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Publication of the Allport, Vernon, Lindzey *Study of Values* (SV) in 1931 marked in many ways the beginning of psychology's concern with the measurement of human values (cf. Tisdale, 1961). This inventory has been used more than any other since, and is still most commonly used today for measurements of this sort. An examination of the college norms in the test Manual, however, reveals that only one school west of the Mississippi is represented: the University of Minnesota. This study is designed, therefore, to examine and evaluate this lack by comparing SV profiles from three midwest college samples with those reported in the Manual.

**PROCEDURE**

The SV itself is a 45 item paper and pencil scale for college students designed to measure the relative strength of one's values or interests in six different areas. Derived initially from Spranger's (1928) classification of men into different pure value-types, the test definitions of the variables currently are as follows:

1. *Theoretical*—This man is concerned primarily with the discovery of truth; he is characterized by an unemotional "intellectual" attitude in his desire for ordering and systematizing knowledge.

2. *Economic*—This type finds his chief interest in what is useful, and usually regards both objects and people from the standpoint of their possible or actual utility.

3. *Aesthetic*—The aesthetic man, in many ways quite the opposite of the theoretical, finds form and harmony to be the highest values in life. Each experience for him is to be judged intrinsically from the standpoint of its grace, beauty, or appropriateness.

4. *Social*—Although the highest value for this type is the love of people as ends in themselves, the SV has found it necessary to attempt to measure only the altruistic or philanthropic aspect of that love.

5. *Political*—Although this value is not always directly expressed in an individual's desire for personal influence, the man who exhibits it is interested primarily in power and the use of power in what he sees as the competition and struggle of life.

6. *Religious*—The highest value of this man is defined as the desire for unity. "He is mystical, and seeks to comprehend the cosmos as a whole, to relate himself to its embracing totality" (Allport, Vernon, Lindzey, 1960, p. 5).

The samples were drawn from three colleges who had scores
on the SV already available at the start of this study, and who were willing to share these with the researcher. All belong to the same athletic conference; all are undergraduate, private, liberal arts schools; all have received substantial awards from the Ford Foundation within the last few years: College A, located in Minnesota, has a current enrollment of about 1300 and (unlike the other two) is unrelated to any church body. College B, in Iowa, currently enrolls about 900 students and is related to The Methodist Church. College C, also in Minnesota, has approximately 2000 students and is described in the catalogue as "a college of the American Lutheran Church." College A contributed a sample of 74 students, College B a sample of 136, and College C a sample of 230. These bring the total to 440 Ss in all, 183 males and 257 females. Since there are typically sex differences in SV profiles, scores for the total sample of 440 will be reported but discussion will deal only with particular male and female subsamples.

It should be noted that the samples from these schools cannot claim to be representative with any finality. Since they are essentially accidental rather than random (cf. Chein, 1959), they may or may not be affected by systematic biases. The general norms with which they are compared also appear to be similar in this respect. The test has been standardized on 8369 college students, 5894 males and 2475 females, representing 20 different colleges and universities. Despite considerable diversity, the authors clearly state in the Manual (p. 11) that "we cannot claim that they [the schools] represent a systematic sampling of American Colleges." Ultimately, then, one must be careful about the sorts of inferences to be drawn from these data.

Results

The means and standard deviations of the norm group and the samples used in this study are placed together in Table 1 for comparison.

Since standard deviations were not available for the norm group as a whole, comparison here was with that portion for which the necessary statistic was reported. Taken together as a composite (ABC), the three schools show significant differences from reported norms in all of the values except the Social. On the basis of this evidence, the national norm sampling appears to have a rather questionable usefulness in describing these colleges.

One notes, however, that the schools exhibit a number of differences among themselves and do not contribute equally to the composite differences. College B, for instance shows only one variable mean which is significantly different from the norm. A and C, on the other hand, each show 7 out of 12 possible differ-
### Table 1. Group Means and Standard Deviations on SV Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Theoretical Mean ± S.D.</th>
<th>Economic Mean ± S.D.</th>
<th>Aesthetic Mean ± S.D.</th>
<th>Social Mean ± S.D.</th>
<th>Political Mean ± S.D.</th>
<th>Religious Mean ± S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>45.78 ± 8.55</td>
<td>36.05*** ± 10.09</td>
<td>7.72 ± 37.63</td>
<td>7.92 ± 43.80</td>
<td>7.47 ± 34.44</td>
<td>12.09 ± 10.09</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>41.74*** ± 2.43</td>
<td>28.83*** ± 9.51</td>
<td>8.19 ± 39.76</td>
<td>7.51 ± 37.62</td>
<td>6.99 ± 41.58</td>
<td>8.00 ± 9.00</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>43.60 ± 7.12</td>
<td>42.50 ± 8.32</td>
<td>9.65 ± 35.71</td>
<td>6.92 ± 43.15</td>
<td>7.16 ± 37.55</td>
<td>9.62 ± 8.00</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>35.64 ± 6.37</td>
<td>36.94 ± 7.21</td>
<td>6.98 ± 41.45</td>
<td>7.28 ± 37.07</td>
<td>6.06 ± 44.99</td>
<td>8.63 ± 7.60</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>39.76*** ± 6.93</td>
<td>38.70*** ± 9.29</td>
<td>10.49 ± 36.76</td>
<td>7.39 ± 41.62</td>
<td>7.79 ± 45.77**</td>
<td>8.00 ± 8.2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>34.18** ± 6.90</td>
<td>34.27*** ± 7.44</td>
<td>7.70 ± 41.30</td>
<td>7.52 ± 36.60*</td>
<td>6.56 ± 50.66**</td>
<td>6.76 ± 6.12</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>42.37* ± 7.80</td>
<td>39.35*** ± 9.49</td>
<td>8.93 ± 36.61</td>
<td>7.40 ± 42.61</td>
<td>7.57 ± 40.53**</td>
<td>10.74 ± 8.29</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>35.58 ± 7.24</td>
<td>34.36*** ± 7.79</td>
<td>44.04* ± 9.95</td>
<td>7.47 ± 36.87</td>
<td>6.48 ± 47.82**</td>
<td>8.29 ± 10.0</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.40*** ± 8.19</td>
<td>36.44*** ± 8.89</td>
<td>41.78*** ± 9.19</td>
<td>7.77 ± 39.26**</td>
<td>7.51 ± 44.79***</td>
<td>10.05 ± 8.29</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>43.75 ± 7.34</td>
<td>42.78 ± 7.92</td>
<td>35.09 ± 8.49</td>
<td>37.04 ± 7.03</td>
<td>42.94 ± 6.64</td>
<td>38.20 ± 9.32</td>
<td>2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>35.75 ± 7.19</td>
<td>37.87 ± 7.30</td>
<td>42.67 ± 8.34</td>
<td>42.03 ± 7.02</td>
<td>43.81 ± 6.23</td>
<td>43.81 ± 9.40</td>
<td>1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.75 ± 7.27</td>
<td>40.33 ± 7.61</td>
<td>38.88 ± 8.42</td>
<td>39.56 ± 7.03</td>
<td>40.39 ± 6.64</td>
<td>41.01 ± 9.31</td>
<td>3778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly different from corresponding Norm group, p < .05.
** Significantly different from corresponding Norm group, p < .01.
*** Significantly different from corresponding Norm group, p < .001.
ences. Looking at each value for which differences are to be found, one sees that the male scores generally show differences between two of the schools and the norm group: for the Economic and Religious A and C are different; for the Aesthetic, A and B; only C is different for the Theoretical. With the females, in three instances one school is different from the norm: Aesthetic, school A; Political and Religious, School C. On the Theoretical and Economic values, women from both schools A and C differ from the norm group. Thus each school is both like the norm group and the other schools in some ways and unlike them in others.

Unfortunately, these comparisons do not communicate any clear sense of resemblances or differences in terms of the order in which the test variables were ranked. It is, for instance, quite possible for any given group to show a number of significant differences from the norm group on the mean scores for the variables, yet still to place them in the same rank order. This kind of thing, in fact, happened in the case of the females from schools B and C in relation to each other. In order to investigate the degrees of similarities in these rankings which the SV is at bottom designed to measure, the variables were ranked for each sample and the appropriate rho's computed (Table 2).

Table 2. SV Variable Rank Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Norm Group</th>
<th>ABC</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norm Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>+.89*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.69</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>+.94*</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>+.94*</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values above diagonal are for male.
Values below diagonal are for females.
* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at .01 level.

The general picture which emerges tends to reveal some, but not uniform, similarities among the groups when the sexes are treated separately. Although the total sample correlations for
males and females with the corresponding norm groups reached significance, none of the single school male sample rankings were significantly related either to the norm group or each other. Schools B and C females' correlations did reach significance both with the norm group and with each other. Thus, although the women's SV scores in school C deviate from the norm in their mean values, they and the women's scores from B hold similar relative hierarchical relationships. In the light of the fact that absolute values of the obtained correlations tend to be higher for the larger sized groups, one might suggest that the female norms reported in the Manual probably would correspond fairly well in terms of order with some other sample of equal size drawn from the midwest or perhaps the western half of the United States.

Finally, an examination of those values which are the highest for each school reveals that College A (with a reputation for very high emphasis on academic achievement) shows a high Theoretical mean for both sexes and College C (Lutheran) a high Religious mean for both sexes. In each case these highs fit well with what one might predict from a superficial acquaintance with the schools—although the lows do not lend themselves to any such easy interpretation. In this respect, at least, these two samples suggest that their respective students do hold certain values in common, although one cannot say with any certainty whether this results from a selective process in student admissions, student changes during residency, or (more likely) a combination of the two.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, then, the following general conclusions seem to be warranted by these data:

1. Whether the Manual norms are appropriate for colleges west of the Mississippi or even in the midwest has not been settled by this survey. The samples were not randomly gathered and were small in comparison to the population to which one would like to generalize. Further, the different statistical methods of analysis used yielded the same, somewhat mixed, picture of similarities. Too, since there are only six ranks involved in the order comparisons, a high value of \( \rho \) would be necessary in order to obtain significance. This would further tend to increase the possibility of accepting the null hypothesis when it was, in fact, false. In light of relatively small sample sizes, the fact that the measurements made by the SV are ultimately ordinal and not interval, and the greater likelihood of a type II error in interpreting the \( \rho \)’s, this author believes
that the ranking of these values for females in schools in the western United States well may not differ greatly from already reported in the Manual. The same cannot be said for males.

2. The distinct individual differences between schools which have been noted should and can easily be recognized. Within each school, it is also quite possible that the SV may have some utility for characterizing the kinds of students to be found—and thus, in a sense, the nature of the individual institutions themselves.

3. The particular group with which any single subject's profile is compared will depend on its intended uses. There well may be many instances in which it would be more helpful to obtain and make use of local norms, rather than national ones. Finally, it may also be useful to observe the rank ordering of the variables as well as their numerical values.
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