emphasizes growth and development, fairness, impartiality, and responsible inner-direction. The change-prone type includes conceptions that means, modes, and ends should be new and novel, with little thought to the consequences.

The other ten themes are specifically related to the decision situations presented in the instrument and were developed from empirical data at the pretest stage in Phase I of the project. These themes are: focus of

functional order, concerning the focus around which the household and its activities ought to be centered; scope of wife's time activities, i.e., what her activities ought to include; social organization, the roles of the family members and their place in the organization of the family including their power structure; kinship, the ties with the nuclear and the extended family; division of work, how work should be divided; material possessions, specifically the house, car or furnishings: what should be the belief about possessions, their purpose, use, and care; mobility, should a move be made or not and why; control of child's behavior, what should be expected in kinds and results of control; mode of child's control, how should they be controlled; and last, control of adult son, what is desirable as to method and amount of control. Each of the themes above was developed for each of the four types. The typology appears on pages 50-53 in its entirety.

The constructed types discussed by Becker¹ and by Diesing² concerned large social issues. The types used here are limited to values in family situations and are related to a limited number of themes; nevertheless, they are sufficiently general to be developed for other themes for other family choice situations or for other groups. The same types would be described further to be exemplified

¹Becker, op. cit.

²Diesing, op. cit.

in each added theme. Two themes, form of response and emphasis, are general enough to remain usable regardless of the group being studied. The specific themes and values are developed to be compatible with these two general themes.

Coding the Responses

A coding manual was written for use in both phases of the project. A sample page is included in the Appendix, page 137. Three coders, two Ph.D. candidates in home management and a research technician, were trained. They were each provided with explanations of terms including three types of 'ought' or 'should' statements and modes, means and ends (pages 54-55); a copy of the typology; and examples of actual responses fitting most of the forty-eight value positions of the typology. After trial sessions which continued until agreement between coders was consistently high, the three coders working in teams of two began the final coding. The same coding procedures and coders were used in Phases I and II.

The two general themes, form of response and emphasis, were coded by type from each of the ten stories. The 10 specific themes were coded by type from any story completion in which they were found. Analyses by theme, type, and story were made possible by including the coded story source with the type in each theme.

Analytical Procedure

The respondents' coded values were tabulated by

theme, by story, and by family role. Also, composite value profiles were developed for individuals. In addition, common values in the family were explored.

Since the values coded from the families did not, nor were expected to fall into pure types when analyzed by means of the constructed typology, a composite value profile was devised to indicate value types coded for each individual and the relative amounts of each type.

First, the percentage of each type of value was calculated from the tabulated values for each individual. Then an individual's composite value profile was constructed from the percentages using these rules for symbolization:

1. Each type is represented by the letter with which it begins (e.g., traditional, 'T' or 't').
2. A capital letter underlined represents 100 percent of a type or 100 percent minus a trace (less than 5 percent) of some other type (e.g., 'A').
3. A capital letter or letters represent the predominant type or equally large types (e.g., 'T' or 'TA').
4. A lower case letter underlined indicates that this type is half or more of the predominant type (e.g., 'At,' 'Ta').
5. Lower case letters represent all remaining types (e.g., 't').
6. Letters are arranged in order of strength of

type (e.g., 'Ts,' 'Atsc').

Using these rules, an individual with 50 percent traditional values, 35 percent autonomous values, and 15 percent social values would have the value profile: 'Tas.'

The composite value profiles were arranged on a continuum of seven categories from most traditional to most autonomous:

T Ta,Tas Ta,Tas TA At,Ats At,Ats A

Although few, the social values were included in the groupings, but the very few change-prone values were omitted.

The composite value profiles of each member of a family were placed on the continuum with those of his own family showing graphically the positions of the individual in his family and the proportionate amount of each type for each person.

Comparisons between husbands' and wives' composite value profiles were made by cross tabulations so that the data concerning the members of the same family were always related. This was also done for husband and sons, wives and sons, husbands and daughters, and wives and daughters.

The composite value profiles were used also to compare value positions with variables of education, occupation, income, and age.

A value was considered to be held in common if coded identically for two or more respondents. Since some themes were consistently coded from more than one story and the values coded were sometimes different for the two or more

sources, possibility exists that more themes or variations of the present themes were being discovered. For example, values concerning scope of wife's time alternatives may be different when there is a baby in the family than when the children are older. For this reason, coding was considered identical if two or more members of a family had the same value position on the same theme and story. First, the values common to entire families were analyzed by theme and story. Then, values common to husband and wife, husband and son, husband and daughter, wife and son, wife and daughter, and to the entire family were recorded. These were counted and percentages computed on the total values of individuals in each role and on the total values of all the individuals in each role.

And last, the value patterns of the ten families with one son and one daughter were analyzed. Because of the identical composition of these families, working with this group seemed especially worthwhile. To accomplish this, percentages of the values held in common by combinations of two, three and all four of the family members were compared.

VALUE TYPOLOGY

| Themes | Value Positions or Types | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| General | Traditional | Social |
| Values | | |
| 1. Form of response | categorical ends (means and modes elevated to ends), many universals with few alternatives | one categorical end with the range of alternatives limited to means of attaining it |
| 2. Emphasis | production, duty, rights and responsibilities, security, other-directed | affection, love, solidarity, loyalty, inner-other directed |
| Specific | | |
| 1. Focus of functional order | work--household tasks and physical care of family members | affectional relationships, unexpressed meanings and feelings |
| 2. Scope of wife's time alternatives | work of the home | activities which foster family togetherness, family members come before household tasks |
| 3. Social organization | hierarchical roles; e.g., father is head of the family, mother is next in authority, children subordinate | each member considered equal, individuality taken into account |
| 4. Kinship | duty and responsibility ties within nuclear and extended family | warm, close relationships within nuclear family and near relatives |

| Value Positions or Types | |
|--|--|
| Autonomous | Change-prone |
| Values | |
| logical, prudential or categorical means to logical, prudential or categorical ends (loose structure tied to multiple ends), many alternatives restricted by some universals | fusion of means and ends (impulse to change), alternatives restricted by few universals; e.g., action statements |
| growth and development, fairness, impartiality, responsible inner direction | the new and the novel, little thought to consequences, inner direction |
| control, discussion, equal opportunity, responsible self-guidance | individual expression |
| work or other activity outside the home allowed if home responsibilities are cared for | any combination of time use possible--particularly something new and different |
| parents as partners, family council with maturer children taking part | no set structure, that structure prevails which suits the mood or situation |
| continuity and harmony taken for granted in nuclear family; parents may, at times, do things together apart from the children | limited involvement with kin, individuals often go their separate ways |

| Specific | Traditional | Social |
|--|---|--|
| 5. Division of work | husband is economic provider, wife is responsible for work of the home, family and work roles learned by apprentice-like experience | informal division of responsibilities, cooperation and reciprocity important, 'help each other out' attitude fostered |
| 6. Material possessions: house, car or furnishings | attached to possessions (possessions give security), people take care of 'things,' quality and appearance to others considered | possessions secondary to people, children permitted to use the furniture, possessions are for the enjoyment and satisfaction of the family members |
| 7. Mobility | move from known locality and family feared | move is all right if it fosters family solidarity or if family decides together to move |
| 8. Control of child's behavior | parents exact obedience from their children, embarrassing consequences often considered | child taught those rules which enable him to get along with others |
| 9. Mode of child's control | shaming, stern reprimands, or physical punishment; e.g., spanking | discipline the child by removing him from the company of others; e.g., ignore him or put him in a room alone |
| 10. Control of adult son | either exact obedience or no control; e.g., either make son finish school before marrying or uninvolved in it | emotionally supportive; e.g., encourage or assist to marry if he is in love |

| Autonomous | Change-prone |
|--|---|
| planned division of labor to make fair distribution according to the needs of family members, some techniques advocated; e.g., schedules | little integration of responsibilities, specialties may be emphasized, extreme division of labor may on occasion be used |
| possessions are regarded as tools to help family attain growth and development purposes in addition to enjoyment and satisfaction; many plans and alternatives seen for use, acquisition and replacement | new and different possessions are prized but little attachment to 'things' as such; e.g., a house is thought of as something that can be easily acquired, sold or exchanged |
| pros and cons considered, move considered favorable for growth experience of family members particularly if husband is promoted | move considered highly desirable for the newness and variety it involves--in people as well as situations |
| appropriate correction made for specific misdeeds, child taught to be self-regulating and responsible, parents try to understand child | child allowed to express himself; consequently, he has little correction |
| discipline according to the act, reason with; e.g., discuss the 'why' or remove a privilege | no punishment or maybe according to the mood; e.g., a parental emotional outburst |
| counsel with him to be sure he has considered consequences and responsibilities | support him in and encourage him to enter new situations, family welcomes new members |

Definitions: Mode, Means, and Ends

Mode - Values referring to ways of acting, manner of carrying out an action itself whether it be conceived as a means or as an end; style in which an instrument is used; an approved or preferred style or manner in which an act is to be carried out or an object made.

Means - Values referring to instrumental character of what is desirable; that which is done for the sake of something else and not for itself alone; an instrument for the shaping of something else.

Ends - Values referring to what is done for itself and not for the sake of something else; aims and virtues which societies and individuals make for themselves; intrinsicness.

Moral, prudential and logical 'ought' or 'should' statements

Wheelwright divided 'ought' or 'should' statements into three categories--moral, prudential, and logical.¹ Since the respondents will be asked "what should be done," analyzing the responses according to these distinctions will be possible. Such an analysis would help place the responses according to type. Explanations of the distinctions follow:

Moral - Moral statements refer to human conduct and express a categorical imperative which is unconditional. "A homemaker should stay home and take care of the baby" is an unconditional categorical imperative. Numerous categorical statements about the modes, means and ends of action would indicate the traditional type because this type emphasizes stability and adherence to prescription. A few categorical statements interspersed with others would indicate the autonomous type which emphasizes a loose structure tied to some unchanging ends. The recurrence of the one imperative about the mode of solving a family problem, "Do what the family together decides they want to do," would indicate the social type which emphasizes the persons of the family. Or the occurrence of the imperative, "Do what is different" would indicate the change-prone type which emphasizes the novel.

¹Wheelwright, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

Prudential - Prudential statements also refer to human conduct but are not unconditional--they are conditional upon a wish. A generalized example is "If you want to . . . Then you ought to do" The end is not prescribed. But given an end, then the steps to reach it follow in order. Since these statements are not imperatives and allow openness in the solution of problems and the selection of ends, they would indicate the autonomous type.

Logical - Logical 'ought' statements do not refer to human conduct and are not imperative. Since the decision stories were constructed around what the family should do, the responses will likely include few of this category. If they do occur, however, they would further indicate the autonomous type.

CHAPTER IV

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

In this chapter the families are described as to family composition, age of the family members, occupation of the husbands and of the wives before and after marriage, and education of the husbands, wives, sons and daughters. In addition, a summary of the reasons for the non-participation of contacted families is included.

Size and Composition of the Families

Fifty-one families comprised of the two parents and the children between the ages of 12 and 18 participated in this study. In all, 193 individuals responded.

In these families the 45 sons and 46 daughters were nearly equally distributed in each of the ages from 12 to 18, but irregularly as to number and sex per family (Table 4.1). This meant that some families had no daughters and some no sons. Only the 10 families with one son and one daughter had the sexes equally represented. Three-fourths of the child respondents came from families with totals of two, three, and four children.

The parents' ages ranged from the early 30's to the late 50's (Table 4.2). The largest number of both husbands and wives were in the 40-50 age class. As a group,

Table 4.1. Composition of families by size and role

| Size of family ^a | Sons per family | Daughters per family | Number of families | Total sons | Total daughters |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 3 | 1 | | 7 | 7 | |
| 3 | | 1 | 15 | | 15 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 4 | 2 | | 5 | 10 | |
| 4 | | 2 | 5 | | 10 |
| 5 | 3 | | 2 | 6 | |
| 5 | | 3 | 1 | | 3 |
| 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 |
| Total | | | 51 | 45 | 46 |

^aBy criteria of participation, both parents are included.

Table 4.2. Ages of husbands and wives

| Age classes | Husbands | | Wives | |
|-------------|----------|-----|-------|-----|
| | N | % | N | % |
| 30-34 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 35-39 | 7 | 14 | 11 | 22 |
| 40-44 | 16 | 31 | 16 | 31 |
| 45-49 | 13 | 25 | 16 | 31 |
| 50-54 | 11 | 22 | 6 | 12 |
| 55-59 | 3 | 6 | .. | .. |
| Total | 51 | 100 | 51 | 100 |

the husbands were older than the wives.

Occupation of Husbands and Family Income

This sample drew heavily from upper middle class levels of occupation, income and education. No attempt was made to secure a sample representative of a given population. Rather, a homogeneous sample of similar socioeconomic levels, well able to express their thoughts in writing, was deliberately chosen.

The majority of the husbands were occupied professionally or in managerial capacities (Table 4.3). The remainder were skilled workers or in clerical and sales occupations. Almost all of the professionally employed, three-fourths of the skilled workers and a few of those in clerical and sales occupations had family incomes over \$10,000, together comprising 76 percent of the families. Only four family incomes were under \$7,000.

Occupation of Wives Before and After Marriage

At the time of the study, 69 percent of the wives had no gainful occupation (Table 4.4). Of the remainder, over one-third worked in professional occupations, mostly as teachers. The wives with clerical and sales occupations were stenographers and secretaries and those in service occupations, beauticians and practical nurses.

Before marriage 80 percent of the wives were employed, one-third professionally in occupations such as medical technician, social worker, editor, registered nurse,

Table 4.3. Gainful occupations of husbands

| Occupational classes | Number | Percentage |
|-----------------------------|--------|------------|
| Professional and managerial | 39 | 76 |
| Clerical and sales | 4 | 8 |
| Skilled | 8 | 16 |
| Totals | 51 | 100 |

Table 4.4. Gainful occupations of wives before and after marriage

| Occupational classes | Before | | After | |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----|-------|-----|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Professional and managerial | 16 | 31 | 6 | 11 |
| Clerical and sales | 20 | 39 | 7 | 14 |
| Service | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 |
| Skilled | 1 | 2 | .. | .. |
| No gainful occupation | 8 | 16 | 35 | 69 |
| No response | 2 | 4 | .. | .. |
| Total | 51 | 100 | 51 | 100 |

and teacher and more than one-third in clerical and sales occupations. The remainder were in service or skilled occupations. Almost two-thirds of the wives who were employed before marriage stopped work afterward, whereas only two wives, previously not employed, began working after marriage.

Formal Education of Husbands, Wives, Sons, and Daughters

In this sample, the husbands and wives were more highly educated than would be true of the population in general. As a group, the husbands had more education than their wives, but ranging from completion of eighth grade to attainment of a doctor's degree (Table 4.5). Sixty-three percent of the husbands were college graduates. Of these, 18 percent held master's degrees and 14 percent doctor's degrees.

Of the wives, only one had less than a high school education, 39 percent were college graduates and 8 percent held master's degrees. For the sons and daughters the education ranged from eighth to twelfth grade, with the exception of a son and a daughter who were high school graduates.

Non-Respondents

Thirty-nine of the families contacted did not participate in the study (Table 4.6). In the interests of facilitating future studies, the reasons for refusal are given.

Although the wife often reported that other members of the family were too busy, she never said she herself

Table 4.5. Education of husbands and wives

| Educational class | Husbands | | Wives | |
|--------------------|----------|-----|-------|-----|
| | N | % | N | % |
| 8th-11th grade | 4 | 8 | 1 | 2 |
| H.S. graduate | 8 | 15 | 16 | 31 |
| 1-3 years' college | 7 | 14 | 14 | 28 |
| Bachelor's degree | 16 | 31 | 16 | 31 |
| Master's degree | 9 | 18 | 4 | 8 |
| Ph.D. degree | 7 | 14 | .. | .. |
| Total | 51 | 100 | 51 | 100 |

Table 4.6. Reasons given by non-respondents for refusal to cooperate in the study

| Reason | No. of families | |
|--|-----------------|--|
| Too busy | 12 | |
| Children | 3 | |
| Father | 5 | |
| Mother | - | |
| Whole family | 4 | |
| Can't get family together | 10 | |
| Don't want to be bothered or involved | 8 | |
| Have just helped with another research project | 1 | |
| Parents separated | 2 | |
| Illness | 4 | |
| Illiterate in English | 2 | |
| Total non-respondents | 39 | |

was too busy. The reason "can't get the family together" may have been closely related to "too busy," but often meant that the wife thought family members would have time but not simultaneously. The reason "don't want to be involved" may have included suspicion of the unknown, in addition to a statement that the husband "didn't take kindly to these things."

The marital status of two of the families had changed since information was supplied for the school records; hence they were ineligible for the study. Illiteracy was limited to two cases, but in a study with less educated respondents, more individuals would fall into this category. Therefore, another method of gathering data, or another form of the same method, would have to be devised.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

In analysis of data, counts were made of coded values by type, story, theme, role, age, education and occupation. Percentages were calculated and used to formulate composite value profiles according to the procedure shown on pages 47-48 and in accordance with the definition on page 34. These profiles were used to compare respondents by age, income, education and occupation of husband and wife, and by role in the family. Also, values shared by family members were tabulated and analyzed by story and theme, by paired roles and by patterns of common values in selected families.

Discussion of the findings is arranged by frequencies of the coded values by family role and type; composite value profile analysis; story analysis; theme analysis; and common value analysis.

Frequency of Coded Values by Role and Type

The number of values coded for each individual ranged from 23 to 34 with a mean of 29 (Table 5.1). Sons had the fewest values coded for them and wives the most. The means of the sons' coded values were 27 for the three youngest ages, 12 to 14, and 29 for the three oldest ages,

Table 5.1. Number of coded values per respondent by role

| Number of coded values per respondent | Frequency by role | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----|-------|-----|------|-----|-----------|-----|-------|-----|
| | Husbands | | Wives | | Sons | | Daughters | | Total | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 23-26 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 28 | 3 | 6 | 21 | 11 |
| 27-30 | 39 | 76 | 37 | 72 | 27 | 60 | 35 | 76 | 138 | 71 |
| 31-34 | 8 | 16 | 13 | 26 | 5 | 12 | 8 | 18 | 34 | 18 |
| Totals | 51 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 45 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 193 | 100 |

16 to 18. Frequency counts of values per person for husbands and wives by age, education, income and occupation showed little variation.

Further, the counts of values by type were tabulated by role. The counts of type by story and by theme including three categories of theme by role are discussed in the story and theme analyses.

Of the total coded values from the responses, 54 percent were autonomous and 42 percent traditional (Table 5.2). Only 4 percent were social and still fewer, less than 1 percent, were change-prone. Classifying the values by role and type showed the wives with twice as many autonomous as traditional, whereas the husbands', daughters', and sons' values were more equally divided between autonomous and traditional. Daughters and husbands had a few more autonomous than traditional values coded for them.

Table 5.2. Coded values by type and by role

| Type | Husbands | | Wives | | Sons | | Daughters | | Total | |
|--------------|----------|-----|-------|-----|------|-----|-----------|-----|-------|-----|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Traditional | 646 | 44 | 485 | 32 | 647 | 51 | 575 | 43 | 2353 | 42 |
| Social | 73 | 5 | 48 | 3 | 49 | 4 | 35 | 3 | 205 | 4 |
| Autonomous | 749 | 51 | 958 | 64 | 557 | 44 | 715 | 54 | 2979 | 54 |
| Change-prone | 4 | .. | 6 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | .. | 17 | .. |
| Total | 1472 | 100 | 1497 | 100 | 1258 | 100 | 1327 | 100 | 5554 | 100 |

Sons were the only ones with more traditional than autonomous responses.

Composite Value Profiles

The composite value profiles show proportionate relationships among value types calculated as described on pages 47-48. Change-prone values, a fraction of 1 percent of the total, were omitted in reporting composite value profiles. Although as few as 4 percent of the values were coded as social, 86 of the 193 profiles included some social values; therefore, they were included in the composite value profile designations. Since the traditional and autonomous values predominated, the profiles were arranged on a continuum ranging from traditional to autonomous:

T Ta,Tas Ta,Tas TA At,Ats At,Ats A

By Mean Coded Values

Means of coded values for the respondents in each of the seven composite value profile groups were calculated (Table 5.3). The respondents with the most traditional profiles had the lowest mean number of coded values and those with the most autonomous profiles the highest; however, the difference was slight.

Further analysis explored composite value profiles by role, age, family income, educational level, occupation of husband and wife, and paired roles.

Table 5.3. Mean coded values by composite value profiles

| Composite value profiles | Number of respondents | Number of coded values | Mean coded values |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| <u>T</u> | .. | .. | .. |
| Ta, Tas | 25 | 672 | 27 |
| T <u>a</u> , T <u>a</u> s | 35 | 993 | 28 |
| TA | 34 | 987 | 29 |
| A <u>t</u> , A <u>t</u> s | 46 | 1321 | 29 |
| At, Ats | 50 | 1492 | 30 |
| <u>A</u> | 3 | 89 | 30 |
| Totals | 193 | 5554 | 29 |

By Role

In order to preserve the comparative relationship within families, the composite value profiles of all members of each family are shown in Table 5.4. This table

Table 5.4. Families by composite value profiles

| Family | <u>T</u> | Ta,Tas | Ta,Tas | TA | At,Ats | At,Ats | <u>A</u> |
|--------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|----------|
| 1 | | | <u>S</u> | <u>HW</u> | | | |
| 2 | | | | <u>HS</u> | | <u>WD</u> | |
| 3 | | | | | <u>SD</u> | <u>HW</u> | |
| 4 | | | <u>HD</u> | <u>D</u> | | <u>W</u> | |
| 5 | | | <u>HS</u> | | <u>WS</u> | | |
| 6 | | <u>H</u> | | <u>D</u> | | <u>W</u> | |
| 7 | | <u>S</u> | <u>W</u> | | | <u>H</u> | |
| 8 | | | <u>HD</u> | | <u>S</u> | <u>W</u> | |
| 9 | | | <u>S</u> | | <u>HD</u> | <u>W</u> | |
| 10 | | | | <u>H</u> | <u>WD</u> | | |
| 11 | | | | | | <u>HWD</u> | |
| 12 | | | <u>D</u> | | <u>HWD</u> | | |
| 13 | | <u>H</u> | <u>WS</u> | <u>S</u> | | | |
| 14 | | | | | <u>HD</u> | <u>W</u> | |
| 15 | | | | | <u>W</u> | <u>HD</u> | |
| 16 | | | | <u>S</u> | <u>W</u> | <u>H</u> | |
| 17 | | <u>H</u> | <u>S</u> | | <u>W</u> | <u>S</u> | |
| 18 | | <u>H</u> | | <u>SSD</u> | <u>WS</u> | | |
| 19 | | | <u>H</u> | | <u>D</u> | <u>WD</u> | |
| 20 | | | <u>W</u> | <u>S</u> | <u>H</u> | | |
| 21 | | | | <u>S</u> | <u>H</u> | <u>W</u> | |
| 22 | | | <u>WD</u> | | <u>H</u> | | |
| 23 | | <u>S</u> | | <u>D</u> | <u>H</u> | <u>W</u> | |
| 24 | | | | <u>H</u> | <u>WDD</u> | | |
| 25 | | | | | | <u>HWS</u> | |
| 26 | | | | | <u>D</u> | <u>HWD</u> | |

Table 5.4. (continued)

| Family | <u>T</u> | Ta,Tas | Ta,Tas | TA | At,Ats | At,Ats | <u>A</u> |
|--------|----------|-------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|
| 27 | | | <u>H</u> | <u>D</u> | | <u>W</u> | |
| 28 | | <u>HS</u> | | <u>W</u> | | | |
| 29 | | | <u>HS</u> | <u>D</u> | | | <u>W</u> |
| 30 | | | <u>H</u> | <u>WD</u> | <u>S</u> | | |
| 31 | | <u>HS</u> | <u>S</u> | <u>S</u> | <u>W</u> | | |
| 32 | | <u>HSD</u> | <u>SS</u> | | | <u>W</u> | |
| 33 | | | <u>HS</u> | <u>SD</u> | | <u>W</u> | |
| 34 | | <u>S</u> | | <u>HDW</u> | <u>D</u> | | |
| 35 | | | <u>S</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>HWS</u> | | |
| 36 | | | | | <u>D</u> | <u>HW</u> | |
| 37 | | <u>H</u> | <u>D</u> | | <u>W</u> | | |
| 38 | | <u>H</u> | <u>S</u> | | <u>S</u> | <u>W</u> | |
| 39 | | <u>S</u> | | <u>S</u> | | <u>HW</u> | |
| 40 | | | <u>WD</u> | <u>H</u> | <u>S</u> | | |
| 41 | | | <u>D</u> | | <u>S</u> | <u>W</u> | <u>H</u> |
| 42 | | | | | | <u>WD</u> | <u>H</u> |
| 43 | | | <u>W</u> | <u>S</u> | <u>H</u> | <u>D</u> | |
| 44 | | | | | <u>D</u> | <u>HW</u> | |
| 45 | | | <u>S</u> | <u>H</u> | | <u>W</u> | |
| 46 | | <u>H</u> | | | <u>W</u> | <u>D</u> | |
| 47 | | <u>HD</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>W</u> | | <u>D</u> | |
| 48 | | | | <u>S</u> | <u>WS</u> | <u>HS</u> | |
| 49 | | <u>HSDD</u> | | | | <u>W</u> | |
| 50 | | | | | <u>W</u> | <u>HD</u> | |
| 51 | | | <u>H</u> | | <u>W</u> | <u>D</u> | |

indicates the number in each family and the roles of family members, as well as the composite value profile of each. Husbands are designated 'H,' wives 'W,' sons 'S,' and daughters 'D.' Similarities and differences within the family as well as between families are evident.

For about half of the families, all the profiles were within three positions on the continuum of seven profile groups. More husband-daughter profiles were the same or adjacent than were wife-daughter or husband-son profiles. Husband-wife and wife-son pairs have the least proximity.

Table 5.5 indicates that approximately half of the individuals in this sample had predominantly autonomous composite value profiles. Husbands' profiles fell about equally in each direction from the center point of the

Table 5.5. Role by composite value profiles

| Composite value profiles | Roles | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|----------|-----|-------|-----|
| | Husband | | Wife | | Son | | Daughter | | Total | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| <u>T</u> | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Ta, Tas | 12 | 23 | .. | .. | 9 | 20 | 4 | 9 | 25 | 13 |
| T <u>a</u> , T <u>a</u> s | 9 | 18 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 27 | 8 | 17 | 35 | 18 |
| TA | 7 | 14 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 24 | 11 | 24 | 34 | 18 |
| A <u>t</u> , A <u>t</u> s | 9 | 18 | 15 | 29 | 10 | 22 | 12 | 26 | 46 | 24 |
| At, A <u>t</u> s | 12 | 23 | 24 | 47 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 24 | 50 | 26 |
| <u>A</u> | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 3 | 1 |
| Totals | 51 | 100 | 51 | 100 | 45 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 193 | 100 |

continuum, whereas the wives were largely toward the autonomous end. Although sons and daughters had more profiles at the center point of the continuum than their parents, on the whole, sons' fell toward the traditional end and daughters' toward the autonomous.

A composite value profile was computed for each entire family according to the rules for an individual's composite value profile. However, when extremes within each family were averaged together, the resulting profiles fell toward the center of the continuum. With variations thus reduced, they were of no use in making comparisons among families.

By Age

Comparison of the composite value profiles of husbands and wives by age revealed that the most autonomous profiles were from the older age classes (Table 5.6). The youngest age class of husbands had a larger proportion of traditional than autonomous profiles.

Younger sons had the most traditional composite value profiles and older sons the least (Table 5.7). Younger sons appear to be more traditional in their values than any other age class or role. Younger daughters had no profiles in the most traditional group in contrast to sons of the same age. Both 17-18 year old sons and 17-18 year old daughters had a much larger proportion of their profiles equally traditional and autonomous than did any other age class of children or parents.

Table 5.6. Ages of husbands and wives by their composite value profiles

| Composite value profiles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----|----|--------|--------------------------|--------|-------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------|--------|-------------|----|------------|-------|-----|
| Age classes | T | | Ta,Tas | | Ta,Tas | | TA | | At,Ats | | At,Ats | | A | | Total | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Husbands | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30-39 | .. | .. | 2 | 17 | 2 | 22 | 2 | 29 | .. | .. | 2 | 17 | .. | .. | 8 | 16 |
| 40-49 | .. | .. | 7 | 58 | 5 | 56 | 4 | 57 | 7 | 78 | 4 | 33 | 2 | 100 | 29 | 57 |
| 50-59 | .. | .. | 3 | 25 | 2 | 22 | 1 | 14 | 2 | 22 | 6 | 50 | .. | .. | 14 | 27 |
| Totals | .. | .. | 12 | 100 (23) ^a | 9 | 100 (18) | 7 | 100 (14) | 9 | 100 (18) | 12 | 100 (23) | 2 | 100 (4) | 51 | 100 |
| Wives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30-39 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1 | 17 | 1 | 20 | 4 | 27 | 7 | 29 | .. | .. | 13 | 25 |
| 40-49 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 5 | 83 | 4 | 80 | 6 | 40 | 16 | 67 | 1 | 100 | 32 | 63 |
| 50-59 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 5 | 33 | 1 | 4 | .. | .. | 6 | 12 |
| Totals | .. | .. | .. | .. | 6 | 100 (12) | 5 | 100 (10) | 15 | 100 (29) | 24 | 100 (47) | 1 | 100 (2) | 51 | 100 |

^aPercentages in parentheses refer to percentages of the total number of husbands or the total number of wives.

Table 5.7. Ages of sons and daughters by their composite value profiles

| Composite value profiles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------|----|--------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|----|-------------|------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------|----------|----|-------|--------------|
| Age classes | <u>T</u> | | Ta,Tas | | <u>Ta</u> , <u>Tas</u> | | TA | | <u>At</u> , <u>Ats</u> | | At,Ats | | <u>A</u> | | Total | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Sons | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12-13 | .. | .. | 5 | 56 | 4 | 33 | 1 | 9 | .. | .. | 2 | 67 | .. | .. | 12 | 27 |
| 14-16 | .. | .. | 4 | 44 | 4 | 34 | 6 | 55 | 6 | 60 | 1 | 33 | .. | .. | 21 | 46 |
| 17-18 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 4 | 33 | 4 | 36 | 4 | 40 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 12 | 27 |
| Totals | .. | .. | 9 | 100 (20) ^a | 12 | 100 (27) | 11 | 100 (24) | 10 | 100 (22) | 3 | 100 (7) | .. | .. | 45 | 100 (100) |
| Daughters | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12-13 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 4 | 50 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 42 | 1 | 9 | .. | .. | 12 | 26 |
| 14-16 | .. | .. | 3 | 75 | 3 | 38 | 4 | 36 | 6 | 50 | 5 | 46 | .. | .. | 21 | 46 |
| 17-18 | .. | .. | 1 | 25 | 1 | 12 | 5 | 45 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 45 | .. | .. | 13 | 28 |
| Totals | .. | .. | 4 | 100 (9) | 8 | 100 (17) | 11 | 100 (24) | 12 | 100 (26) | 11 | 100 (24) | .. | .. | 46 | 100 (100) |

^aPercentages in parentheses refer to percentages of the total number of sons or the total number of daughters.

By Income

Since the majority of families in this sample had incomes over \$10,000, incomes were classed into those over and those under \$10,000 (Table 5.8). Higher incomes and predominantly autonomous profiles appear to be related, at least for the husbands. For the two husbands and one wife with the most autonomous profiles, family incomes were over \$10,000.

By Education

Table 5.9 indicates a probable relationship between composite value profiles and education for both husbands and wives. The proportion of autonomous values appears to increase with the amount of education. One-fourth of the husbands with less than a college degree had predominantly autonomous profiles as compared to more than half of the husbands with master's or doctor's degrees. However, both the one husband with the least education and one of those with the most had largely traditional profiles.

Wives, high in autonomous values as a group, nevertheless exhibited an appreciable difference between those with less than a bachelor's degree and those with a bachelor's or master's degree. All the wives with predominantly traditional profiles had less than a college degree. All of the wives with master's degrees had 'At' profiles.

By Occupation

Composite value profiles of husbands do not seem

Table 5.8. Family incomes of husbands and wives by their composite value profiles

| Composite value profiles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------|----|--------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|----|-------------|------------------------|-------------|--------|-------------|----------|------------|-------|--------------|
| Family income classes | <u>T</u> | | Ta,Tas | | <u>Ta</u> , <u>Tas</u> | | TA | | <u>At</u> , <u>Ats</u> | | At,Ats | | <u>A</u> | | Total | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Husbands | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Below \$10,000 | .. | .. | 4 | 33 | 3 | 33 | 1 | 14 | 2 | 22 | 2 | 17 | .. | .. | 12 | 24 |
| Over \$10,000 | .. | .. | 8 | 67 | 6 | 67 | 6 | 86 | 7 | 78 | 10 | 83 | 2 | 100 | 39 | 76 |
| Totals | .. | .. | 12 | 100 (23) ^a | 9 | 100 (18) | 7 | 100 (14) | 9 | 100 (18) | 12 | 100 (23) | 2 | 100 (4) | 51 | 100 (100) |
| Wives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Below \$10,000 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1 | 17 | 1 | 20 | 6 | 40 | 4 | 17 | .. | .. | 12 | 24 |
| Over \$10,000 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 5 | 83 | 4 | 80 | 9 | 60 | 20 | 83 | 1 | 100 | 39 | 76 |
| Totals | .. | .. | .. | .. | 6 | 100 (12) | 5 | 100 (10) | 15 | 100 (29) | 24 | 100 (47) | 1 | 100 (2) | 51 | 100 (100) |

^a Percentages in parentheses refer to percentages of the total number of husbands or wives.

to be closely related to occupation. However, since 76 percent of the sample were in professional and managerial occupations, too few cases fell in clerical and sales and skilled occupations to merit generalization (Table 5.10).

Table 5.10. Gainful occupations of husbands by composite value profiles

| Composite value profiles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|----|--------|-----|---------------|-----|----|-----|---------------|-----|--------|-----|----------|-----|-------|-----|
| Occupational classes | <u>T</u> | | Ta,Tas | | <u>Ta,Tas</u> | | TA | | <u>At,Ats</u> | | At,Ats | | <u>A</u> | | Total | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Professional & managerial | .. | .. | 8 | 67 | 8 | 89 | 6 | 86 | 6 | 67 | 9 | 75 | 2 | 100 | 39 | 76 |
| Clerical & sales | .. | .. | 1 | 8 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1 | 11 | 2 | 17 | .. | .. | 4 | 8 |
| Skilled | .. | .. | 3 | 25 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 14 | 2 | 22 | 1 | 8 | .. | .. | 8 | 16 |
| Totals | .. | .. | 12 | 100 | 9 | 100 | 7 | 100 | 9 | 100 | 12 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 51 | 100 |

For wives working before marriage (Table 5.11), more than half of those professionally employed but less than half of those in clerical and sales occupations had profiles in the two most autonomous profile groups. Proportions were about the same for the fewer wives in the same categories who were employed after marriage. However, the numbers were too small to give more than an indication of possible trend toward autonomous profiles for the professionally employed.

By Paired Roles

In order to discover more about values within the

Table 5.11. Gainful occupations of wives before and after marriage by composite value profiles

| Composite value profiles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------|---------|-------|---------|--------------------------|--------|-------------|---------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|------------|-------|--------------|
| Occupational classes | <u>T</u> | | Ta, Tas | | Ta, Tas | | AT, TA | | AT, ATs | | A | | Total | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| Professional and managerial | before | | | | 1 | 17 | 2 | 40 | 3 | 20 | 9 | 38 | 1 | 100 | 16 | 31 |
| | after | | | | | | 1 | 20 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 17 | | | 6 | 12 |
| Clerical and sales | before | | | | 3 | 50 | 1 | 20 | 7 | 46 | 9 | 38 | | | 20 | 39 |
| | after | | | | 1 | 17 | 1 | 20 | 3 | 20 | 2 | 8 | | | 7 | 14 |
| Service | before | | | | 2 | 33 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 7 | | | | | 4 | 8 |
| | after | | | | | | | | 2 | 13 | 1 | 4 | | | 3 | 6 |
| Skilled | before | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 4 | | | 1 | 2 |
| | after | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No gainful occupation | before | | | | | | | | 3 | 20 | 5 | 20 | | | 8 | 16 |
| | after | | | | 5 | 83 | 3 | 60 | 9 | 60 | 17 | 71 | | 100 | 35 | 68 |
| No response | before | | | | | | 1 | 20 | 1 | 7 | | | | | 2 | 4 |
| | after | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Totals | before | | | | 6 | 100 (12) ^a | 5 | 100 (10) | 15 | 100 (29) | 24 | 100 (47) | 1 | 100 (2) | 51 | 100 (100) |
| | after | | | | 6 | 100 (12) | 5 | 100 (10) | 15 | 100 (29) | 24 | 100 (47) | 1 | 100 (2) | 51 | 100 (100) |

^aFigures in parentheses refer to percentages of the total number of wives.

family, husbands' composite value profiles were compared with those of their own wives, and husbands' and wives' composite value profiles with those of their own sons and daughters (Tables 5.12 through 5.16).

In this set of tables the number and percentage of profiles between the diagonal lines are those which were alike for the role pair being compared. In the lower right rectangle are those predominantly autonomous for both, and in the upper left rectangle, those predominantly traditional for both. Above the diagonal lines are the profiles in which one of the pair was more autonomous, and below, those in which the other was more autonomous.

About one-fifth of the husband-wife value profiles were alike, but the largest number fell in the section where the wives' profiles were more autonomous than the husbands' and the fewest where both have predominantly traditional profiles.

Of the husband-son pairs, over one-fourth had value profiles alike. More of their profiles were in the traditional rectangle than for any other pair, and fewer in the autonomous rectangle. Both husband-daughter and wife-daughter pairs had 30 percent of their profiles alike, a larger percentage than for the other three paired combinations. Husband-daughter pairs had next to the greatest number of traditional profiles but far fewer than husband-son pairs.

Fewest profiles were alike for wives and sons.

Table 5.12. Comparison of husbands' composite value profiles with their wives' composite value profiles

| Wives' composite value profiles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|---|--------|---|------------------------|---|-------|---|------------------------|---|--------|---|----------|---|----------------|---|-------|--|
| Husbands' value profiles | <u>T</u> | | Ta,Tas | | <u>Ta</u> , <u>Tas</u> | | TA | | <u>At</u> , <u>Ats</u> | | At,Ats | | <u>A</u> | | Total husbands | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| <u>T</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ta,Tas | | | | | | | 1 2 | | 2 4 | | 5 9 | | 4 8 | | | | 12 23 | |
| <u>Ta</u> , <u>Tas</u> | | | | | | | | | 1 2 | | 2 4 | | 5 10 | | 1 2 | | 9 18 | |
| TA | | | | | | | | | 1 2 | | 2 4 | | 2 4 | | 2 4 | | 7 14 | |
| <u>At</u> , <u>Ats</u> | | | 3 6 | | | | 2 4 | | 4 8 | | | | 9 18 | | | | | |
| At,Ats | | | 1 2 | | | | 4 8 | | 7 13 | | | | 12 23 | | | | | |
| <u>A</u> | | | | | | | | | 2 4 | | | | 2 4 | | | | | |
| Total wives | | | 6 12 | | 5 10 | | 15 29 | | 24 47 | | 1 2 | | 51 100 | | | | | |

Table 5.13. Comparison of husbands' composite value profiles with their sons' composite value profiles

| Sons' value profiles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------|---|--------|----|--------|----|----|----|--------|----|--------|---|----------|---|----------------|-----|
| Husbands' value profiles | <u>T</u> | | Ta,Tas | | Ta,Tas | | TA | | At,Ats | | At,Ats | | <u>A</u> | | Total husbands | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| <u>T</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ta,Tas | | | 5 | 11 | 5 | 11 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | | | 17 | 38 |
| Ta,Tas | | | | | 3 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | | | | | 7 | 16 |
| TA | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | | | 5 | 11 |
| At,Ats | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | | | | | 6 | 13 |
| At,Ats | | | 2 | 5 | | | 3 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | | | 9 | 20 |
| <u>A</u> | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| Total sons | | | 9 | 20 | 12 | 27 | 11 | 24 | 10 | 22 | 3 | 7 | | | 45 | 100 |

Table 5.14. Comparison of husbands' composite value profiles with their daughters' composite value profiles

| Daughters' value profiles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|---|--------|---|---------------|---|-------|---|---------------|---|--------|---|----------|---|----------------|---|--|--|-------|--|
| Husbands' value profiles | <u>T</u> | | Ta,Tas | | <u>Ta,Tas</u> | | TA | | <u>At,Ats</u> | | At,Ats | | <u>A</u> | | Total husbands | | | | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | | | | |
| <u>T</u> | <div></div> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ta,Tas | | | | | | | 4 9 | | 2 4 | | 2 4 | | | | 2 5 | | | | 10 22 | |
| <u>Ta,Tas</u> | | | | | | | | | 2 4 | | 5 11 | | 1 2 | | 2 4 | | | | 10 21 | |
| TA | | | | | | | | | 1 2 | | 1 2 | | 4 9 | | 1 2 | | | | 7 15 | |
| <u>At,Ats</u> | | | | | | | | | 2 5 | | 3 7 | | 3 6 | | 1 2 | | | | 9 20 | |
| At,Ats | | | | | | | 4 9 | | 4 9 | | | | 8 18 | | | | | | | |
| <u>A</u> | | | 1 2 | | | | | | 1 2 | | | | 2 4 | | | | | | | |
| Total daughters | | | 4 9 | | 8 17 | | 11 24 | | 12 26 | | 11 24 | | | | 46 100 | | | | | |

Table 5.15. Comparison of wives' composite value profiles with their sons' composite value profiles

| Sons' value profiles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------|---|--------|----|------------------------|----|----|----|------------------------|----|--------|---|----------|---|-------------|-----|
| Wives' value profiles | <u>T</u> | | Ta,Tas | | <u>Ta</u> , <u>Tas</u> | | TA | | <u>At</u> , <u>Ats</u> | | At,Ats | | <u>A</u> | | Total wives | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>T</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ta,Tas | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Ta</u> , <u>Tas</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TA | | | 2 | 4 | | | 3 | 7 | 1 | | 2 | | | 6 | 13 | |
| <u>At</u> , <u>Ats</u> | | | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 2 | | | 4 | 9 | | |
| At,Ats | | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 11 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 5 | | | 16 | 36 |
| <u>A</u> | | | 4 | 9 | 6 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 2 | | | 18 | 40 |
| Total sons | | | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 |
| | | | 9 | 20 | 12 | 27 | 11 | 24 | 10 | 22 | 3 | 7 | | | 45 | 100 |

Table 5.16. Comparison of wives' composite value profiles with their daughters' composite value profiles

| Daughters' value profiles | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|----------|---|--------|---|--------|---|-------|---|--------|---|--------|---|----------|---|-------------|---|
| Wives' value profiles | <u>T</u> | | Ta,Tas | | Ta,Tas | | TA | | At,Ats | | At,Ats | | <u>A</u> | | Total wives | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| <u>T</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ta,Tas | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ta,Tas | | | | | | | | | 2 5 | | | | 1 2 | | | |
| TA | | | 1 2 | | 1 2 | | 2 5 | | 1 2 | | 1 2 | | | | 6 13 | |
| At,Ats | | | | | 2 4 | | 2 4 | | 4 9 | | 4 9 | | | | 12 26 | |
| At,Ats | | | 3 7 | | 3 6 | | 6 13 | | 7 15 | | 5 11 | | | | 24 52 | |
| <u>A</u> | | | | | | | 1 2 | | | | | | | | 1 2 | |
| Total daughters | | | 4 9 | | 8 17 | | 11 24 | | 12 26 | | 11 24 | | | | 46 100 | |

Nearly three-fourths of the wives' profiles were more autonomous than their sons', so most of the wife-son profiles were clustered in the rectangle that had traditional sons' profiles and autonomous wives' profiles.

Two-thirds of the wife-daughter profiles which were alike were in the more autonomous groups. Also, more of all their profiles than for any other pair were in the autonomous rectangle. Wives had more autonomous profiles than had daughters.

Story Analysis

The incomplete stories varied in their productivity in eliciting values from the family members. From most to least the stories were ranked as follows by number of coded values for all respondents:

1. Story 3 -- children's behavior
2. Story 1 -- first baby
3. Story 4 -- move
4. Story 10 -- son's marriage
5. Story 6 -- children in school
6. Story 8 -- dishwashing
7. Story 7 -- furniture
8. Story 9 -- transportation
9. Story 5 -- vacation
10. Story 2 -- new home characteristics (Table 5.17).

The coded values for each role produced much the same rank order. Stories 3 and 1 were always in first and second place and Stories 4 and 10 in the next two places. Stories 6, 7, 8, and 9 ranked in the fifth to eighth places for all roles but in varying order and Stories 5 and 2 in the last two places (Table 5.18).

The set of incomplete stories may be found in the Appendix, pp. 132-136.

Table 5.17. Coded values by type and by story

| Stories | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|----------|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total | |
| Types | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % | N % |
| Traditional | 411 63 | 125 29 | 423 60 | 235 41 | 102 22 | 232 43 | 253 47 | 247 46 | 144 27 | 181 31 | 2353 42 | |
| Social | 18 3 | 15 3 | 25 4 | 2 .. | 80 18 | 13 2 | 23 4 | 7 1 | 1 .. | 21 4 | 205 4 | |
| Autonomous | 223 34 | 295 68 | 253 41 | 344 59 | 270 60 | 299 55 | 250 46 | 288 53 | 385 73 | 372 65 | 2979 54 | |
| Change-prone | | | 1 .. | | 1 .. | | 14 3 | 1 .. | | | 17 .. | |
| Total | 100 652 (12) ^a | 100 435 (8) | 100 702 (12) | 100 581 (10) | 100 453 (8) | 100 544 (10) | 100 540 (10) | 100 543 (10) | 100 530 (9) | 100 574 (10) | 100 5554 | |

^aFigures in parentheses refer to percentages of the total coded values.

Table 5.18. Coded values by type, by story and by role

| Stories | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|------|-----|
| 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | 10 | | Total | | |
| Type | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Husbands (N = 51) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traditional | 123 | 73 | 32 | 28 | 102 | 57 | 44 | 29 | 20 | 16 | 85 | 59 | 65 | 46 | 75 | 50 | 44 | 31 | 56 | 37 | 646 | 44 |
| Social | 4 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 4 | .. | .. | 41 | 33 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | .. | .. | 3 | 2 | 73 | 5 |
| Autonomous | 43 | 25 | 74 | 66 | 71 | 39 | 110 | 71 | 63 | 51 | 7 | 39 | 68 | 48 | 72 | 48 | 97 | 69 | 94 | 61 | 749 | 51 |
| Change-prone | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 4 | 3 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 4 | .. |
| Totals | 170 | 100 | 113 | 100 | 180 | 100 | 154 | 100 | 124 | 100 | 145 | 100 | 142 | 100 | 150 | 100 | 141 | 100 | 153 | 100 | 1472 | 100 |
| Wives (N = 51) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traditional | 93 | 55 | 31 | 27 | 86 | 46 | 46 | 29 | 26 | 21 | 46 | 31 | 51 | 34 | 60 | 42 | 28 | 20 | 18 | 12 | 485 | 32 |
| Social | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 12 | 8 | 2 | 2 | .. | .. | 4 | 2 | 48 | 3 |
| Autonomous | 69 | 41 | 84 | 72 | 97 | 52 | 114 | 70 | 89 | 72 | 97 | 64 | 81 | 55 | 80 | 56 | 114 | 80 | 133 | 86 | 958 | 64 |
| Change-prone | .. | .. | .. | .. | 1 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 5 | 3 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 6 | 1 |
| Totals | 169 | 100 | 116 | 100 | 187 | 100 | 162 | 100 | 124 | 100 | 151 | 100 | 149 | 100 | 142 | 100 | 142 | 100 | 155 | 100 | 1497 | 100 |

Sons (N = 45)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Traditional | 95 62 | 30 30 | 126 77 | 73 56 | 32 30 | 61 50 | 70 58 | 56 46 | 38 33 | 66 52 | 647 51 |
| Social | 5 3 | 7 7 | 6 4 | | 22 21 | 2 2 | 3 3 | | 1 1 | 3 2 | 49 4 |
| Autonomous | 53 35 | 64 63 | 31 19 | 58 44 | 51 48 | 58 48 | 43 36 | 64 53 | 76 66 | 59 46 | 557 44 |
| Change-prone | | | | | 1 1 | | 3 3 | 1 1 | | | 5 1 |
| Totals | 153 100 | 101 100 | 163 100 | 131 100 | 106 100 | 121 100 | 119 100 | 121 100 | 115 100 | 128 100 | 1258 100 |

Daughters (N = 46)

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Traditional | 100 63 | 32 30 | 109 63 | 72 54 | 24 24 | 40 31 | 67 52 | 56 43 | 34 26 | 41 30 | 575 43 |
| Social | 2 1 | | 9 5 | | 8 8 | | 3 2 | 2 2 | | 11 8 | 35 3 |
| Autonomous | 58 36 | 73 70 | 54 32 | 62 46 | 67 68 | 87 69 | 58 44 | 72 55 | 98 74 | 86 62 | 715 54 |
| Change-prone | | | | | | | 2 2 | | | | 2 .. |
| Totals | 160 100 | 105 100 | 172 100 | 134 100 | 99 100 | 127 100 | 130 100 | 130 100 | 132 100 | 138 100 | 1327 100 |

Coded Values by Type and by Story

Only Stories 1 (first baby) and 3 (children's behavior) elicited more traditional values than autonomous (Table 5.17). Story 5 (vacation) had by far the largest percentage of social values, although other stories yielded some. Stories eliciting the greatest proportions of autonomous values were Story 9 (transportation), Story 2 (new home), Story 10 (son's marriage), and Story 5 (vacation). Most of the change-prone values were coded from responses to Story 7 (furniture).

Coded Values by Type, by Story, and by Role

Despite the fact that more autonomous than traditional values were coded for husbands, over half of their values for Story 1 (first baby), Story 3 (children's behavior), Story 6 (children in school), and Story 8 (dishwashing) were traditional (Table 5.18). Wives, with almost two-thirds autonomous values, had over 50 percent traditional values on Story 1 only.

Sons, the one role with more than half of all values coded traditional, had more traditional than autonomous values for six of the ten stories. Interesting to note is that the sons had more autonomous values than their fathers on Story 8 (dishwashing).

Sons and daughters were slightly more traditional on Story 4 (move) whereas their parents were predominantly autonomous on the same story. All roles had predominantly autonomous values for Story 10 (son's marriage) except sons.

Story 5 (vacation) elicited the most social values from husbands and sons. The wives had more social values on Story 7 (furniture) and daughters on Story 10 (son's marriage) than on Story 5.

Value profiles showing proportionate amounts of each type coded from an individual's total response to a story were computed. Since these value profiles by story and role reveal too few additional results to warrant discussion, they were not included in this report.

Theme Analysis

Since every story was coded for two general themes, form of response and emphasis, equally large numbers of values fell into each (Table 5.19). Because the remaining, more specific themes were not elicited by every story, the number coded for them varied from 371 to 54. However, some of these themes had coding from more than one story source. Themes having multiple source coding were scope of wife's time alternatives, material possessions, and less frequently, division of work. For scope of wife's time alternatives, Stories 1 (first baby) and 6 (children in school) were sources. In addition, while working with the responses and coding them, it appeared that this theme actually had two parts: (1) the wife's time alternatives while the children are small, and (2) her time alternatives after the children are in school. Since respondents apparently had different conceptions of the desirable with respect to each of these situations, they were coded separately.

Table 5.19. Coded values by type and by theme

| Types | Themes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------|----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|----------|--|-------|
| | Form of response | Emphasis | Focus of functional order | Scope of wife's time alternatives | Social organization | Kinship | Division of work | Material possessions | Mobility | Control of child's behavior | Mode of child's control | Control of adult son | | | |
| Traditional | 955 50 | 701 37 | 3 6 | 185 50 | 39 48 | 13 22 | 57 32 | 95 34 | 75 42 | 128 67 | 52 43 | 50 28 | 2353 42 | | |
| Social | 42 2 | 82 4 | 12 22 | 5 1 | 6 7 | 19 32 | 4 2 | 13 5 | 1 1 | 7 4 | 6 5 | 8 4 | 205 4 | | |
| Autonomous | 930 48 | 1142 59 | 39 72 | 181 49 | 36 45 | 28 46 | 114 65 | 164 58 | 104 57 | 55 29 | 61 51 | 125 68 | 2979 54 | | |
| Change-prone | 2 .. | 4 .. | | | | | 1 1 | 9 3 | | | 1 1 | | 17 .. | | |
| Total | 100 1929 (35) ^a | 100 1929 (35) | 100 54 (1) | 100 371 (7) | 100 81 (2) | 100 60 (1) | 100 176 (3) | 100 281 (5) | 100 180 (3) | 100 190 (3) | 100 120 (2) | 100 183 (3) | 100 5554 | | |

^aFigures in parentheses refer to percentages of the total values.

Material possessions drew values from three stories, Story 3 (new home), Story 7 (furniture), and Story 9 (transportation); hence it is surprising that the number of values coded in this theme was not greater.

The fewest values were coded for focus of functional order and for social organization. Although evidence of values in these two themes was scant, more values in both were coded for the parents than for their children, suggesting a possible relationship to role.

Three Theme Categories

Since three theme categories, form of response, emphasis, and all other themes, each contained about one-third of the coded values, they were analyzed to discover whether the results were similar. If so, they might be used independently of each other to classify data, otherwise all three might be needed in the analysis. Also, similarity would indicate some degree of validity of type and reliability of coding. Table 5.20 presents the coded values in the three theme categories, tabulated by type and role.

In Table 5.20 all the roles for one type in one theme equal 100 percent. The relative percentages of the four roles in a type were consistent for all three theme categories, both in traditional and in autonomous, where the bulk of the data lie. Likewise, social showed similarity in percentages by role for emphasis and all other themes, but not for form of response. Change-prone had no discernible pattern.

Table 5.20. Coded values for form of response, emphasis and all other themes by type and by role

| Type and role | Form of response | | Emphasis | | All other themes | | Total | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----|-----------|-----|------------------|-----|------------|-----|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Traditional | | | | | | | | |
| Husbands (N=51) | 249 | 26 | 195 | 28 | 202 | 29 | 646 | 27 |
| Wives (N=51) | 209 | 22 | 132 | 19 | 144 | 20 | 485 | 21 |
| Sons (N=45) | 258 | 27 | 203 | 29 | 186 | 27 | 647 | 28 |
| Daughters (N=46) | 239 | 25 | 171 | 24 | 165 | 24 | 575 | 24 |
| Total | 955 (17) ^a | 100 | 701 (13) | 100 | 697 (12) | 100 | 2353 (42) | 100 |
| Social | | | | | | | | |
| Husbands | 19 | 45 | 28 | 34 | 26 | 32 | 73 | 36 |
| Wives | 3 | 7 | 21 | 26 | 24 | 30 | 48 | 23 |
| Sons | 12 | 29 | 19 | 23 | 18 | 22 | 49 | 24 |
| Daughters | 8 | 19 | 14 | 17 | 13 | 16 | 35 | 17 |
| Total | 42 (1) | 100 | 82 (1) | 100 | 81 (2) | 100 | 205 (4) | 100 |
| Autonomous | | | | | | | | |
| Husbands | 241 | 26 | 285 | 25 | 223 | 25 | 749 | 25 |
| Wives | 297 | 32 | 356 | 31 | 305 | 33 | 958 | 32 |
| Sons | 179 | 19 | 226 | 20 | 152 | 17 | 557 | 19 |
| Daughters | 213 | 23 | 275 | 24 | 227 | 25 | 715 | 24 |
| Total | 930 (17) | 100 | 1142 (21) | 100 | 907 (16) | 100 | 2979 (54) | 100 |
| Change-prone | | | | | | | | |
| Husbands | .. | .. | 1 | 25 | 3 | 27 | 4 | 24 |
| Wives | 1 | 50 | 1 | 25 | 4 | 37 | 6 | 35 |
| Sons | 1 | 50 | 2 | 50 | 2 | 18 | 5 | 29 |
| Daughters | .. | .. | .. | .. | 2 | 18 | 2 | 12 |
| Total | 2 (0) | 100 | 4 (0) | 100 | 11 (0) | 100 | 17 (0) | 100 |
| Totals | 1929 (35) | | 1929 (35) | | 1696 (30) | | 5554 (100) | |

^aFigures in parentheses refer to percentages of total coded values.

In addition, figures in parenthesis show that the percentages of the total coded values in a type were similar across the three theme categories with the traditional values having a slightly higher percentage in form of response and the autonomous values slightly more in emphasis.

Coded Values by Type and by Theme

Since results of this study show a prevalence of autonomous values, any deviations are of particular interest. Table 5.19 (page 90) indicates the percentage of the four types in each theme. Traditional values were most predominant in control of child's behavior, and next in form of response, scope of wife's time alternatives, and social organization.

Themes with the most autonomous values were focus of functional order, control of adult son, and division of work. Next came emphasis, material possessions, and mobility. Most of the social values were coded for kinship and focus of functional order, and the change-prone for material possessions.

Coded Values by Type, by Theme, and by Role

Further analysis of values by theme and role indicate that all roles were predominantly traditional for control of child's behavior, sons and daughters having the largest percentages (Table 5.21). The husbands' most traditional theme was scope of wife's time alternatives. Other predominantly traditional themes were social organization

Table 5.21. Coded values by type, by theme and by role

| Themes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------|-----|----------|-----|---------------------------|-----|-----------------------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|---------|-----|------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|----------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|-------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|-------|-----|--|
| Types | Form of response | | Emphasis | | Focus of functional order | | Scope of wife's time alternatives | | Social organization | | Kinship | | Division of work | | Material possessions | | Mobility | | Control of child's behavior | | Mode of child's control | | Control of adult son | | Total | | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | |
| Husbands | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traditional | 249 | 49 | 195 | 38 | 1 | 4 | 62 | 67 | 12 | 46 | 6 | 38 | 23 | 42 | 26 | 40 | 15 | 31 | 32 | 64 | 9 | 34 | 16 | 32 | 646 | 44 | |
| Social | 19 | 4 | 28 | 6 | 7 | 26 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 37 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | .. | .. | 2 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 73 | 5 | |
| Autonomous | 241 | 47 | 285 | 56 | 19 | 70 | 29 | 32 | 11 | 42 | 4 | 25 | 31 | 56 | 32 | 50 | 33 | 69 | 16 | 32 | 15 | 58 | 33 | 66 | 749 | 51 | |
| Change-prone | .. | .. | 1 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 3 | 5 | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | 4 | .. | |
| Total | 509 | 100 | 509 | 100 | 27 | 100 | 92 | 100 | 26 | 100 | 16 | 100 | 55 | 100 | 64 | 100 | 48 | 100 | 50 | 100 | 26 | 100 | 50 | 100 | 1472 | 100 | |

Wives

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| Traditional | 209 41 | 132 26 | 1 5 | 46 46 | 15 54 | 1 5 | 13 28 | 20 24 | 11 23 | 27 54 | 7 23 | 3 6 | 485 32 |
| Social | 3 1 | 21 4 | 3 16 | 3 3 | | 6 27 | 2 5 | 7 9 | 1 2 | | | 2 4 | 48 3 |
| Autonomous | 297 58 | 356 70 | 15 79 | 52 51 | 13 46 | 15 68 | 31 67 | 51 63 | 36 75 | 23 46 | 23 74 | 46 90 | 958 64 |
| Change-prone | 1 .. | 1 .. | | | | | | 3 4 | | | 1 3 | | 6 1 |
| Total | 510 100 | 510 100 | 19 100 | 101 100 | 28 100 | 22 100 | 46 100 | 81 100 | 48 100 | 50 100 | 31 100 | 51 100 | 1497 100 |

Sons

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| Traditional | 258 57 | 203 45 | | 39 49 | 5 36 | 5 31 | 11 33 | 26 46 | 28 65 | 35 80 | 19 65 | 18 47 | 647 51 |
| Social | 12 3 | 19 4 | 1 25 | 1 1 | 3 21 | 6 38 | | 2 4 | | 2 4 | 2 7 | 1 3 | 49 4 |
| Autonomous | 179 40 | 226 50 | 3 75 | 40 50 | 6 43 | 5 31 | 22 65 | 27 48 | 15 35 | 7 16 | 8 28 | 19 50 | 557 44 |
| Change-prone | 1 .. | 2 1 | | | | | 1 2 | 1 2 | | | | | 5 1 |
| Total | 450 100 | 450 100 | 4 100 | 80 100 | 14 100 | 16 100 | 34 100 | 56 100 | 43 100 | 44 100 | 29 100 | 38 100 | 1258 100 |

Daughters

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|-------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------|
| Traditional | 239 52 | 171 37 | 1 25 | 38 39 | 7 54 | 1 17 | 10 24 | 23 29 | 21 51 | 34 74 | 17 50 | 13 30 | 575 43 |
| Social | 8 2 | 14 3 | 1 25 | | | 1 17 | 1 3 | 1 1 | | 3 6 | 2 6 | 4 9 | 35 3 |
| Autonomous | 213 46 | 275 60 | 2 50 | 60 61 | 6 46 | 4 66 | 30 73 | 54 68 | 20 49 | 9 20 | 15 44 | 27 61 | 715 54 |
| Change-prone | | | | | | | | 2 2 | | | | | 2 .. |
| Total | 460 100 | 460 100 | 4 100 | 98 100 | 13 100 | 6 100 | 41 100 | 80 100 | 41 100 | 46 100 | 34 100 | 44 100 | 1327 100 |

for wives and daughters and mobility, mode of child's control, and form of response for sons and daughters.

Predominantly autonomous for all roles was division of work, but more so for wives, sons and daughters. Themes predominantly autonomous for husbands and wives were mobility, and mode of child's control; and for all except sons, control of the adult son and emphasis. The largely autonomous themes for wives and daughters were kinship and material possessions. Daughters were the only role predominantly autonomous in scope of wife's time alternatives. Over one-third of the husbands' and sons' kinship values were social.

Analysis of Common Family Values

Family values were further analyzed to determine the extent to which the coded values were held in common in the family and by which members of the family. Since each value was coded from a story into a type and theme, a value was considered to be held in common when two or more family members had identical coding.

In Table 5.22 the number and percentage of values held in common by the entire family are grouped by story and themes coded from each story and further classified by type.

In the 51 families there were 399 instances in which the entire family held a value in common. These common values were two-thirds autonomous and one-third traditional. Stories 9 (transportation) and 8 (dishwashing) produced the

Table 5.22. Coded values common to entire family by type and by story with related themes (N = 51 families)

| Story and related themes | Type | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----|----------|------------|-----|----------|-------|-----|-----|
| | Traditional | | | Autonomous | | | Total | | |
| | N | N | % | N | N | % | N | N | % |
| Story 1 | | 37 | 27 | | 8 | 3 | | 45 | 11 |
| Form of response | 13 | | | 1 | | | 14 | | |
| Emphasis | 12 | | | 3 | | | 15 | | |
| Scope of wife's time alternatives | 12 | | | 4 | | | 16 | | |
| Story 2 | | 4 | 3 | | 28 | 11 | | 32 | 8 |
| Form of response | 4 | | | 8 | | | 12 | | |
| Emphasis | .. | | | 20 | | | 20 | | |
| Story 3 | | 36 | 26 | | 10 | 4 | | 46 | 11 |
| Form of response | 6 | | | 2 | | | 8 | | |
| Emphasis | 13 | | | 3 | | | 16 | | |
| Control of child's behavior | 15 | | | 2 | | | 17 | | |
| Mode of child's control | 2 | | | 3 | | | 5 | | |
| Story 4 | | 3 | 2 | | 25 | 10 | | 28 | 7 |
| Form of response | 2 | | | 8 | | | 10 | | |
| Emphasis | 1 | | | 10 | | | 11 | | |
| Mobility | .. | | | 7 | | | 7 | | |
| Story 5 | | 4 | 3 | | 27 | 10 | | 31 | 8 |
| Form of response | 4 | | | 8 | | | 12 | | |
| Emphasis | .. | | | 19 | | | 19 | | |
| Story 6 | | 7 | 5 | | 22 | 8 | | 29 | 7 |
| Form of response | 4 | | | 8 | | | 12 | | |
| Emphasis | 3 | | | 9 | | | 12 | | |
| Scope of wife's time alternatives | .. | | | 5 | | | 5 | | |
| Story 7 | | 17 | 12 | | 19 | 7 | | 36 | 9 |
| Form of response | 2 | | | 13 | | | 15 | | |
| Emphasis | 9 | | | 6 | | | 15 | | |
| Material possessions | 6 | | | .. | | | 6 | | |
| Story 8 | | 23 | 17 | | 27 | 10 | | 50 | 13 |
| Form of response | 21 | | | 2 | | | 23 | | |
| Emphasis | 2 | | | 14 | | | 16 | | |
| Division of work | .. | | | 11 | | | 11 | | |
| Story 9 | | 2 | 2 | | 53 | 20 | | 55 | 14 |
| Form of response | 1 | | | 4 | | | 5 | | |
| Emphasis | .. | | | 37 | | | 37 | | |
| Material possessions | .. | | | 12 | | | 12 | | |
| Social organization | 1 | | | .. | | | 1 | | |
| Story 10 | | 4 | 3 | | 43 | 17 | | 47 | 12 |
| Form of response | 3 | | | 12 | | | 15 | | |
| Emphasis | 1 | | | 17 | | | 18 | | |
| Control of adult son | .. | | | 14 | | | 14 | | |
| Totals | | 137 | 100 (34) | | 262 | 100 (66) | | 399 | 100 |

greatest number of values common to a family, whereas the fewest were for Stories 4 (move) and 6 (children in school). Stories 1 (first baby) and 3 (children's behavior) provided over half of the traditional shared values. Although the autonomous values held in common were more widely scattered among the stories, Story 9 (transportation) and 10 (control of older son) had the most, together contributing over one-third. No social or change-prone values common to a family occurred but the data were sparse for these types.

As in analysis of composite value profiles by paired roles (page 76), role pairs in common value analysis included husband-wife, husband-son, husband-daughter, wife-son, and wife-daughter. Values common to each role pair were tabulated and percentages of an individual's coded values that he held in common with each other role were computed.

Tables 5.23 through 5.26 show distribution of individuals by role over the wide range of percentages of each individual's values he held in common with each other role. Although a few had over 80 percent and a few under 30 percent of their values in common with another role, the majority of all roles had between 40 and 61 percent in common with each other role.

One-fourth of the husbands held over 60 percent of their coded values in common with their wives but almost one-third had over 60 percent in common with their daughters. The role with the most individuals having less than 50 percent

Table 5.23. Husbands by percentages of their coded values held in common with other roles

| Percentage ranges of husband's values in common | Husbands holding values in common | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|-------------|-----|
| | with W | | with S | | with D | | with WS | | with WD | | with Family | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Over 80 | 2 | 4 | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 71-80 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | | | | | | |
| 61-70 | 8 | 16 | 7 | 16 | 10 | 22 | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 51-60 | 17 | 33 | 14 | 31 | 13 | 28 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 8 |
| 41-50 | 16 | 31 | 16 | 36 | 10 | 22 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 10 |
| 31-40 | 5 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 17 | 38 | 18 | 39 | 10 | 19 |
| 21-30 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 38 | 12 | 26 | 10 | 20 |
| Under 21 | | | 1 | 2 | | | 6 | 13 | 5 | 11 | 21 | 41 |
| Total | 51 | 100 | 45 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 45 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 51 | 100 |
| Percentage means of common values | 53 | | 50 | | 53 | | 30 | | 33 | | 27 | |

Table 5.24. Wives by percentages of their coded values held in common with other roles

| Percentage ranges of wife's values in common | Wives holding values in common | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-----|-------------|-----|
| | with H | | with S | | with D | | with HS | | with HD | | with Family | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Over 80 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 71-80 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 61-70 | 11 | 22 | 8 | 18 | 6 | 13 | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 51-60 | 17 | 33 | 11 | 24 | 17 | 37 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 8 |
| 41-50 | 14 | 27 | 14 | 31 | 15 | 33 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 10 |
| 31-40 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 25 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 27 | 16 | 35 | 10 | 19 |
| 21-30 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 22 | 49 | 12 | 26 | 8 | 16 |
| Under 21 | | | | | | | 5 | 11 | 7 | 15 | 23 | 45 |
| Total | 51 | 100 | 45 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 45 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 51 | 100 |
| Percentage means of common values | 53 | | 49 | | 52 | | 29 | | 33 | | 26 | |

Table 5.25. Sons by percentages of their coded values held in common with other roles

| Percentage ranges of son's values in common | Sons holding values in common | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-----|--------|-----|---------|-----|-------------|-----|
| | with H | | with W | | with HW | | with Family | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Over 80 | | | | | | | | |
| 71-80 | | | | | | | | |
| 61-70 | 14 | 31 | 8 | 18 | | | | |
| 51-60 | 13 | 29 | 18 | 40 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 41-50 | 11 | 25 | 11 | 24 | 8 | 18 | 2 | 4 |
| 31-40 | 6 | 13 | 7 | 16 | 14 | 31 | 4 | 9 |
| 21-30 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 31 | 9 | 20 |
| Under 21 | | | | | 8 | 18 | 29 | 65 |
| Total | 45 | 100 | 45 | 100 | 45 | 100 | 45 | 100 |
| Percentage means of common values | 53 | | 51 | | 31 | | 19 | |

Table 5.26. Daughters by percentages of their coded values held in common with other roles

| Percentage ranges of daughter's values in common | Daughters holding values in common | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|-----|--------|-----|---------|-----|-------------|-----|
| | with H | | with W | | with HW | | with Family | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Over 80 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 71-80 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 7 | | | | |
| 61-70 | 7 | 15 | 7 | 15 | | | | |
| 51-60 | 13 | 28 | 16 | 35 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| 41-50 | 15 | 33 | 14 | 30 | 8 | 17 | 5 | 11 |
| 31-40 | 5 | 11 | 4 | 9 | 18 | 39 | 9 | 20 |
| 21-30 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 22 | 10 | 22 |
| Under 21 | | | | | 7 | 15 | 20 | 43 |
| Total | 46 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 46 | 100 | 46 | 100 |
| Percentage means of common values | 52 | | 52 | | 33 | | 25 | |

of their values in common with another role was wives in relationship with sons.

In combinations of three roles, more husbands had more of their values in common with wife and daughter than with wife and son. Also, a larger number of wives had more of their values in common with husband and daughter than with husband and son. About one-fifth of both husbands and wives held over 40 percent of their values in common with the entire family. Very few sons shared this many, two-thirds of them having less than 21 percent of their values in common with the whole family. The larger the family or group within the family, the smaller the percentage of an individual's values common to the family or group.

Next, the number of values common to each role pair was totaled for all the families and the percentages of an entire role's values by type that were held in common with another role were computed for those roles that could be paired equally (Table 5.27).

The traditional values shared by husband and wife were 42 percent of the husbands' traditional values and 56 percent of the wives' traditional values. Husbands shared a larger percentage of their autonomous values than of their traditional values with their wives. The wives shared nearly the same percentage of each with their husbands.

Sons had more traditional values in common with their fathers and more autonomous values with their mothers. The daughters had nearly an equal number of traditional

Table 5.27. Total coded values for each role by type held in common with other roles equally represented in the sample

| Family member | Value type | Total coded values | Values in common with husband | | Values in common with wife | |
|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|----|----------------------------|----|
| | | | N | % | N | % |
| Husbands (N = 51) | T ^a | 646 | | | 273 | 42 |
| | S | 73 | | | 6 | 8 |
| | A | 749 | | | 510 | 68 |
| | C | 4 | | | | |
| | Total | 1472 | | | 789 | 54 |
| Wives (N = 51) | T | 485 | 273 | 56 | | |
| | S | 48 | 6 | 13 | | |
| | A | 958 | 510 | 53 | | |
| | C | 6 | | | | |
| | Total | 1497 | 789 | 53 | | |
| Sons (N = 45) | T | 647 | 369 | 57 | 277 | 43 |
| | S | 49 | 9 | 18 | 1 | 2 |
| | A | 557 | 281 | 50 | 371 | 67 |
| | C | 5 | | | | |
| | Total | 1258 | 659 | 52 | 649 | 52 |
| Daughters (N = 46) | T | 575 | 309 | 54 | 223 | 39 |
| | S | 35 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 11 |
| | A | 715 | 384 | 54 | 469 | 66 |
| | C | 2 | | | | |
| | Total | 1327 | 697 | 53 | 696 | 52 |

^aT = Traditional S = Social A = Autonomous C = Change-prone

and autonomous values in common with their fathers, but a much larger percentage of autonomous with their mothers. Sons and fathers held the highest percentage of social values in common of any role pair.

Sharing of husbands' and wives' values with sons and daughters is not included because some of the husbands and wives did not have sons and some did not have daughters, whereas all wives were paired equally with husbands and all sons and daughters had both parents represented in the sample.

Table 5.28 shows values held in common in 10 families of identical composition, having one son and one daughter. Although these families varied greatly in the number of common values and in the combinations of roles who held the common values, the 10 families had a mean of 55 percent of the total family values common to three-fourths or more of the family with a range from 35 percent to 75 percent. The number in common for all four roles (the entire family) ranged from 10 percent to 35 percent of the family total. Values coded solely for one member ranged from 13 percent to 22 percent. The common value patterns of these 10 families are shown in Table 5.29.

Table 5.28. Total coded values for ten families by those held in common with four, three, two, and no roles

| Family number | No. of values held in common | | | | | | | | | | Total family values | |
|------------------|------------------------------|-----|----|------------|-----|----|------------|-----|----|-------------|---------------------------|----------|
| | By 4 roles | | | By 3 roles | | | By 2 roles | | | By no roles | | N % |
| | N | X | % | N | X | % | N | X | % | N | % | |
| 2 | 10 | 40 | 33 | 14 | 42 | 34 | 11 | 22 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 122 100 |
| 3 | 7 | 28 | 23 | 12 | 36 | 30 | 15 | 30 | 25 | 27 | 22 | 121 100 |
| 8 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 25 | 27 | 54 | 44 | 26 | 21 | 122 100 |
| 9 | 4 | 16 | 14 | 11 | 33 | 29 | 23 | 46 | 41 | 18 | 16 | 113 100 |
| 23 | 5 | 20 | 17 | 14 | 42 | 37 | 14 | 28 | 25 | 24 | 21 | 114 100 |
| 29 | 3 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 45 | 40 | 16 | 32 | 29 | 23 | 20 | 112 100 |
| 30 | 10 | 40 | 35 | 15 | 45 | 39 | 6 | 12 | 10 | 19 | 16 | 116 100 |
| 40 | 7 | 28 | 24 | 16 | 48 | 41 | 11 | 22 | 19 | 18 | 16 | 116 100 |
| 41 | 6 | 24 | 21 | 12 | 36 | 31 | 16 | 32 | 27 | 24 | 21 | 116 100 |
| 43 | 6 | 24 | 21 | 12 | 36 | 31 | 20 | 40 | 35 | 15 | 13 | 115 100 |
| Total | 61 | 244 | 21 | 131 | 393 | 34 | 159 | 318 | 27 | 212 | 18 | 1167 100 |

Table 5.29. Common value patterns for ten families composed of husband, wife, son and daughter

| Family members holding same values | Family 2 | | | | Family 3 | | | | Family 8 | | | | Family 9 | | | | Family 23 | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----|----|----|----------------|----|----|----|----------------|----|----|----|----------------|----|----|----|----------------|----|----|----|
| | Values by role | | | | Values by role | | | | Values by role | | | | Values by role | | | | Values by role | | | |
| | H ^a | W | S | D | H | W | S | D | H | W | S | D | H | W | S | D | H | W | S | D |
| HWSD ^a | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| HWS | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 6 | 6 | 6 | | | | | | 4 | 4 | 4 | |
| HWD | 4 | 4 | | 4 | 3 | 3 | | 3 | | | | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 4 | 4 | | 4 |
| HSD | 4 | | 4 | 4 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 4 | | 4 | 4 | 6 | | 6 | 6 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| WSD | | 4 | 4 | 4 | | 4 | 4 | 4 | | | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| HW | 2 | 2 | | | 4 | 4 | | | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | | | 5 | 5 | | |
| HS | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 3 | | 8 | | 8 | | 4 | | 4 | | 2 | | | 2 |
| HD | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | | 6 | | 6 | | 6 | | 6 | | | | | |
| WS | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 2 | | 5 | 5 | | | 6 | 6 | | | | | | |
| WD | | 4 | | 4 | | 1 | | 1 | 4 | | 4 | 4 | 4 | | 4 | 4 | 3 | | 3 | 3 |
| SD | | | | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 4 | 4 |
| H | 6 | | | | 6 | | | | 2 | | | | 5 | | | | 7 | | | |
| W | | 5 | | | | 8 | | | 12 | | | | 7 | | | | 6 | | | |
| S | | | 4 | | | | 5 | | | | 2 | | | 4 | | | | | 6 | |
| D | | | | 3 | | | | 8 | | | | 10 | | | | 2 | | | | 5 |
| Total | 32 | 32 | 28 | 30 | 30 | 32 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 30 | 29 | 28 | 27 | 29 | 29 | 28 | 32 | 27 | 27 |

^aH = Husband W = Wife S = Son D = Daughter

Table 5.29. (continued)

| Family members holding same values | Family 29 | | | | | | Family 30 | | | | | | Family 40 | | | | | | Family 41 | | | | | | Family 43 | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----|----|----|--|--|----------------|----|----|----|--|---|----------------|----|----|----|--|---|----------------|----|----|----|--|---|----------------|----|----|----|---|--|
| | Values by role | | | | | | Values by role | | | | | | Values by role | | | | | | Values by role | | | | | | Values by role | | | | | |
| | H | W | S | D | | | H | W | S | D | | | H | W | S | D | | | H | W | S | D | | | H | W | S | D | | |
| HWSD | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | | | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | | | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | | | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | | |
| HWS | 4 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | | | | 8 | 8 | 8 | | | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| HWSD | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 6 | 6 | | 6 | | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | | 4 | 4 | | 4 | | |
| HSD | 6 | | 6 | 6 | | | 5 | | 5 | 5 | | | 3 | | | 3 | | | | | | | | 5 | | 5 | 5 | 5 | | |
| WSD | | 4 | 4 | 4 | | | | 4 | 4 | 4 | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| HW | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| HS | 4 | | 4 | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | | 4 | | 4 | | | | 4 | | 4 | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | |
| HD | 1 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 6 | | | 6 | | |
| WS | | 5 | | 5 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 8 | 8 | | | |
| WD | | | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | 3 | | 3 | | | | 2 | | 2 | | | |
| SD | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 4 | 4 | 4 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| H | 7 | | | | | | 7 | | | | | | 4 | | | | | | 9 | | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| W | 11 | | | | | | 7 | | | | | | 3 | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | 5 | | | | |
| S | | 1 | | | | | | 4 | | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 | | | |
| D | | | 4 | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 6 | | | | | | | 6 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| Total | 29 | 31 | 25 | 27 | | | 30 | 30 | 26 | 30 | | | 30 | 29 | 32 | 25 | | | 28 | 30 | 29 | 29 | | | 29 | 29 | 30 | 27 | | |

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This final chapter presents a summary of the study and the findings. Limitations of the study, implications for further research and implications for home management are included.

Summary

This study was performed as Phase II of a Michigan Experiment Station project of the Department of Home Management and Child Development of Michigan State University. The master project is entitled "Values Underlying Managerial Decisions in the Family." The general purposes of this project were to carefully select a definition of values that would distinguish them from a host of related concepts and to attempt to identify family values. In Phase I Engebretson¹ developed a projective story completion instrument to gather data and constructed a typology as a conceptual system to identify and classify values. She explored values of groups of wives using these instruments. The present study, Phase II, using the same projective device and conceptual system, explored the values of the entire family.

¹Engebretson, op. cit.

The basic objectives of the present research were:

(1) to elicit values of individuals in the family and of the entire family using an incomplete story device and (2) to identify and compare the values of the family members by means of a constructed typology. In this second phase of the master project another objective was simultaneously to explore further the fruitfulness of the story completion instrument as a device to elicit values and the typology as a conceptual system to identify, structure and analyze responses.

The projective stories, built around a set of family decision situations, were administered by the researcher to families, comprised of husband, wife and children between the ages of 12 and 18. Simultaneously, in their own homes, the respondents wrote completions to the stories. Questions at the end of each story, "What should be done?" and "Why?" guided respondents to express their "conceptions of the desirable which affect choices among possible courses of action"--the definition of values chosen for the master project. Family decision situations were selected as subject matter for the stories since values can be revealed through decision-making.

Values were identified and organized by means of the constructed typology which consisted of four value types: traditional, social, autonomous, and change-prone, developed for twelve themes. The same coders worked on both Phase I and Phase II. Analysis included construction

of a composite value profile for each respondent, analysis by type and role in stories and in themes, and exploration of common values in the family.

Fifty-one families composed of husband, wife and children between the ages of 12 and 18 constituted the sample. Wives' ages ranged from 30 to 54 and husbands' ages from 30 to 59. The majority of family incomes were over \$10,000 and occupations were chiefly professional and managerial for the husbands. Eighty percent of the wives were employed before marriage, whereas only 31 percent were employed afterwards. Education ranged from eighth grade to the master's degree for wives and to the Ph.D. degree for husbands. Almost two-thirds of the husbands had college degrees.

Number of values coded for individuals ranged from 23 to 34, with a mean of 29. Of the total values coded, 42 percent were traditional and 54 percent autonomous; only 4 percent were social and less than 1 percent change-prone.

On the continuum of composite value profiles ranging from traditional to autonomous, husbands' profiles were about equally distributed in each direction from the center point. The wives were largely at the autonomous end. Although the sons and daughters had more profiles at the center point than their parents, the sons tended toward traditional and the daughters toward autonomous. A larger proportion of younger sons had predominantly traditional profiles than any other age group of any role.

The group of respondents with the most traditional profiles had the lowest mean coded values. The mean increased as the proportion of autonomous values increased.

Comparison of composite value profiles of husbands and wives with age, income, education, and occupation showed predominantly autonomous profiles increasing somewhat with increase in age, amount of income, and especially amount of education. For wives, the data indicate a possible trend toward more autonomous profiles for the professionally employed. Type of employment is no doubt related to education.

The most values were coded for Stories 1 (first baby) and 3 (children's behavior), and the least for 5 (vacation) and 2 (new home) for all respondents and for all roles. Story 5 yielded the most social values and Story 7 (furniture) the most change-prone. Only Story 1 elicited more traditional than autonomous values for the total group and for all roles.

The proportion of values of each type varied with role for some stories. Wives alone did not have more traditional values on Story 3 (children's behavior). Husbands and sons had more traditional values but wives and daughters more autonomous on Story 6 (children in school). Sons and daughters had more traditional values and parents more autonomous on Stories 4 (move) and 7 (furniture), showing differences by sex in the first comparison and by age (or maturity) in the second. For all roles, Stories 2 (new home) and 9

(transportation) elicited mostly autonomous values. Story 10 (son's marriage) also yielded more autonomous values for all except sons.

Since the two general themes, form of response and emphasis, were coded from every story, equally large numbers of values fell into each. The next largest numbers were coded for scope of wife's time alternatives and material possessions, each having two or more story sources.

Themes predominantly traditional were control of child's behavior (for all roles); social organization (for wives and daughters); mobility, mode of child's control, and form of response (for sons and daughters); and scope of wife's time alternatives (for husbands only).

Themes predominantly autonomous were division of work (for all roles); control of adult son and emphasis (for all roles but sons); mobility and mode of child's control (for husbands and wives); kinship and material possessions (for wives and daughters); and scope of wife's time alternatives (for daughters only).

Comparison of three theme categories, form of response, emphasis and all other themes, showed some consistencies as well as some unexplained inconsistencies. The relative proportions of each role in a type were stable and similar for all three theme categories for traditional and autonomous types, seeming to support the validity of these two types. For each role, relative proportions of type appeared to vary somewhat from one theme category to another.

Composite value profiles of role pairs were compared with those of identical pairs in other families. Husband-daughter and wife-daughter pairs had the most profiles alike and wife-son pairs the fewest. In combination with any other role, wives had more autonomous profiles than did the other role, with nearly three-fourths of their profiles more autonomous than their sons' profiles. The majority of paired wife-daughter profiles were predominantly autonomous. Husbands in combination with wives had the fewest profiles in which both were predominantly traditional, yet husbands in combination with sons had the most.

Of the 399 instances in which a value was common to the entire family, two-thirds were autonomous values and one-third traditional. The greatest number of common values were for Story 9 (transportation) and Story 8 (dishwashing) and the fewest for Story 4 (move) and Story 6 (children in school).

The percentage of an individual's values that he held in common with another family member ranged from 20 percent to over 80 percent with means for the four roles ranging from 49 percent to 53 percent. In combinations of three roles, the husband, wife and daughter had more values in common than did the husband, wife and son. The larger the family, the smaller the percentage of each role's values common to the family.

Percentages of an entire role's coded values by type that were held in common with another role were compared.

All roles held about an equal percentage of traditional and autonomous values in common with husbands but all roles held more autonomous values in common with wives.

Analysis of common values for the 10 four-member families with one son and one daughter indicate a range of 10 percent to 35 percent of the family's total values common to the entire family. A mean of 55 percent of the total values were common to three or more of the family. Patterns of commonality varied from family to family in quantity and in roles holding the common values.

The objectives of the study were met. The incomplete stories appeared to be meaningful to the respondents and elicited a quantity of value-laden material from which values could be identified by means of the constructed typology. Further, the typology did serve as a valuable framework by which the values could be organized and compared.

Comparison of Findings Between Phase I and Phase II

Respondents in Phase I were wives ranging in age from the early 20's to over 60, in comparison to the range from the early 30's to the early 50's for wives in Phase II. Incomes and educational levels were similar for wives in both phases. Wives' gainful occupations before and after marriage were also similar but for Phase II a few more wives were employed after marriage, and a few more were in professional and managerial occupations.

The mean number of coded values per individual was

29 for both phases. In Phase I, coded values were 59 percent autonomous, 37 percent traditional, 3 percent social and 1 percent change-prone for the wives. Wives in Phase II had 64 percent autonomous, 32 percent traditional, 3 percent social and 1 percent change-prone values. When all family members were included, the proportions of types were 54 percent autonomous, 42 percent traditional, 4 percent social and less than 1 percent change-prone. The prevalence of traditional and autonomous types in data of both studies provides support for validity of these two types.

In Phase I, 39 percent of wives' composite value profiles were mainly autonomous, whereas 27 percent of respondents in Phase II had mainly autonomous profiles. Only 3 percent in Phase I had mainly traditional profiles, lower than the 13 percent in Phase II. For both phases, the group of individuals with most traditional profiles had the lowest mean coded values. Both phases showed a slight trend toward more autonomous profiles for those with higher incomes and more education, the latter being slightly more pronounced in Phase II.

Analysis of three theme categories, form of response, emphasis, and all other themes, showed relative proportions of respondent classes in each type to be fairly consistent across the three categories for the traditional and autonomous types for both phases.

Predominantly traditional were Story 1 (first baby) for both phases and Story 3 (children's behavior) for Phase

I and all except the wives in Phase II. Stories 2 (new home) and 9 (transportation) were among the most autonomous for Phase II as well as for Phase I. Story 10 (son's marriage) was also largely autonomous for all except the sons. Wives in both phases were predominantly autonomous for Stories 4 (move), 6 (children in school), and 5 (vacation). Phase I wives' social values were evident in Story 5 (vacation) and Story 7 (furniture). Phase II wives' social values were coded primarily from Story 5. Wives from both phases had some social values coded from Story 6 (children in school). Change-prone values for both phases came from Story 7 in the main.

Theme analysis indicated control of child's behavior as the only theme with predominantly traditional values for Phase I and as the most traditional theme for Phase II except for husbands who had more in scope of wife's time alternatives. As for themes predominantly autonomous, division of work was the only one for both phases and all roles. However, mode of child's control, mobility, and focus of functional order ranked high for wives of Phase I and for wives and husbands in Phase II. Control of adult son was high in autonomous values for all categories of respondents except sons. In both phases most of the social values were coded in kinship and focus of functional order. Phase II had more social values spread over other themes than did Phase I. Change-prone values were coded in material possessions in both phases. Wives in Phase I had some change-

prone values in mobility, whereas wives in Phase II had some in mode of child's control.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of this study include those imposed intentionally to obtain manageable scope, and those inherent in an exploratory study which future research might be expected to overcome.

1. The selected situations in the incomplete story device did not presume to elicit the entire value system of a respondent or a family, nor was the typology expected to encompass all the values explicit and implicit in the responses but to serve as a significant basis for comparison, hence discussion concerns coded values.
2. Generalizations are limited to this non-probability sample which was selected to assure: (a) ability to express ideas in writing, (b) accessibility by telephone and car, (c) unbroken families, (d) children old enough to find the story situations meaningful and to write completions, and (e) willingness to meet as a family to complete the stories.
3. The differences observed were not submitted to statistical check within the confines of this study so it is not known to what extent the differences might be due to chance.
4. The stories were intended to be completed by individuals capable of written expression and would not be appropriate for use in this form for illiterate or low

literate groups.

5. Validity and reliability tests performed in Phase I, although not rigorous, were thought to be satisfactory for analysis of the unstructured data in this type of study.

Implications for Further Study

New data concerning family values are contributed by this study. Although conclusions are not of high generality, they generate hypotheses and suggestions for further study.

Roles appear to have characteristic differences in values which should be explored further with other population samples. Do the values of family members have the same variations in other socio-economic classes? Will differences by education be more apparent in wider educational ranges than were present in this study? Are there geographical variations in family values? What are the cross-cultural or sub-cultural differences in values of the family and its members?

The finding that the younger sons, well-known to mature less rapidly than daughters, had the most traditional values of the family leads to questions concerning the relationship of maturity, as well as sex, to values. Do values change with maturity? If an individual has had less experience with a situation, is he likely to have more traditional values about it?

The present study begins to explore the common value patterns of the family. There does appear to be a network of common values. Some families, especially the larger ones, had few values common to the entire family, but had many common to pairs or groups of three or more. Each member seems to have some individually held values, but each has some in common with each other member of his family. Also, certain values seem to be more frequently common to specific role pairs. What are the consequences of these varying patterns of commonality?

Similarly, results show some families held widely different and others very similar values within the same family. What are the implications for decision-making and for family relationships closely associated with home management of holding similar or disparate values.

A next step in family value research could be to develop an instrument suitable for use in assessing values of a wider sample. The responses in the two phases of this study and material in the typology could be used as a basis for an inventory-type instrument suitable for respondents of all educational levels with varying skills in verbal expression. Precoding would be possible and would add to ease in analysis so a larger sample with the possibility of more respondent and response variation could be utilized. An instrument of this type would be useful in conjunction with the projective stories and with depth interviews to give basis for further evaluation of validity and reliability.

Investigation of the development or change of values in the family was not a part of the present study. It appears pertinent for further research to explore whether values do change in a predictable way as, for example, with maturity. Bell and Vogel comment:

. . . values are constantly being re-evaluated in the light of appropriateness, in solving the problems which arise in the family. While a solution which is wholly out of tune with family values may not be permitted, there may be a gradual process of weakening of some family values, and other values may develop which are more appropriate to contemporary conditions and which do not interfere greatly with other family values.

Any change, however, may potentially upset the system of values so that there is usually careful explanation and rationalization of the changes in the light of other values.¹

Numerous hypotheses are suggested as a result of this exploratory investigation. Some of these are presented with the hope that they will help direct the search for further knowledge about family values.

1. Husbands, wives, sons and daughters tend to have characteristically different value profiles: wives have the most autonomous profiles, daughters next most autonomous, husbands about equal in autonomous and traditional values and sons slightly more traditional than autonomous values.
2. Quantity of value expression is a function of role: wives express the largest number of values, daughters

¹Norman W. Bell and Ezra F. Vogel (eds.), A Modern Introduction to the Family (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960), p. 28.

the next largest, then husbands, and sons the fewest.

3. Quantity of value expression is a function of type: persons holding predominantly traditional values will express fewer values; persons holding predominantly autonomous values will express a larger number of values.
4. Fewer values will be expressed in relation to themes of a higher level of abstraction, such as, focus of functional order and social organization.
5. Wives have more autonomous values than do husbands, even in themes which tend to be tradition-bound, as scope of wife's time alternatives.
6. The higher the level of education, the more autonomous values an individual will hold.
7. Sons 12 and 13 years of age have more traditional values than do sons 17 and 18 years of age.
8. Husbands' value profiles are more like their daughters' profiles than like their wives' or their sons'.
9. Wives' value profiles are most similar to their husbands' and their daughters' and least similar to their sons' profiles.
10. All family roles have more traditional values related to family members and more autonomous values related to possessions.
11. Families hold more autonomous than traditional

values in common.

12. Each family member holds about half of his values in common with each other family member.

Implications for Home Management

Because values are involved in every phase and process of management they are firmly in the realm of home management. The field of home management has a need as well as a responsibility to conduct further value research.

Even though more research is needed to predict the consequences of holding a value type or combination of types, of holding values in common with other family members, or of having values different from other family members, some deductions and conjectures can be made which have bearing on further study of values as related to home management.

For instance, since family roles seem to have characteristically different value profiles, assumption cannot be made, in assessing values, that the wife will be representative of the whole family, but data from other family members as well must be included.

The types of values held may influence the amount and kind of information the individual or family is willing to seek or accept. Persons with autonomous values often have multiple ends with multiple alternatives among means and modes. No doubt these people will be more open to new information than those with traditional values who state ends categorically and often elevate means and modes to ends.

The trend of the findings indicates that it may be possible for the researcher or the professional in home management to make some predictions about the values influencing a family's decisions by knowing the family composition including the number, age, role, and also amount of education of members of the family.

Since decision-making within the family may involve several or all of the members of the family in goal formation, in provision and use of resources, and in consequences of decisions made, the finding that the families studied varied widely in the number and type of values they held in common is of utmost importance. Deacon and Bratton¹ state that recognition of underlying individual or family values has considerable significance and that families who have developed or recognized a system of values will experience more satisfaction in their management than those who have not. Although this research identified and compared the values of the families, the extent to which the families themselves were aware of their own values is not known.

Indications that values vary with age and level of education suggest the need for home management professionals to have more knowledge about predictable influences on values.

Values and other related concepts such as interests, preferences and desires are conceptually distinct entities. Operationally maintaining this distinction is important in value research.

¹Deacon and Bratton, op. cit., p. 763.

LITERATURE CITED

1. BECKER, HOWARD. Through Values to Social Interpretation. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1950.
2. BELL, NORMAN W., and VOGEL, EZRA F. (eds.). A Modern Introduction to the Family. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.
3. BENNER, NORMA. "The Development and Use of a Projective Type Test to Determine Values of Students from Varying Social Classes." Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Home Economics in the Graduate School, Southern Illinois University, 1963.
4. BEYER, GLENN H. Housing and Personal Values. Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Memoir 364 (Ithaca, New York, 1959).
5. CONNOR, RUTH, GREEN, HELEN F., and WALTERS, JAMES. "Agreement of Family Member Conceptions of 'Good' Parent and Child Roles," Social Forces, XXXVI (1958), 353-358.
6. COYLE, GRACE L. "Concepts Relevant to Helping the Family as a Group," Social Casework, XLIII (July, 1962), 347-354.
7. CUTLER, VIRGINIA F. Personal and Family Values in the Choice of a Home. Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 840 (Ithaca, New York, November, 1947).
8. DEACON, RUTH E., and BRATTON, ESTHER CREW. "Home Management--Focus and Function," Journal of Home Economics, LIV (November, 1962), 760-766.
9. DIAZ GUERRERO, ROGELIO. "Neurosis and the Mexican Family Structure," American Journal of Psychiatry, CXII (1955), 411.
10. DIESING, PAUL. Reason in Society: Five Types of Decisions and their Social Consequences. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1962.
11. DOBY, JOHN T. (ed.). An Introduction to Social Research. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: The Stackpole Company, 1954.

12. DYER, DORIS M. "Students' Wives Values as Reflected in Personal and Family Activities." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Home Management and Child Development, Michigan State University, 1962.
13. EAMES, S. MORRIS. "Valuing, Obligation, and Evaluation," Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, XXIV (March, 1964), 318-328.
14. ENGBRETSON, CAROL L. "Analysis by a Constructed Typology of Wives' Values Evident in Managerial Decision Situations." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Home Management and Child Development, Michigan State University, 1965.
15. FERNANDEZ-MARINA, RAMON, MALDONADO-SIERRA, EDUARDO D., and TRENT, RICHARD D. "Three Basic Themes in Mexican and Puerto Rican Family Values," The Journal of Social Psychology, XLVIII (1958), 167-181.
16. FISHER, SARA C. Relationships in Attitudes, Opinions, and Values Among Family Members. University of California Publication in Culture and Society II. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1948.
17. FRANK, LAWRENCE K. "The Philosophy of Home Management," Home Management Papers, Seventh International Management Congress. Washington, D.C.: National Management Council, 1938.
18. GOLDSCHMIDT, WALTER, and EDGERTON, TOBERT B. "A Picture Technique for the Study of Values," American Anthropology, LXIII (February, 1961), 26-47.
19. HEAL, FLORENCE L. D. "Values in a Group of Lower Socio-Economic Students," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (November, 1960), 370-372.
20. HENLE, R. J., S.J. "Intellectual Elements in Home Economics Education," Journal of Home Economics, LII (January, 1960), 9-12.
21. JACOB, PHILLIP E., and FLINK, JAMES J., with the collaboration of Hedvah L. Shuchman. "Values and Their Function in Decision-Making," Supplement to the American Behavioral Scientist, IX, No. 9 (May, 1962), 1-38.
22. KETCHUM, FRANCES N. "A Study of Homemakers Values as Reflected in Time Used for Family and Personal Activities." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Home Management and Child Development, Michigan State University, 1961.

23. KLUCKHOHN, CLYDE, and others. "Values and Value-Orientations in the Theory of Action," in Toward a General Theory of Action. Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (eds.). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1954.
24. KOHLMANN, ELEANORE L. "Development of an Instrument to Determine Values of Homemakers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, 1961.
25. KOHN, MELVIN L. "Social Class and Parental Values," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (January, 1959), 337-351.
26. MILLAR, PAMELIA LOTT. "A Pilot Study of Patterns in Home Management over a Period of Three Generations in a Selected Group of Families." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Home Management and Child Development, Michigan State University, 1959.
27. MORRIS, CHARLES, and JONES, LYLE V. "Value Scales and Dimensions," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, LI (1955), 523-535.
28. MOTZ, ANABELLE B. "The Role Conception Inventory: A Tool for Research in Social Psychology," American Sociological Review, XVII (August, 1952), 465-471.
29. SCOTT, WILLIAM A. "Empirical Assessment of Values and Ideologies," American Sociological Review, XXIV (June, 1959), 299-310.
30. SLOCUM, W. L., and STONE, CAROL L. "A Method for Measuring Family Images Held by Teen-Agers," Marriage and Family Living, XXI (August, 1959), 245-250.
31. SMITH, M. BREWSTER. "'Mental Health' Reconsidered: A Special Case of the Problem of Values in Psychology," American Psychologist, XVI (June, 1961), 299-306.
32. _____. "Personal Values in the Study of Lives," in The Study of Lives. Robert W. White (ed.). New York: Atherton Press, 1963.
33. STEIN, HERMAN D., and CLOWARD, RICHARD A. (eds.). Social Perspectives on Behavior. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.
34. TAYLOR, PAUL W. Normative Discourse. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961.

35. WEISSKOPF, WALTER A. "Existence and Values," in New Knowledge in Human Values. Abraham H. Maslow (ed.). New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.
36. WHEELWRIGHT, PHILIP. A Critical Introduction to Ethics. Third Edition. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1959.
37. WILLIAMS, ROBIN M. "Value Orientations in American Society," in Social Perspectives on Behavior. Herman D. Stein and Richard A. Cloward (eds.). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.
38. WOODRUFF, ASAHEL D. "The Concept-Value Theory of Human Behavior," Journal of General Psychology, XL (1949), 141-154.

APPENDIX

Directions for Administering the
Incomplete Stories, the Incomplete
Story Instrument, and Samples from
Coding Manual

Michigan State University
Agricultural Experiment Station
Project 700, Phase II

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE INCOMPLETE STORIES

Here are 10 stories about situations in which a family might find itself. Read each one carefully and then write what in your opinion should be done in each situation; that is, what in your opinion ought to be done. You may have had the same decisions to make yourself in your own home, but please answer, not what you did but what you think this family ought to do--what would be desirable for them to do and the reasons why. There are no right or wrong answers.

We do not want you to put your name on the paper. Write what you really think. Without your name on the paper, you can write honestly what you think.

When you read the first story you will see that there are two questions at the end. Please think about these questions. They will help you to finish the story. Use your imagination. Write clearly and as quickly as you can. When you finish the first story continue to the next story without delay.

Remember--answer what you think they ought to do, not what you did, unless they happen to be the same. Try to finish all ten stories. It shouldn't take more than an hour to complete them. Do you have any questions?

Michigan State University
Agricultural Experiment Station
Project 700, Phase II

Record No. _____

Personal Data:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Wife: | 3. Ages of all children |
| Age _____ | boys _____ |
| Education _____ | girls _____ |
| Occupation _____ | _____ |
| Occupation before marriage _____ | _____ |
| 2. Husband: | 4. Family income before |
| Age _____ | subtracting taxes: |
| Education _____ | Below \$2,999 _____ |
| Occupation _____ | \$3,000 - \$4,999 _____ |
| | \$5,000 - \$6,999 _____ |
| | \$7,000 - \$9,999 _____ |
| | \$10,000 and over _____ |

Record No. _____

1. Mr. and Mrs. Smith were married recently and are living in an apartment. Mrs. Smith worked for a few years before marriage and has continued on since. She likes her work and they need the money, but now she is pregnant.

What should the Smiths do after the baby comes?

Why? Give all the reasons for your choice.

2. Because Mr. Smith's job has been transferred to another state, Mr. and Mrs. Smith have to find a place to live in the new location. They have two young children, a boy three and a girl one year old. As they think about their move they realize that their new home must have certain characteristics if it is to be what they want.

What should the place they want to find be like?

Why? Give all the reasons for choosing the features or characteristics.

Record No. _____

3. On a vacation visiting relatives and friends, the Smiths had difficulty with their children's behavior. The children's ages then were two and four.

What should the Smiths do about the way their children behave?

Why? Give all the reasons for your answer.

4. Next year the plant in the eastern part of the country where Mr. Smith works is moving to another part of the country. He has been offered a job in its new location. The plant in the east is closing so if he stays he will have to find a new job. The Smiths have four children, a boy eight, a girl six, and another girl and boy who are not yet in school.

What should the Smiths do?

Why? Give all the reasons for your choice.

Record No. _____

5. Mr. Smith this year will have a two-week vacation in the summer. His family is composed of himself, his wife and their four children--three of whom are in elementary school and one who is four years old.

What should the Smiths do on their vacation?

Why? Give all the reasons for your choice.

6. At this point the oldest of the Smith children, Bob, is a freshman in high school, the two girls are in elementary school, and the youngest, Jack, is five years old. Next year Jack will be in school, too, and the family is thinking about this new situation when all the children are in school.

What changes should they make in this new situation?

Why? Give all the reasons for your answer.

Record No. _____

7. The Smith children are now in high school and elementary school and they have had their living room furniture since the family was established. It is still usable but scratched and worn looking.

What should the family do about the furniture?

Why? Give all the reasons for your answer.

8. In the Smith family, even though they have a dishwasher, each member thinks his most disliked task is doing the dishes. Bob and Nancy are in high school and Mary and Jack are in elementary school. The children are busy with school work and activities outside of school hours.

What should the Smiths do about the dishes?

Why? What are all the reasons for your choice?

Record No. _____

9. Mr. and Mrs. Smith have a 1961 automobile in the low-priced range. Mr. Smith needs the car to drive to work. Mrs. Smith needs the car for her activities and the oldest of their four school age children has just purchased his first driver's license.

What should the Smiths do about the situation?

Why? Give all the reasons for your answer.

10. When Bob was a sophomore in college he fell in love with and wanted to marry a classmate at the same college.

What should the Smiths do?

Why? Give all the reasons for your answer.

Samples from the coding manual:

Material possessions

from typology:

examples from actual responses:

- 1 traditional
attached to possessions
(possessions to give security), people take care of 'things,' quality and appearance

In the first place I do not believe in allowing the children to ruin the furniture, I still use some I started with over 30 years ago and there are no scratches, I believe that it is a terrible waste of money to allow this condition. The Husband works to hard for his money to allow it.

- 2 social
possessions secondary to people, children permitted to use the furniture, possessions are for the enjoyment and satisfaction of the family members

It could be a family project to paint redo the furniture., It just gives you a better feeling to have things look better if you all help.

- 3 autonomous
possessions are regarded as tools to help the family attain growth and development purposes in addition to enjoyment and satisfaction; many plans and alternatives seen for use, acquisition and replacement

It depends on 1) family income; std of living to which they are accustomed 2) desirable to spruce up the house now that friends of children will be coming over, etc. 3) must decide what's more important - - present or future expenditures, say for college.

- 4 change-prone
new and different possessions are prized but there is little attachment to 'things' as such, i.e., a house is thought of as something that can be easily acquired, sold or exchanged

Sell it--or use it in the cottage, or give it to a worthy person. Buy new! The change would be good for all the family as well as giving a decided lift to the mother who has to clean every day. Some of it can be used in a rec room, some in the bedrooms as they, too, have probably had much wear, tear.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293006850154