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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which educators' disclosing of personal values relates to their influence on students.

There are two concepts contained in the problem statement which need further definition at this point in order to make the problem and the remaining study more meaningful.

The phrase, "disclosing of personal values" is best understood when personal values are defined as follows:

To say that a person has a value is to say that he or she has an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally and socially preferable to alternative modes of conduct or end-states of existence (Rokeach, 1973, p. 25).

"Influence," as used in the following study, means that the students have a positive regard for the educator and, furthermore, that this regard may result in their nominating the educator for a Teacher Excellence Award. The educators included in this research are eligible to be nominated by students for this award.

The Need and Significance of the Study

It is the schooling process which attempts to delineate and clarify the nature of social-cultural forces and to enable both teacher
and learner to live meaningfully within their environments. Choices and
modes of conduct reflect personal and/or social values and are, in time,
influenced by the schooling process itself. Illich (1970) evaluates this
influence and calls schooling the new church. He claims that schools
have a major influence in the establishment of personal and social morals
and values.

Adelson (1961) clarifies the influence of the schooling process by
identifying pluralism in teaching as being the many styles of influence
and modes of communications that bind the student and teacher to each
other. He speaks of the teacher as priest: the one who achieves his
influence as an agent of the collective power—a degree granting, future-
promising educational institution.

The teacher and student are generally in a close relationship
to each other. The student is encouraged to model his activity
after the teacher's, very much as in those experiments on im-
printing, where the baby duck follows the decoy. . . . . This
mode of teaching is effective because it offers the student a
stake in a collective, utopian purpose, and also a promise of
such tangible regards as power, position, money, intellectual

Not all scholars would agree with these conclusions. Increasingly,
however, questions are being asked by the public concerning the extent
to which the educational process does influence students, and whether or
not the values communicated within the schools are being perceived by the
students.

The university participates in the schooling process and is best
defined as a fellowship of scholars (Trueblood, 1959; Goodman, 1962).
It is in the interchange between teacher and learner that inquiry takes
place and disclosures of thinking and person occur. Although this
teacher-learner process has been the subject of a myriad of studies
throughout the history of education, only recently, and in few circum-
stances, has the emphasis of these studies focused on the disclosure of
personal values by the educators. Even more limited, is knowledge about
this disclosure process within the university community.

There is, therefore, a need to increase our information about the
self-disclosing of personal values which may be occurring within this
teacher-learner fellowship. Jourard's (1971) studies indicate that all
of human behavior may in essence be self-disclosing behavior, which in
turn, influences the disclosure of another. "From our studies, it is
clear that the role, personality, and way of being of the other person
are the most powerful influences upon anyone's disclosure (Jourard, 1971,
p. 184).

A study of the educators' disclosure of self and values must include
their role, personality and way of being. It is important that we know
how and to what extent preferred modes of conduct and end-states of
existence are communicated to students and the impact of these disclosures.

While numerous values may be disclosed and have an influence on
students, one value, equality, is of special concern to this research.
Rokeach (1973) establishes a "two value model of politics" by identifying
the values of equality and freedom as indicators of similarities and
differences in major ideological orientations. From his findings he
states his law of political activism.

A more extreme regard for either of or both of the two political
values, equality and freedom, is a minimum condition for sustained
political action and is also a minimum consequence of political
action (Rokeach, 1973, p. 25).

The value of equality has been chosen as the critical value and
theme of the 1976 National Convention of the American Association of
Higher Education. The contemporary prominence of this value indicates its importance both politically and educationally.

Questions are raised within this study as to how equality is regarded by educators within higher education and what that preference has to do with student influence. Is it possible to conclude, similar to Rokeach's law of political activism, that there exists a "law of educational influence"? Do educators who have the highest preference for the value of equality also show evidence of sustained educational influence?

Many questions may be asked when the schooling process becomes more clearly defined as a value disclosing environment. What values are being communicated through the educational process? Are these values congruent with societal norms and expectations? Knowing that their decisions reflect personal values, what choices are educational leaders to make relative to the setting of priorities, choice of alternatives, use of resources, or the expression of attitudes and beliefs? To what extent can educational managers describe the influence and importance of value disclosure to the total educational process? Is schooling to be seen as the new church, and educators as priests—the real value and moral influencers?

This study, therefore, is worthy of consideration because of the following reasons:

1. It could provide information about the kinds of personal values which are held by the educators within the population studies.

2. It could provide information about the disclosure of these personal values as perceived by students.

3. It could provide information about the relationship between disclosure of personal values and how this disclosure relates to the influence of certain faculty.
4. It could provide information about the differences existent between the educators of various academic disciplines when considering their disclosure of values and the influence related to that disclosure.

5. It could provide information about the relative importance of the value of equality to the educators who represent various disciplines, and the extent to which influential educators prefer equality as an end-state of existence.
This chapter reviews studies which relate to the following: (1) historic developments basic to the elaboration of a conceptual framework for the study of values; (2) studies relating to the educator's disclosure of personal values within academic environments, and the influence this disclosure may have on students; and, (3) studies relating to the end-state value, equality.

Where appropriate, a statement of the theoretical hypothesis will follow the provision of related literature.

Historic Developments

A review of some of the basic problems of axiology is essential to understanding this study of values. Generally, two extreme positions are used to discuss the nature of values. These are presented in the question, "Are things valuable because we desire them, or do we desire them because they are valuable?" This axiological inquiry into the objective or subjective nature of values has become a watershed in the history of value research.

If desire or preference is attributed to the person then the phenomena of valuing becomes a valid source of inquiry. However, if value is an attribute of things or behaviors, then research related to
the preferences or values which a person holds becomes meaningless. These two concepts confront any person who wishes to describe the behavior of persons engaged in the process of choice or selection of an object, class of objects, or a particular action.

Among the philosophers who have studies the problem of values, the German, H. Lotze (1817-1881) provided the earliest analysis. Lotze, influenced by the school of positivism, made values independent of reality. He asserted that values have no being; they simply have value. As a result of his and subsequent schools of thought, an attempt was made to divide nature and value. The natural sciences, and the resultant scientific method, were seen (and continue to be so regarded by some scholars today) to be value free. This trend encouraged the division of the social sciences from the natural sciences, and the frequent separation of value considerations in technological advancement.

This objective (objects have value), subjective (requires the presence of a subject) polarity produced a spate of theorists on each pole. While the intent of this review is not to delineate in full the philosophical foundations of the two positions, and the variations thereof, an overview is important to the consideration of the ways in which value research has been influenced by these conceptions.

The objectivists, in the extreme, may be represented by economist Lionel Robbins, who stated, "Scientific method demands that we should leave out of account anything that is incapable of direct observation . . . we can not observe valuation. It is therefore out of place in a scientific explanation (Robbins, 1935, pp. 87-90). This position resulted in the classification of objects and their value, a process
also used in the early years of empirical social research. For example, W. I. Thomas (1918-1920) studied the values of the Polish peasants by analyzing and classifying the objects which became targets of the peasants' attitudinal dispositions (Thomas & Znaniecki, 1918-1920). More recently, studies have been centering on the usage of the reward, reinforcing, or incentive value of various behaviors or goals.

B. F. Skinner, in denying that humans possess values, states, "the reinforcing effects of things are the province of behavioral science, which, to the extent that it is concerned with operant reinforcement, is a science of values (Skinner, 1971, p. 104)."

If in a study of values the subject is the selective behavior of the person, such a study is generally identified with the subjectivist school of thought. Out of this conceptualization of values flows the historical background of this study. Values, as identified in Chapter I of this study, are constituted around the capacity of the person to prefer certain modes of conduct or end-states of existence.

The capacity to prefer was first systematically described in an axiology postulated by the German philosopher Alexius Meinong (1853-1921). Widening the pathways laid by his teacher, Franz Bretano (1837-1917), Meinong stressed that something has value in accord with the degree to which it pleases us.

Perry (1876-1957) became the first and most outstanding American axiologist to continue some of these early teachings of the German subjectivists. He focused his analysis on the interest which a person may express in an object. "In the last analysis, good springs from desire and not desire from good (Perry, 1950, p. 104)." Perry's
"desire", however, became a weak source from which further research could be conducted. No distinctions were made which helped solve the conflicts of various interests. Perry's value theory also failed to identify the sources from which certain valuable interests are derived.

Similar problems in distinction are confronted in the works of Alfred J. Ayer and Bertrand Russell, noted English philosophers. Ayer was more extreme in his subjectivist position, when he purported that value judgments are neither true nor false. Ayer believed they only express a given feeling similar to a burst of laughter or a scream of terror. A discussion of values is, therefore, only possible if the persons agree on a particular system of values. Without that agreement, the discussion (or study) of these expressions is meaningless. According to Ayer, research has severe limitations. We can only enquire: "what are the set of values? and, what causes them to have the system of values or the feelings that they actually have (Ayer, 1950, pp. 103 and 113)?"

To compare the various expressions is as meaningless as it is to assign to them rightness or wrongness.

Bertrand Russell (1872-1969), known for his brilliant contributions to all fields of knowledge, followed Ayer in identifying personal values as desires, but not as assertions or facts. Because, for Russell, there is no objective criterion to values, there is no rightness or wrongness to values. Human behavior is reduced to relativism where "sin" disappears and, "Hell, as a place of punishment for sinners, becomes quite irrational (Russell, 1935, p. 239)."

The subjectivist treatment of values has often brought into question the value of "desire." When desire is reduced to "expression"
or "taste", then the distinctions between values become less useful as
descriptions of human phenomena. Smith (1969) identified this problem
by saying: "The more serious problem, which has yet to be solved in
systematic research, is to distinguish between the desired and the
merely desired (Smith, 1969, p. 116)." When the "desired" is an asserted
selection of one mode of behavior or end-state of existence preferred
over other possibilities, then we are describing something more than a
mere desire or preference for a particular food or certain taste.

The research work of Kluckhohn (1951) resulted in his conclusion
that a "conception of the desirable" is that "which influences the
selection from available modes, means, and ends of actions (Kluckhohn,
1951, p. 395)." These conceptions, influenced by personal history and
cultural factors, represent a clustering of the numerous factors which
influence human choice. For Kluckhohn, the choice is more than just
"merely desired"; it is rather expressive of a belief that there is a
requiredness present. This use of value as "oughtness" will be
described later. It is important at this point to recognize that values
are identified in contemporary research as being more than taste,
expression, or mere desire.

One of the earliest attempts to identify the clusters of alternatives
or desires was Spranger (1928). He argued that an individual's person­
ality is best investigated via an inquiry into the person's values or
evalitative attitudes. He proposed the following "ideal types" of men:
(1) The Theoretical; (2) The Economic; (3) The Aesthetic; (4) The Social;
(5) The Political; and, (6) The Religions. These classifications became
the basis for Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey's well known Study of Values
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which has the subtitle, *A Scale for Measuring the Dominate Interests in Personality* (Allport, Vernon & Lindzey, 1960). Their work was an attempt to refine the Spranger classifications and to provide an instrument standardized on a liberal arts college population. The test was actually a measure of the preferences an individual may have in reference to the six groupings or clusters included in Spranger's study.

The early dominance of these two measurements of "values" is well documented (Cantril & Allport, 1953; Duffy, 1940; Dukes, 1955). These studies clearly showed the dominance of "personal values" in the research and literature. Vocational interest inventories, Likert-type scales, and value-goals were used during this early period of research. Values were, however, considered to be personal goals or interests. They were not seen to be preferences which resulted in hierarchically important components of a personal philosophy of life.

Subsequent to this period of study and research in human values, scientific inquiry led to further numerous definitions of personal values. In addition to relating value to "conceptions of the desirable", Kluckhohn (1951) distinguished value from attitude: "If one follows Allport's classic definition of attitude - 'a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related' - the principle differences from value are: a) exclusive referability to the individual, and b) absence of imputation of the desirable (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 423)." Later in his research Allport stated that: "attitudes themselves depend on values (Allport, 1961, pp. 802-803)." Rokeach (1973) provided seven
reasons, supported by related research, for the difference between a value and an attitude. He stated: "It [a value] concerns a desirable mode of behavior or end-state that has a transcendental quality to it, guiding actions, attitudes, judgments, and comparisons across specific objects and situations and beyond immediate goals to more ultimate goals (Rokeach, 1973, pp. 18-19)."

Maslow (1948) described values as needs, stating that they were physical and instinctive in nature. He suggested that it is intrinsic requiredness rather than extra-organismic forces which result in the formulation of values. While Maslow's treatment of value was a reductionist position, his conclusions do caution against the exclusion of need disposition when considering personal value. The taxonomy of needs, developed by Maslow (Maslow, 1948) indicated that there was some kind of cognitional process functioning in response to intrinsic requiredness. This cognitive process, which appeared to be a human attribute, as distinct from other primates, required a value description beyond Maslow's orientation.

Value research has viewed values as needs, desires, attitudes, preferences, conceptions of the preferable, and numerous other descriptions. Somewhat inclusive in all these views is the usage of the human capacity to conceptualize. It is this human ability to think conceptually which has become the focus of studies in ethics, morality, and values. Frankena (1963) cited the centrality of this human capacity:

Very often when one is puzzled about what he [or she] should do in a certain situation, what one needs is not really any ethical instruction, but simply either more factual knowledge or greater conceptual clarity . . . . The two besetting sins in our prevailing habits of ethical thinking are our ready acquiescence
in unclarity and our complacence in ignorance - the very sins that Socrates [and Christ] died combating two thousand years ago (Frankena, 1963, pp. 11-12).

Kluckhohn (1951), attempting to lessen the "unclarity" about values, identified values as conceptions of the desirable. In speaking of the meaning of "conception" he said:

A conception identifies value as a logical construct comparable to culture or social structure. That is, values are not directly observable any more than culture is. Both values and culture are based upon what is said and done by individuals but represent inferences and abstractions from the immediate sense data (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 397).

The assertion of these value concepts will often be oblique, indirect, verbalizations or behaviors; for Kluckhohn, however, they must "be susceptible of abstraction by the observer and in terms that the subject can understand and agree or disagree (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 397)."

Rokeach (1973) based his research on the conceptual nature of values. He questioned, however, whether "conceptions of the desirable or preferable" were sufficiently definitive and showed the need to treat values and conduct value research around the following three categories: (1) Cognitively--"to say that a person has a value is to say that he (or she) knows the correct way to behave or the correct end-state to strive for"; (2) Affectively--"feel emotion about it, be affectively for or against it, approve of those who exhibit negative instances of it"; and, (3) Behaviorally--"an intervening variable that leads to action when activated" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 7).

The research of Rokeach (1973) was chosen as the primary source of this study's analysis of values. In addition to stating, with Rokeach, that values have the above components, it was also necessary to further show that values become a kind of prescriptive or proscriptive belief.
Values have often been identified with the concepts of "right" or "wrong" and "better" or "worse." As noted previously, this concept of "ought" or requiredness has been a consideration throughout the history of axiology and value research. Heider (1958) identified "oughtness" as "a cognized wish or requirement of a suprapersonal objective order which has an invariant reality, and whose validity therefore transcends the point of view of any one person (Heider, 1958, p. 222)." When values are understood from the component of "oughtness", there is first a transcending of self values which have the potential to disintegrate into the relative categories of tastes or preferences. Values need a validity which is beyond individual fiat. "Few of us are like Nietzsche's Superman; all too human, we need the support of cobelievers to remain convinced that our standards are interpersonally valid (Smith, 1969, p. 341)."

Human values, as perceived by Rokeach (1973), have a more subdued presence of "oughtness." When considering preferred modes of behavior or terminal end-states of existence, he saw less demand for societal conformity. This observation is debatable, as culture seems often to demand a conformity in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects of life.

The requiredness basic to Rokeach's treatment of personal values was contained in the identification of values as a kind of belief. This conclusion is a result of his human belief system studies which he began in 1951. His work, classic in the field, investigated the nature of attitudes, opinions, beliefs, and resultant value systems. Allport's results (1961), similar to Rokeach's later conclusions, stated that: "A value is a belief upon which man acts by preference (Allport, 1961,
The meaning of belief was revealed for Rokeach in a quote from Trueblood:

We have beliefs about history . . . structure . . . God, and what we ought to do . . . . Most beliefs are elliptical in that the primary statement is omitted. We might reasonably preface each proposition (e.g., 'I ought to work rather than play tennis today.') with 'I believe, or there seems to be good evidence that.' Every proposition becomes in fact a judgment . . . and we are deeply interested in the correctness of our judgments (Trueblood, 1942, p. 24).

These propositional judgments, based upon a sense of oughtness, became Rokeach's basis of personal values.

The research conducted by Rokeach, relative to belief as the prescriptive and proscriptive nature of personal values, concerned two kinds of values: modes of conduct and end-states of existence. Philosophy has always been concerned with the means-end question, and it is apparent that value research must also be interested in this process: "We need to know a great deal more about the relation between 'asserted' values, at the level of explicit testimony, and 'operating' values which are implicit in ongoing behavior (Kluckhohn, 1951, p. 408)." Values, as studied by Rokeach (1973), are shown in the functional relationships that exist between the instrumental (operating) and terminal (asserted) nature. While numerous attempts have been made to assess the nature of either aspect of this relationship, his extensive studies treat the valuing phenomena as being a unity of word and deed.

The Rokeach Value Survey, Form E², (Appendix A) has been used to study the personal-social continuum present in terminal values and moral and competency kinds of instrumental values. It has been found that some end-states of existence may be socially determined for certain elements of society, while others may be personally chosen for self-
centered reasons. When these ranked terminal choices are compared with a person's ranked means or actions chosen to attain these end-states, it was possible to make a more reasonable assessment of human values. Rokeach (1973) stressed that there is no simple predictive relationship between the two kinds of instrumental and terminal values.

One may raise the question whether there is a close connection between the two kinds of instrumental values; concerning morality and competence and the two kinds of terminal values, concerning personal and social end states . . . . There is reason to doubt that there is any simple one to one connection between the two kinds of terminal and instrumental values (Rokeach, 1973, p. 9).

The intent of the research reported herein was not to investigate the interrelationships between instrumental and terminal values. However, it is important to have cited the extensive research which is basic to the terminal values used in this research and included in the Value Survey.

In summary, it will be noted that this review of the historic developments has provided the rationale for this study's understanding and analysis of human values. It is now possible to consider further research which leads us to the theoretical hypothesis of this investigation.

Studies Relating to the Educator's Disclosure of Personal Values Within Academic Environments, and the Influence This Disclosure May Have on Students

There exists a relationship between values and the instructional components of the educational scene. Illich (1970) clarifies one of these components when he defines the roles of the teacher as being custodian, preacher, and moralist.
The teacher-as-moralist substitutes for parents, God, or the state. He indoctrinates the pupil about what is right or wrong, not only in school but also in society at large. He stands in 'loco parentis' for each one and ensures that all feel themselves children of the same state. . . . School teachers and ministers are the only professionals who feel entitled to pry into the private affairs of their clients at the same time as they preach to a captive audience (Illich, 1970, p. 31).

This relationship between education and ethics, values, and morals is in need of further empirical research. Jacob (1957), in a conclusion to his survey of data describing values in higher education, said:

The meager amount of trend data, indicative of developing values over a period of years, is particularly noticeable. 'Phenomenological' evidence is also lacking - for instance personal evaluations by students or faculty of educational experiences which they believed to have influenced values . . . . In general, a systematic and definitive identification has yet to be made of educational situations in which a real influence upon student values is occurring (Jacob, 1956, pp. 130-131).

Jacob's study entailed the analysis of some 354 sources available in the literature. An attempt was made to answer questions about value patterns, the effect of college experiences on values, the influence of instruction, the impact of the instructor, the change in values due to pedagogical methods, the comparative influence of various institutions, and the relationship of personality to value change. Because of the lack of empirical control of instrumentation across the numerous studies, his conclusions became less valid:

The validity of almost every major conclusion of this study is open to challenge on the grounds that the various instruments used to detect and measure individual and group values lack sufficient sensitivity . . . a considerable element of subjectivity necessarily has entered into the process of evaluation (Jacob, 1957, p. 133).

In spite of these limitations, and because of the lack of other studies, Jacob's study became, and has remained, an essential source of reference and analysis. His overall conclusion was that "college does
make a difference - but not a very fundamental one for most students. Basic values remain largely constant through college (Jacob, 1957, p. 39)."

When considering the impact of the teacher, Jacob concluded: "Equally disturbing is evidence that the quality of teaching has relatively little effect upon the value-outcomes of general education—in the social science fields or in other fields—so far as the great mass of students is concerned (Jacob, 1957, p. 8)."

When Jacob considered the fact that some faculty do influence some students, he observes, "It is perhaps significant, however, that faculty identified as having this power [influence] with students are likely to be persons whose own value commitments are firm and openly expressed, and who are out-going and warm in their personal relations with students (Jacob, 1957, p. 8)."

Jacob's conclusions relative to the influence of "openly expressed" value commitments were germane to the nature of this investigation, which asked, "What is the relationship of the self-disclosure of personal values to the nature of influence?"

Jourard's studies identified self-disclosure as the communication of intimacy or the act of revealing personal information to others (Jourard and Jaffee, 1970). Other terms such as "verbal accessibility" (Polansky, 1965) and "social accessibility" (Rickers-Ovsiankina, 1956) have also been used to describe this concept.

A study of self-disclosure in interpersonal relationships was conducted by Jourard and Lasakow (1958). They found that disclosure to mother and father correlated significantly with liking. Worthy, Gary, and Kahn (1960) predicted that liking leads to disclosure, and disclosure
leads to liking. They tested a group of 48 students as to their levels of disclosure when exchanging information about their personal responses to a 70 item "get-acquainted" questionnaire. Measures of intimacy, eye contact, and dogmatism were taken. The results supported the hypothesis that "the degree of final liking indicated for each of the others would be a function of how much each of the others has disclosed to the subject (Worthy, Gary & Kahn, 1969, pp. 59-63)."

Worthy, et al. (1960), Jourard (1959), and Jourard and Landsman (1960) have shown self-disclosure to result in reciprocity. That is, when a person received the self-disclosure of another, the recipient was more likely to reciprocate with a self-disclosure. In the studies, this was often a dyadic situation, where the reciprocating behavior was an in-kind type of response.

Cozby (1972) has suggested a curvilinear relationship between disclosure and liking. A high degree of disclosures and intimacy may, in some situations, arouse anxiety in the recipients and the reaction may be negative.

It is evident that numerous variables may relate to disclosure and liking or influence. Content as well as situation is one example. When the disclosed information (e.g., attitudes) correlates to the attitudes of the subject, there appeared to be a more positive influence (Byrne, 1969).

Gilbert and Horenstein (1975) considered the effect of disclosure content in their study of 40 men and 40 women at the State University of New York at Albany. The positiveness or negativeness of the content—valence—was found to have significantly greater influence on students. 
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than did the degree of disclosure intimacy. Their study also concurred with Cozby (1972) and Simmel (1964) who have suggested that maintaining a private area of the self may enhance others' impressions of oneself as an individual.

It appears as though there is a proper balance to be obtained in the content and incidence of self-disclosure. "How do these variables interact to affect receiver reactions? More research is needed to understand the functions of privacy and disclosure . . . as well as situational and social forces deemed appropriate for disclosure (Gilbert & Horenstein, 1975, pp. 316 and 322)."

The particular concern of this study was to more fully understand disclosure of personal values by educators in academic environments. Cozby's (1973) extensive review of the self-disclosure literature contained no mention of research in this area. Similarly, Breed (1971) developed a bibliography annotating the research in self-disclosure. There were no entries related to the specific problem dealt with in this study.

Small (1970), working with S. M. Jourard, conducted a study of personal values and self-disclosure. He also was unable to discover in the literature any research relating these two variables. In his study, female subjects, in response to the "Way to Live" scale (Morris, 1956), were classified into two value groups. The interview condition was structured to respond personally to one-half of the subjects, and treat the other half impersonally. The results indicated that the interview structure, rather than the subjects' personal values, influenced their degree of self-disclosure.
The literature, cited above, appears to relate the self-disclosure of personal values to some kind of influence, even though it is not clear what the nature of that disclosure or influence may be. When this relationship was investigated in reference to the stated problem of this study, it became clear that there was also an assumption of the students' capacity to perceive the educators' personal values.

The assumption that the values of others are important as motivators of perceiver behaviors was established by Jones and Thibout (1958). One of the important goals of interaction is "securing motivational and value support (Jones & Thibout, 1958, pp. 151-178)." They indicated not only how values are perceived, but that we tend to attribute positive characteristic to those perceived to have values congruent with our own. However, negative cathexis does not always result from value dissimilarity.

The influence of perceived values was studied by Fensterheim and Tresselt (1953). College students indicated their liking of objects which in many instances resembled the value systems of the student subjects. This "halo effect" was also shown to be related to personality evaluations. These conclusions are supported by an impressive list of findings (Gage and Suci, 1951; Tagiuri and Petrullo, 1958; Stensaasen, 1970).

Studying the nature of perception and its intervening variables was not the specific object of this research. However, related studies seem to suggest that educator values may be perceived within academic environments, and that a relationship may exist between this value perception and the personal influence of the educator.

The above implication, relating to the research concern of this study, has not been clearly demonstrated through empirical data. The Value Survey, Form D (Rokeach, 1972) was used by Blai (1973) to answer,
among other functions, the value intentions of faculty and students at several community colleges in California. The values ranked most important to the faculty were a "sense of accomplishment", "self respect", "freedom", and "inner harmony"; the students ranked "happiness", "mature love", "freedom", and "inner harmony" as being most important. These results seemed to indicate that both the faculty and the students were attracted toward self-oriented values, and that this mutual attraction may allow for the increased tendency to be influenced by persons of similar value structures.

Park (1971) surveyed 242 faculty members at three junior colleges in California to investigate whether the values and perceptions of faculty members influence the institution's goals. Through the use of the Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973), Park indicated that the self as self is the greatest concern of the faculty, a concern which he labels "self-centeredness." The perceptions of the institution and students were negative when they were viewed as conflicting with the educator's drive for prestige and fulfillment of personal needs. These perceptions were the result of numerous factors including faculty organizations and environmental press. Park's study concluded:

Plainly stated the subjects isolate themselves from their work: They reject the institution . . . hold themselves in high esteem . . . yet negate the modes of conduct that one would assume help to bring about their desired ends. Since, it may be argued, few people have given much thought to values and value-orientations, it is reasonable to find some confusion in the subjects' value-orientations. However, these are teachers who deal in value judgments that are vital to the process of learning (Park, 1971, p. 57).

This section of the review of related literature has indicated that the disclosure of one's personal values is associated with inter-
personal influence, and that the perception of this disclosure appears to occur in academic environments. The first theoretical hypothesis:

The influence educators, herein described as Teacher Excellence Award nominees, will have a greater disclosure of personal values than will a random sample of non-nominees.

Studies Relating to the End-State Value "Equality"

The present study was designed to explore the possibility that there might be a distinctive association between particular values and the nature of influence in academic settings. The personal value, "equality" was selected for this investigation.

It appeared as though this value was essential to the educational environment as well as the identity of this society. de Tocqueville's (1858) words have been an inspiration for the perpetuation of this value: "The passion for equality . . . links up with feelings basic to our very nature. . . . Our love for equality is constant . . . [we are] ready to make every concession to those who give it satisfaction (de Tocqueville, 1970, pp. 81-83)."

The impact of this political, social, educational value (though often not realized in human history) is a basic human expectation.

This expectation of equality, justice, and reciprocity in human relations is basic to moral development. Kohlberg (1971), following the influence of Piaget (1948), averred that the last stage in moral development is the adoption of principles of conscience which hold the highest value on human life, equality, and dignity. Fromm (1941), during a critical period of human history, stressed the need to see persons in a relationship of solidarity, not one of domination-submission. "Persons
are born equal but they are also born different . . . [this] implies that they all share the same fundamental human qualities, that they share the basic fate of human beings, that they have the same inalienable claim on freedom and happiness (Fromm, 1941, pp. 290-291)." Equality, so defined, creates learning-growing environments which allow individuals to have equal opportunities for growth and becoming.

Recent reports within the field of education continue to highlight the importance of equality (Coleman, 1966; Jenks, 1972; Durham, 1973). The Michigan Department of Education (1971), in keeping with this national emphasis, specified equality as one of its goals: "Michigan education . . . must create within the school system an atmosphere of social justice, responsibility, and equality which will enable students to carry a positive and constructive attitude about human differences and similarities . . . (Michigan Department of Education, 1971, p.12)."

The value "equality", so essential to educational influence, is identified by Rokeach (1973) as being "brotherhood, equal opportunity for all (Rokeach, 1973, p. 359)." He documented the priority given to this desired end-state of existence, and illuminated the ways in which various segments of the population choose attitudes, behaviors, and other modes of existence which may or may not ensure the attainment of sisterhood and brotherhood.

Research (Rokeach, 1973; Feather, 1971; Penner, 1971) reveals that the two-value model, "freedom-equality", does delineate between the traditional categories of open and closed-mindedness, or several of the other polarities existent in political-social-educational environments. Placed in juxtaposition to "equality", "freedom" is identified by Rokeach (1973) as being the desire for "independence, free choice."
Rokeach's (1973) illustration of this model is shown below in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equality Low</th>
<th>Equality High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>Freedom Low</td>
<td>Freedom High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facism</td>
<td>Capitalism</td>
<td>Socialism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Rokeach "Freedom-Equality" Model.

Educational environments could be substituted in the above model to indicate open-closed classrooms, peer teaching-teacher directed, or non-participatory-participatory decision making settings.

The high or low ranking of equality as a personal value has been shown to have a predictive quality: "of all the 36 values, 'equality' is the one that best predicts reactions toward blacks, the poor, Vietnam, student protest and church activism (Rokeach, 1973, p. 170)."

The two value model studies cited above showed that dogmatism is in a curvilinear relationship to equality. The higher equality is ranked, the less inclined the person is toward dogmatism and authoritarianism. This intolerance of others, and the unwillingness to stress equal opportunities, has been the subject of extensive social research (Adorno and the Berkeley researchers, 1950; Kirscht and Dillehay, 1967; Rokeach, 1960, 1968).

Rokeach (1969), in response to his own findings, and in concurrence with previous studies (Allport and Kramer, 1946; Allport and Ross, 1967; Hadden, 1967) cited a linear relationship between the value "salvation" and a predisposition toward closedness, inequality and a lack of social compassion. This conservative religious value (stressing salvation...
as a regard and not a calling to service) depends, according to Stark (1970), upon: "1) a self-centered imputing of failures to the individual and, 2) a miracle motif - the belief that the world is epiphenomenal and that the solution to worldly problems can only come from the world beyond (Stark, 1970, pp. 151-154)."

It appears as though human attitudes and behaviors are in the service of personal values. As cited previously, this association has been empirically evidenced, whether the value is salvation, equality, or freedom. This inclines the student of human phenomena to expect: (1) that leadership attitudes and behavior may be associated with personal values; (2) that when considering the relative importance of the value, equality, certain predispositions in these leadership influencing behaviors may be anticipated; and, (3) that in a democratic society, a high priority would be given to the value, equality.

These expectations, based upon the related research reviewed in this section, resulted in the formulation of a second theoretical hypothesis of this study:

The influence educator, herein described as a Teacher Excellence Award nominee, will assign a higher rank to the value of equality than will the non-nominees.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purposes of this study were to investigate: (1) the degree of educator disclosure of personal values within the academic classroom; (2) the educator's priority assigned to the value "equality"; and, (3) the association of the above two variables, self-disclosure and equality, to the nature of the educator's influence in the classroom. This chapter describes the sample, data collection procedures, and instrumentation used to complete the investigation. The operational hypotheses and statistical procedures used to test the hypotheses will also be reported.

The Population Used and the Method of Selection (An Overview)

The study was conducted at Western Michigan University, which is located in Kalamazoo, Michigan. The University is a large public institution servicing some 21,361 students and employing 929 instructional staff at the time of the study. Western Michigan University, a multi-purpose institution of higher education, ranks fourth in Michigan in number of students and diversity of programs. It offers 128 major programs leading to bachelor's degrees, and 61 master's degree programs. The eleven specialist and eight doctoral programs provide additional possibilities for advanced degree work. The number of students from the
State of Michigan totaled 19,461 with most coming from the southwestern and southeastern counties of the State.

Sample

The hypotheses testing required the obtaining of data from three groups of persons: (1) faculty identified as "influence" educators because they had been nominated by students for a University Teacher Excellence Award; (2) faculty identified as "non-nominees" because they were not nominated for a Teacher Excellence Award; and, (3) students who were enrolled in one of the randomly selected classes taught by either of the two groups of faculty.

The investigation was directed toward the 1974 Teacher Excellence Award nominees. These faculty were first nominated through an on-campus balloting by students. Second, alumni were given an opportunity to select their candidates from either the listing of student nominations or they could submit a write-in nomination. In this study, only student nominations were utilized to obtain the influence educator population.

Subsequent to receiving student and alumni nominations, a committee of persons, appointed by the University Alumni Association, made final selection of the Teacher Excellence Award recipients. Public recognition and $1,000 awards were granted to the selected faculty from within the six academic colleges of the University. This selection committee was composed of the following people:

a. Two faculty selected by the President and Executive Board of the Faculty Senate;

b. Two alumni selected by the Board of Directors of the Alumni Association;
c. Two students selected from within the honor societies of the University; and,

d. One supporting staff member to represent the University.

The charge of this committee was to apply the proper guidelines for the receiving of nominations and the granting of the awards.

The process of student nomination was germane to this study, as it became the basis for the influence variable. It is assumed that the student nomination resulted from the positive in-class contributions or influence of the educator. Guidelines were given to students to assist them in their balloting judgments. The publicity, which contained selection guidelines and informed the student about the opportunity to nominate Teacher Excellence faculty, included the following criteria:

The individual to be a teacher on the Western Michigan University faculty who shows exceptional teaching ability; is accessible to the student and sensitive to the student's viewpoint; combines the best characteristics of the great teacher: enthusiasm, dedication, empathy, purpose, high standards (Western Michigan University Alumni Association, News Release, Spring, 1974).

These criteria were publicized as part of the nomination ballots distributed on campus, and announced in the campus and community news media.

The selection committee received student nominations and applied the above stated guidelines. Consideration was given to instructor class load, exposure to students, and a similar weighting of other variables in order to ensure equitable choices.

The students nominated 90 faculty for the 1974 Teacher Excellence Award. Table 1 indicates the distribution of those nominations according to college identity. Again, it was assumed that the persons represented by this distribution are those faculty who have had a positive influence on the students in their classes, and that the committee had followed
stated policies in arriving at the nominations described by Table 1.

Table 1

A DISTRIBUTION BY COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT OF THE STUDENT NOMINATIONS FOR THE 1974 TEACHER EXCELLENCE AWARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Nominations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>General Business Law</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Education/Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Center and Clinic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women's Physical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men's Physical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering/Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The sampling of "influence" faculty was completed by selecting a two-thirds sample from the list of nominees in each of the colleges using a random number table.

A second group of faculty was selected and identified as "non-nominees." These were the educators who were not placed in nomination for the 1974 Teacher Excellence Awards. Random number table selection was based on representation of each of the six colleges in approximately equal number to those already selected as nominee faculty, and, a matched proportion in the academic areas of those colleges which have departments in both the natural sciences and the social sciences. This last criterion was considered essential to ensure making comparisons between two groups of faculty instructing in similar academic areas.

A sampling of students was also needed to test the hypotheses of this study. These students were selected by random number selection of one of the classrooms of the faculty sample.

Data Gathering

Contact was made with several of the Deans of the colleges within the University prior to drawing the appropriate random sample. During
this initial contact, the design, instrumentation, informational letters, and research agreement processes were shared and discussed. Additionally, the nature of the research was also presented to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Office of Institutional Research. Encouragement was given and acceptance of the research process expressed.

In order to solicit each selected faculty's participation in the study, the following procedures were carried out:

1. A letter was sent explaining the nature of the research, its purpose, and the nature of the participation being requested of the faculty member. This letter is contained in Appendix B.

2. Follow-up letters were sent (Appendix B) and in some instances calls were made to the faculty encouraging their participation. The letter contained further details and a return card on which to indicate their decision and the size of the class which had been randomly selected (Appendix B).

A table of random numbers was used when it was necessary to find replacements for those who chose not to participate or for those faculty who were unable to continue their commitments to the project.

A research packet was prepared and sent to those who agreed to participate in the study. This sealed packet provided faculty the following:

1. On the outside of the large envelope containing the research instrumentation, a number of instructions were given so as to aid in the administration of the Value Survey (Appendix B). The instructions included:

   a. identification of classroom to be utilized
   b. request for the appointment of a student proctor
   c. a directing of the proctor's attention to the instructions, contained therein, which were essential to administration of the Value Survey to both faculty and students.
   d. procedures for the collecting and returning of the completed surveys in a sealed envelope
2. Inside, the research packet contained the following:

   a. instructions to be read to the class describing the
      nature of the study being conducted (Appendix B)
   b. instructions to be read after the distribution of
      the student surveys (Appendix B)
   c. a faculty Value Survey listing the 18 Terminal
      Values, appropriate instructions, and the particular
      class identification number (Appendix B)
   d. student surveys, in appropriate numbers, to be
      distributed to all the students in attendance—these
      surveys, of a different color than the faculty survey,
      also contained a class identification number
      (Appendix B)
   e. a large return envelope in which the completed student
      surveys were to be placed, sealed, and returned to
      the researcher
   f. a smaller envelope to be used by the faculty for the
      separate return of their faculty Value Survey

These research packets were received by the participating
faculty approximately one week prior to the target dates for data
collection. These target dates covered a three week period in November,
1975. During this time the selected faculty were responsible for enacting
the following processes:

1. A student proctor was appointed to administer and collect
   the completed Value Surveys in accord with the research
design.

2. The data were selected for administration of the Value Survey.
   This date, to be chosen from within the targeted three
   week administration period, was to be set in accord with
   their own in-class schedules. Faculty were encouraged to
   allow the students approximately ten minutes for ranking
   the 18 Terminal Values.

3. The student proctor was to be given the sealed research
   packet at the time of administration.

4. During the selected class period, the educators were to
   complete the Faculty Value Survey. The completed survey
   was to be sealed in the appropriate envelope and returned
   to the researcher.

After the above processes were completed, the researcher received
the identified faculty survey and student surveys from each of the randomly
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sampled classrooms. When the student or faculty surveys contained incomplete rankings, repeated numbers, or other errors, they were judged unusable to the research and were therefore not included in the data analysis. The incident of such errors was minimal.

The collection of these data provided the following information:

1. Faculty Value Survey: a ranking of the 18 Terminal Values which, in accord with the research design and the limits of the instrumentation, best described the educator's actual holding of these particular personal end-state values.

2. Student Value Survey: a description of the personal value ranking which each student in the class perceived the educator to be holding.

3. A class identification number: these data provided the placing of the class within the particular college or department of the University.

This information was essential to the investigation of the research problem contained herein.

Instrumentation

This investigation measured the personal values of faculty, and the students' perceptions of the self-disclosure of those personal values. This measurement was gained by utilizing the Rokeach Value Survey (1973). The survey is composed of two sets of 18 values. The first, instrumental values, refers to modes of behavior or behavioral activities and are stated adjectively (Appendix C). The second, terminal values, are identified as end-states of existence (Appendix C). Much of the research (Feather, 1975; Rokeach, 1973) describes the associations which may exist between these ends and means. Instrumental and terminal values are both related to each other, and are also structured into separate hierarchical organizations. Rokeach (1973) demonstrated how these relationships and
organizations may be understood by having persons rank order the two sets of values in terms of their priority as guides for life. As in everyday life, the rank orderings indicate the time, energy, and commitment given to certain conducts and end-states.

As indicated previously, this research was conducted to understand the valuing process by utilizing Terminal Values only. Also, as indicated earlier, the problem investigated herein concerned the personal value ranking of educators and the students' perceptions of those rankings. Data relating to these rankings and perceptions were collected through the use of what Rokeach (1973) identified as being the more reliable set of values, the terminal or end-state values.

Rokeach (1973) reported that the decision to choose 18 terminal values (as opposed to some other number) resulted from the need to expand previous forms of the instrument after it was shown that other important values had been excluded. Additionally, a process of face validity judgments and the empirical evidence from studies in literature, sociology, and semantics resulted in the present 18 Terminal Values of the Value Survey.

The test-re-test reliability of the Rokeach Value Survey, Terminal Values, was reported by Homant (1970). For the mimeographed version, the findings indicated a .74 reliability for college students with a five week re-test interval. The same figure was found for an older adult sample during a 12 week period. The Terminal Values appeared to have a higher reliability due to what may have been an earlier stabilization of end-state values (Rokeach, 1973).

Cochrane and Rokeach (1970) studied the possibility that an order
effect would cause respondents to rank the first values higher and the
last values lower. A national sample of 1,409 adult Americans indicated
no order effect for these 18 values. Greenstein and Bennet (1974) used
a computer randomization of the values and presented this order to
respondents. They also concluded that the Value Survey is free of
presentation order effects. Further studies by Feather (1975) supported
these conclusions and also showed that the presentation of terminal or
instrumental values have no significant effect on the outcome.

When considering the connotative meaning of the 18 terminal values
to different people, the research of Homant (1969) becomes informative.
He measured the semantic meaning of a rank ordering of Rokeach's 18 terminal
and instrumental values by comparing it with Osgood's semantic differential
technique (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957). The comparison indicated
that the two instruments provide essentially the same semantic informa-

A further study of the shared meanings of the values was conducted
by Rokeach (1973). He showed that the reliability coefficients are
virtually unaffected when one leaves out the defining phrases for each
value. He concluded: "If the values employed in the value survey were
semantically tyrannical, meaning different things to different people,
significant results of a systematic kind would not be possible (Rokeach,
1973, p. 50)."

This implied question of connotative meaning is relative to the
consideration of the value "equality." According to the Value Survey the
implication of the value "brotherhood, equal opportunity for all", concerns
the equal opportunity to make one's way in life and to warrant equal
treatment of individuals. This abstract terminology was found (Rokeach, 1973) to have a somewhat normative meaning within the culture of the United States. However, equivalence of meaning cannot be easily ensured even between two individuals in a subset of society. Rokeach (1973) identified the previously cited semantic studies as one of the several reasons for his confidence in the use of this value. Additionally, he cited the psychological significance attributable to a particular value ranking. The comparison of equality as a desired end-state to other ranked end-states may be more valuable to research than the broader cross-cultural analysis of semantic differences. "In the final analysis, it is probably scientifically more fruitful to be concerned with the concept of psychological significance than with the question of the semantic meaning of values (Rokeach, 1973, pp. 50-51)."

The Value Survey is both ordinal and ipsative. Gorsuch (1970) is critical of the Value Survey because of this characteristic of ipsatation. Rokeach (1970) responded by saying:

It is true that the ipsative procedures introduce a lack of . . . 'independence between statistical tests upon the separate values . . .' With 18 values the extent to which there is lack of independence is estimated to be one-eighteenth of the total variance. This is relatively small error (Rokeach, 1970, p. 159).

This ipsative aspect of ordinal data does not allow for the same kind of normative group comparisons as does interval or ratio data. In other respects, however, the Value Survey has evidenced itself to be in many ways a very efficient instrument.

it . . . provides us with a reasonably valid measure of variables that are of central importance to the individual and to his (or her) society. . . . Research to date suggests that the Value Survey's instructions are easily grasped by people between the ages of 11 and 90, providing they can read, and that comparative data can be obtained for people within this age group (Rokeach, 1973, p. 51).
Operational Hypotheses

The primary purposes of this study were to investigate an educator's influence on students as this influence may be related to: (1) the educator's self-disclosure of personal values; and, (2) the educator's ranking of the value, "equality." In this section the theoretical hypotheses will be stated in operational terms.

Hypothesis One:

The influence educators, herein described as Teacher Excellence Award Nominees, will have a greater disclosure of personal values than will a random sample of non-nominees.

The terminal values of the Rokeach Value Survey (1973) were used to assess the personal values of the nominee and the non-nominee faculty. This scale of terminal values was also used to determine the students' perceptions of these self-disclosed faculty values.

The students' perception of the faculty members' self-disclosing of personal values becomes the dependent variable of this hypothesis. The independent variable will be the influence of the "educator" designation given to those faculty receiving a student nomination for the 1974 Teacher Excellence Award at Western Michigan University.

The operational hypothesis used to test Hypothesis One is:

The Teacher Excellence Award nominees will have a higher mean score obtained from the Fisher $z$-transformation of the Pearson Correlations than will the non-nominees.

Hypothesis Two:

The influence educators, herein described as Teacher Excellence Award nominees, will assign a higher rank to the value of equality than will the non-nominees.

As in Hypothesis One, the terminal values of the Rokeach Value Survey (1973) were administered to all faculty included in the study.
From these data an analysis was made as to the ranking of the value "equality."

The dependent variable of this second hypothesis was the educator's ranking of the desired end-state value, equality, as obtained from the Value Survey.

The independent variable was the identification of the "influence educator" as being equated with those faculty being nominated by students for the Teacher Excellence Award at Western Michigan University.

This second hypothesis stated in operational terms is:

The $U$ statistic, as obtained from the Mann-Whitney test, when tested for its significance by the related "z" value, will indicate that the Teacher Excellence Award nominees rank the value "equality" higher than will the non-nominees.

Statistical Procedures

The application of statistical procedures required that the data were received, judged as to its completeness, coded according to class identification number, and properly organized to allow for statistical computer analysis. The analysis of the data was completed through the application of the statistical devices described within this section.

Hypothesis One

The operational expression of the first hypothesis is:

"The Teacher Excellence Award nominees will have a higher mean score as obtained from the Fisher $z$-transformation of the Pearson correlations, than will the non-nominees."

After an appropriate organization of the data, the following statistical models were reviewed, assessed, and applied.

1. For each of the classes, the Kendall coefficient of con-
cordance: "W", was employed to determine the degree of ranking agreement which exists in each class. As stated by Siegel (1956), "The coefficient of concordance would be [is] an index of divergence of the actual agreement shown in the data from the maximum possible (perfect) agreement (Siegel, 1956, p. 230.)"

2. The determination of the statistical significance of any obtained value of "W" was computed by the Chi square statistic. A criterion level of significance of .05 was established.

3. The result of the above determinations was an average class ranking for each of the 18 terminal values. This average class ranking represented the students' perception of the instructors' values.

4. Using the available class rankings and faculty rankings, a [Pearson Product-Moment Correlation] coefficient, $r_{xy}$, was calculated for each class. This correlation will indicate the degree of relationship that exists between student and instructor rankings in each of the classes (Winer, 1962). Hayes (1963) relates the appropriateness of the Pearson correlation when analyzing ranked data. Games and Klare (1967) state: "The Spearman [rank difference correlation] index is just a special case of Pearson's more general index, and computing $p$ [Pearson Product-Moment Correlation] on a bivariate distribution of ranked data will yield the same value as would be obtained by the rank-difference formula (Games and Klare, 1967, p. 350)."
5. The hypothesis called for a comparison of the nominee and non-nominee samples. After obtaining the Pearson correlations for each class, a Fisher $z$-transformation was applied to each of the correlations in order to normalize the calculated Pearson correlations. Because correlations from relatively large samples will follow a normal distribution, the $z$-transformation was an appropriate process to apply (Winer, 1962).

6. The final step was to determine the significance of the difference between the independent nominee and non-nominee samples (a difference which was indicated by the resultant means, gained from the $z$-transformations of the correlation scores). The significance of this difference was measured by the two sample $t$-tests. The $t$-test is a robust statistic requiring that the variances be approximately equal, of large sample size, or that the samples be obtained from a normally distributed population (Glass and Stanley, 1970). These assumptions were met by the data. A .05 probability level was established for the rejection of the hypothesis of no difference between the sample means.

**Hypothesis Two**

The operational expression of the second hypothesis is:

"The $U$ statistic, as obtained from the Mann-Whitney $U$ test, and when tested for its significance by the related $Z$ value, will indicate that the Teacher Excellence Award nominees rank the value 'equality' significantly higher than do the non-nominees."

After an appropriate organization of the data, the following statistical models were applied:
1. Using the instructor data only, the Mann-Whitney \( U \) test was applied to each of the 18 values in each of the two independent samples. This test was an appropriate procedure as the data were ordinal, and the desire was to test whether there were significant differences in the populations from which the samples were drawn. Seigel (1956) indicates that this nonparametric test approaches the power-efficiency of the parametric \( t \)-test when a large sample size is used.

2. The resultant \( U \) statistics were judged as to the significance of the difference which is represented between the samples. This judgment is performed by obtaining a \( z \) score related to the various \( U \) statistics. These scores were then tested by the appropriate table of normal distributions. A decision, based on a previously established .05 region of rejection, was then made as to whether to accept or reject the operational hypothesis.

**Supplementary Analysis**

Supplementary analysis of the data were completed through some form of the analysis of variance. It may be noted that the analysis of variance is a robust procedure useful even when there is a quite marked departure from the underlying assumptions (Scheffe, 1959). Feather (1975) makes extensive use of this statistic:

when other tests of significance, such as the Median Test and the Kruskal-Wallis Test (Siegel, 1956) have been employed on the same data by way of comparison, results obtained have been highly consistent with one another, both in our own studies and in those of Rokeach. The analysis of variance does have the advantage of enabling more complex types of comparisons. . . . For example, when used in multifactor form, one can investigate whether various interaction effects that may be of interest are significant (Feather, 1975, pp. 24-25).
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter will report and discuss the results of data analysis pertinent to the research problems presented within this study. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section represents the descriptive data from the returned sample. These results indicate the numbers of faculty (Tables 2 and 3) and students (Table 4) participating in the study. The next two sections deal with the test of the operational hypotheses for the two theoretical hypotheses. The last section reports the results of supplementary data analysis.

Sample Results

Nominees

The research design required that approximately a two-thirds sample be drawn from among student nominations for the 1974 Teacher Excellence Award. This sampling comprised the nominee or "influence educator" grouping used within this study. The distribution of these nominations was presented in Table 1.

The data gathering processes as outlined in Chapter III were followed, and usable data from the sample of Teacher Excellence Award faculty were received. Table 2 describes the distribution of these responses according to college and department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Nominee Requests</th>
<th>Nominee Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Men's Physical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women's Physical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An inspection of the table indicates that, after being requested to participate, 59 nominee faculty agreed, with 53 of these contributing data according to the research design. The drawing of a two-thirds sample percentage was applied to each of the six colleges involved. Further, the figures reveal that distinctions were made among the academic disciplines of the various colleges.

Non-nominees

A sampling of a comparative group of faculty, not placed in nomination for the 1974 Teacher Excellence Award, was essential to the research design. This sampling permitted the computation and analysis of statistical comparisons between groups. Equally essential to the design was the necessity that this group be comparable to the kinds of disciplines represented by the nominee faculty sample.

Sixty-one non-nominee faculty agreed to participate in the study; and, of that number, fifty-eight submitted usable data.

The random selection of faculty was completed from within academic disciplines similar to that of the nominee faculty sample. This process enabled the drawing of faculty whose academic areas present a close similarity when comparing nominee and non-nominee department selections.

Student Sample

Student perceptions of faculty member's values provided the data relative to the educator's self-disclosure of personal values.

Table 4 indicates by college, the numbers of students--for both nominee and non-nominee faculty--who participated in this research. In total, 2,727 students submitted data relative to the nominee or non-nominee educator's value disclosing behavior. 1,421 of these
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Nominee Requests</th>
<th>Nominee Returns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Men's Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women's Physical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
STUDENT SAMPLE RETURNS LISTED BY COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Non-Nominee</th>
<th>Total for College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>2,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

students were in the classes of nominee faculty; 1,306 were in non-nominee classrooms.

Hypothesis One

The influence educators, herein described as Teacher Excellence Award nominees, will have a greater disclosure of personal values than will a random sample of non-nominees.

Hypothesis one is supported if the following operational hypothesis is accepted.

Operational Hypothesis

The Teacher Excellence Award nominees will have a higher mean score as obtained from the Fisher's $z$-transformations of the Pearson Correlations than will the non-nominees.

When testing this hypothesis, the students' ranking of their educators' values were first considered. It was necessary: (1) to determine the degree of agreement between the students' perceptions of the educators' values. This agreement, calculated through the use
of the Kendall coefficient of concordance: $W$, was determined for each of the classrooms; and, (2) to determine, through the use of the Chi square statistic, whether the obtained agreements could have happened by chance or if they were statistically significant at the previously established .05 probability level.

Appendix D contains a listing of the obtained $U$ scores for each of the classes in the sample. All of these results, when tested for significance, proved to be well below the .05 probability level. It was found, in fact, that the levels were all below the .001 level.

The researcher utilized the obtained class average ranking as an indication of the values which educators' classes perceive them to be holding. The comparison of student perception to faculty ranking was completed through the use of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient: $r_{xy}$.

The degree of relationship which exists between the average student faculty rankings is shown in Appendix E. These correlations became the data from which the hypothesis was tested.

Following the statistical design of this study, a Fisher $z$-transformation was applied to each of the correlations listed in Appendix E. A mean for each sample was determined.

Table 5 contains the two means obtained from the Fisher $z$-transformation of the correlation scores. Table 5 also indicates the significance of the difference between the independent nominee and non-nominee samples. This difference was measured by the two sample $t$-test statistic.

Table 5 shows that the mean of the nominee group was found to be
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TABLE 5
RESULTS OF THE TWO SAMPLE T-TEST OF THE FISHER Z-TRANSFORMATION OF THE PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nominee</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.4816</td>
<td>0.3561</td>
<td>.0479</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-nominee</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.4786</td>
<td>0.3070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.4816 and the non-nominee mean, .4786. This difference was not significant at the previously established .05 level of probability.

Hypothesis One Summary

The statistical evidence does not indicate any significant differences in the educators' self-disclosure of personal values when comparing the Teacher Excellence Award nominees and a random sample of non-nominees.

Hypothesis Two

The influence educator, herein described as Teacher Excellence Award nominees, will assign a higher rank to the value of equality than will the non-nominee faculty.

Hypothesis two is supported in the following operational hypothesis is accepted.

Operational Hypothesis

The $U$ statistic, as obtained from the Mann-Whitney $U$ test, and, when tested for its significance by the related $z$ value, will indicate that the Teacher Excellence Award nominees rank the value "equality" significantly higher than do the non-nominees.

To test this hypothesis it was necessary to compare the nominee
and non-nominee ranking of the value, "equality." This comparison was accomplished through the use of the Mann-Whitney $U$ Test statistic.

Table 6 shows that the $U$ value for the nominee sample was 1563.00 and the non-nominee value of this statistic was 1511.00. These values were tested for significance through the use of the Z score statistic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>$U$ Value</th>
<th>Z Score</th>
<th>Two-Tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominee</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1563.00</td>
<td>0.1538763</td>
<td>.87771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-nominee</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1511.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that the difference between the two obtained $U$ values was not significant at the .05 level of probability. Based on the statistical results included in Table 6, it was evident that the operational hypothesis could not be accepted. It was concluded that the second theoretical hypothesis was not supported by the findings.

**Hypothesis Two Summary**

The empirical data, gained according to the design of this research, seems to indicate that there is little difference in the rankings nominee and non-nominee educators assign to the value, equality.

**Supplementary Analysis**

**Hypothesis One**

Further analysis of the data basic to the first hypothesis was completed through use of the one-way analysis of variance. Utilized
in this analysis were the means gained from the Fisher z-transformed correlational scores. This one-way analysis of variance compared the means for each college according to nominee and non-nominee samples.

Table 7 contains the results of this analysis.

**TABLE 7**

RESULTS OF A ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE FISHER Z-TRANSFORMED PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR EACH OF THE SIX ACADEMIC COLLEGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.3255</td>
<td>.2499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>.0793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.6109</td>
<td>.2711</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.3697</td>
<td>.3874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.2435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.5385</td>
<td>.3694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.5571</td>
<td>.2550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An inspection of the results indicates that this analysis of variance, having 5 and 105 degrees of freedom, produced an F Value of 2.038 and a probability of .0793. The pre-determined probability level of .05 was exceeded; therefore, the results did not show any apparent significant differences among the six colleges. However, lower mean scores were obtained from the College of Business and the College of Applied Sciences.

**Hypothesis Two**

The second hypothesis considered the ranking assigned by nominee
and non-nominee samples to the value, "equality." The ranking and its significance were evaluated through the use of the Mann-Whitney $U$ statistic, followed by the application of the $z$ score.

This process was applied to each of the other 17 values ranked by the faculty in both samples.

The value, "Happiness (contentedness)" was found to be given a higher priority by the nominee educators. Table 8 shows that the $U$ value for the nominees was 1863.50 compared to the non-nominee $U$ of 1210.50. This resulted in a $z$ score of 1.93 and an associated two-tailed probability of .053—a probability close to, but slightly exceeding the established .05 level of significance.

| TABLE 8 |
| RESULTS OF THE MANN-WHITNEY $U$ TEST AS APPLIED TO THE VALUE, HAPPINESS |
| Sample | Number | $U$ Value | $z$ Score | Two-Tailed Probability |
| Nominee | 53 | 1863.50 | 1.933551 | .05317 |
| Non-nominee | 58 | 1210.50 | |

The nominees also ranked the value, "Inner Harmony (freedom from inner conflict)" significantly higher than did the non-nominees. Table 9 shows a probability of .037, indicative of the significant difference between the two groups' ranking of this value, "inner harmony."

A third value, "Salvation (saved, eternal life)" was assigned a higher rank by the nominee educators. The significance of this ranking, lower than the .05 probability level, is reported in Table 10.

A further analysis of the data relative to the educators' ranking
of values revealed that the non-nominee sample gave a higher priority to some values than did the Teacher Excellence Award nominees.

The non-nominees ranked the value, "Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)" higher than did the nominees. The significance of this ranking is shown by the two-tailed probability value of .02730, contained in Table 11.
The other value given a higher ranking by the non-nominee educators was "A World of Beauty (beauty of nature and the arts)." Table 12 contains the data related to this value.

### TABLE 12

RESULTS OF THE MANN-WHITNEY $U$ TEST AS APPLIED TO THE VALUE, A WORLD OF BEAUTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>$U$ Value</th>
<th>$z$ Score</th>
<th>Two-Tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominee</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1219.50</td>
<td>-1.883043</td>
<td>.05969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-nominee</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1854.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is shown, the probability level of .059 slightly exceeds the established .05 level of significance, but does point to a higher priority assigned this value by the non-nominees.

**Summary**

The data analysis chapter was divided into three sections: survey results; hypotheses testing data; and, supplementary analysis of the empirical data obtained from this study. The results of data analysis were presented for inspection and evaluation through the use of tables and narrative.

The first hypothesis compared two faculty samples according to the degree of their self-disclosure of personal values in academic classrooms. Through an analysis of statistical results it was concluded that the first operational and theoretical hypothesis could not be supported. There did not appear to be a significant difference in the groups' personal value self-disclosure behavior. Therefore, the nominees for the 1974
Teacher Excellence Awards, identified in this study as influence educators, did not seem to reveal more about their own personal values than did a random group of non-nominees.

The second hypothesis compared the nominees' and non-nominees' ranking of the value, "equality." The operational hypothesis stated that there should be a statistical significance to the higher ranking by the nominee group. An analysis of the research data indicated that there was no significant difference in the two groups' ranking of the value, "equality." Therefore, granted the design of the data, it does not appear as though the influence educators ranked the value, "equality", much differently than did a random sample of the faculty.

Supplementary analysis of the self-disclosure data when analyzed by college, revealed no further differences between the samples. An evaluation of the ranking of the other 17 values included in the instrumentation revealed that nominees held the values of "Inner Harmony", and "Salvation" as being significantly more important to them than did non-nominees. Happiness was also ranked as being more desired by nominees, although its ranking slightly exceeded the pre-determined level of significance. The non-nominee group, however, ranked significantly higher the value "Wisdom", than did the nominee group. Another value, "A World of Beauty", was judged to be clearly more important to non-nominees. This ranking was found to be at the .06 probability level.

The conclusions to be drawn from these results will be presented in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem

The purposes of this study were: (1) to determine the extent to which the educator's disclosure of personal values relates to their influence on students; and, (2) to investigate how the Teacher Excellence Award nominees and a random sample of non-nominees rank the personal value, "equality."

The review of the related literature did not provide evidence of prior research investigating the relationship of the educator's self-disclosure of personal values in academic environments to their influence with students. Some social scientists, studying contemporary educative environments, have concluded that students' values are influenced by the schools. Illich's (1970) conclusions illustrated this contemporary analysis. He identified the teacher's role as one of priest, and the school as the new church.

Studies of self-disclosure in other arenas of human encounter demonstrated that people are in a constant process of telling something about themselves through verbal or non-verbal processes. These findings, when applied to the educator, pointed to the numerous disclosures which may occur within the classroom.

The literature contained evidence that values, in order to be
values, must be acted upon. This behavioral component of personal values was shown to be essential to the person's capacity to rank certain preferred or desired terminal values.

There was a limited availability of research related to the students' perceptions of these behaviorally disclosed values. Previous studies illustrated, however, that students were able to perceive many aspects of the human encounter as it occurs in academic environments. In sum, human perception research implied that the problem encountered in this study may be dealt with through the obtaining of empirical data relevant to the students' perception of their educators' personal values.

The value, "equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)", was analyzed as to its importance, and rankings were assigned to it by the two sample groups of faculty. The importance of this value, when considering its influence and predictive nature, was well identified in research. "Equality", basic to the sustaining of our democratic nation state, was shown to be crucial to educational leadership in our society's schools. The personal value, "equality", being other directed, was hypothesized to be more the desired end-state of influence educators.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses investigated by this study were:

1. The influence educators, herein described as Teacher Excellence Award nominees, will have a greater disclosure of personal values than will a random sample of non-nominees.

2. The influence educators, herein described as Teacher Excellence Award nominees, will assign a higher rank to the value of equality than will the non-nominees.

"Influence", as it related to these educators, meant that the
students had a positive regard for the educator. This regard resulted in the students' nomination of the educator for a Teacher Excellence Award.

General Design

The research design was applied within the educational environment of Western Michigan University. Two faculty samples were drawn from a table of random numbers. The first, a two-thirds sample, was taken from the listing of student nominations for the 1974 Teacher Excellence Award. The second was a matching, proportional sample. It was drawn from those educators who were not nominees for the 1974 Award.

One hundred and eleven faculty agreed to participate and followed the expectations for data gathering. Fifty-three were from the nominee sample and fifty-eight were non-nominees.

The student sample was attained by randomly drawing one academic class taught by the selected educators. From these one hundred and eleven classes, 2,727 students provided data describing their perceptions of educators' values.

The Value Survey, Form E, developed by Rokeach (1973) was used to assess the personal end-state values of the educators. Each educator submitted a ranking of his/her own values. Students were asked to rank the same scale of values according to how they perceived the educator to be holding the values. This use of the Value Survey provided for the researcher two sets of data: (1) the faculty member's ranking of his or her own values; and, (2) the students' perception of faculty values.

The data were analyzed through the use of appropriate statistical
techniques. The first hypothesis required an evaluation of: (1) the degree of ranking agreement within each of the classes; (2) the correlation which may exist between the educator's value priority and the classes' perception of that priority; and, (3) the resultant statistically significant difference between the two samples when comparing the correlation scores.

The operational expression of the second hypothesis necessitated an evaluation of the statistically significant difference which may exist between the nominee and non-nominee rankings of the value, "equality."

Supplementary analyses of the value data were undertaken. The intention was to determine whether there were other significant differences which might inform the conclusions to be drawn about findings related to the two theoretical hypotheses.

Findings

Hypothesis One

A testing of the first hypothesis resulted in a comparison between the Teacher Excellence Award nominees and a random sample of non-nominees. The empirical data used in this comparison related to their self-disclosure of personal end-state values. It was hypothesized that the nominees would have a higher degree of disclosure than would the non-nominees. The finding indicated that there appeared to be no significant differences resultant from making this two sample comparison of self-disclosure behavior.

Supplementary Analysis of Hypothesis One

Supplementary analysis of disclosure behavior was conducted through
an investigation of the differences between the samples when they were compared by academic colleges. While no statistically significant differences were discovered, it appeared as though there was a trend toward less disclosure in the College of Business and the College of Applied Science.

**Hypothesis Two**

The finding which resulted from a testing of the second hypothesis indicated no significant differences in how the two faculty samples ranked the value, "equality." The statistic applied to analyze the difference showed a probability level of .88 when comparing the two groups.

**Supplementary Analysis of Hypothesis Two**

A further study was made of the priority given to the other 17 values which were ranked by the faculty. "Inner Harmony", and "Salvation" were ranked significantly higher by the award nominees than by a random sample of non-nominee faculty. "Happiness" was also valued more highly by nominees, although at a slightly less than significant level. The non-nominees, however, assigned a significantly higher priority to the value, "Wisdom" than did the nominees. "A World of Beauty" was also valued more highly by the non-nominees, although its probability was .06, greater than the pre-determined .05 level of significance.

**Conclusions**

Two initial conclusions were drawn from the empirical data of this study. It was concluded that the Teacher Excellence Award nominees and a random group of non-nominees appeared to be similar in: (1) their
degree of self-disclosure of personal values in academic classrooms; and, (2) their priority assigned to the value, "equality."

Conclusions were also drawn from an analysis of the correlation scores listed in Appendix E. Almost all of the scores were positive, indicating that the students have some capacity to correctly identify faculty values. Conversely, an equal dispersion of positive and negative scores, with an average near zero, would have shown an incapacity to perceive values.

The degree of agreement between class and faculty values seems to be basically dependent upon the incident of disclosure. However, other variables may have intervened. Certain values may have been attributed to faculty in accord with various preconceptions students have about an educator's role and values. The design of the study did not allow for the testing of these preconceptions. The data did show, however, that, if the incident of disclosure is high, and if the disclosure is perceived correctly by students, then the obtained correlation will tend to be higher.

Academic areas seemed to influence the disclosure of faculty values. A lower disclosure was found in the Colleges of Business and Applied Science. While the causation for this difference was not tested, it may be inferred from the studies previously cited, that, when academic inquiry is enacted from the value-free, positivistic position, there is less disclosure and perception of educator values.

The students exhibited a high degree of unity in their perception of faculty values, and they also showed some capacity to identify the values held by the faculty. These findings point toward Illich's (1970)
conclusions that the school may be becoming the new church as values appear to be disclosed regularly by all kinds of faculty in all kinds of classrooms.

"Influence" in this study meant that the students have a positive regard for an educator. It was hypothesized that "positive regard" was resultant from having experienced the self-disclosure of an educator's values. However, the self-disclosure research by Cozby (1972), Byrne (1969) and Gilbert and Norenstein (1975) highlighted the necessity to consider both the content and intensity of the disclosure when attempting to understand its influence. This study, and its resultant findings, seemed to confirm this need to evaluate the quality and nature of an educator's self-disclosure in academic environments. The conclusion may be made that it is not just the incident of self-disclosure which appeared to result in a student's positive regard for an educator, but that this influence may be more related to the perceived appropriateness of, and intentionality attributed to the educator's disclosure behavior.

One of the variables investigated in this study was the hierarchy of personal values which were held by the faculty, and the relationship of that hierarchy to the influence of the faculty. Students in this study appeared to have a more positive regard for those faculty who held highly the values of "Happiness", "Inner Harmony", and "Salvation." These values are identified by Rokeach (1973), and Feather (1975) as being interior or self-seeking values. Park (1971) and Blai (1973) found similar results in their studies of faculty in higher education. There appeared to be an attraction between students and faculty who favored self-oriented values. Educators who held these self-directed
values seemed to be placed in nomination for the Teacher Excellence Award to a greater degree than did those faculty who held other value orientations.

It was also noted that the nominees and non-nominees were similar in the priority given to the value, "equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)." This value was identified in the literature as being essential to society and education. It was, therefore, hypothesized that influence educators may have a greater disclosure of this value in the classroom than would a random sample of the faculty. This expected greater disclosure was not supported by the data. It may be concluded that those faculty who assigned a higher rank to the value, equality, do not stand out uniquely within the Teacher Excellence Award nominee sample.

It has been previously indicated that students and nominee faculty seemed to have a higher cathexis toward self-directed values. This study supported that conclusion by showing how the value orientations of its two faculty samples differed. If, however, a higher ranking would have been assigned to the value, "equality", that would have shown a tendency to be "other-directed" in desired end-states of life. Therefore, lack of preference for the value "equality" seemed to support the conclusion that nominees tend to be more self-oriented in their desired end-state values.

Further support for this self-orientation conclusion comes from the priority nominees assigned to the value "Salvation." There is evidence (Rokeach, 1969; Stark, 1970) which revealed how a higher ranking of the value "Salvation" is related to self-concern, closedness, inequality, and a lack of social compassion. The research contained herein
confirmed the conclusions of Rokeach (1967) and Stark (1970) by pointing toward the self-oriented tendency of the nominee faculty. Self-orientation appeared to be opposed to an influence which may arise from the nature of desiring an equal opportunity for all.

Recommendations

This study provided insight into the nature of an educator's self-disclosure of personal values and relationship of that disclosure to the positive regard they receive from students. Conclusions were also made in reference to priorities faculty members assign to certain end-state values. The findings, resultant from an analysis of the data, indicated the need to conduct further research into several related areas.

The research problem of this study appears to have received little attention in the literature. Therefore, it is difficult to make conclusions based on similar studies conducted with different populations. Replication of this design seems essential to a more complete understanding of the nature of an educator's disclosure and influence in education. These studies would help to clarify how educators disclose their values and the proper place such disclosures may have in all phases of education. This kind of data could be especially helpful to those concerned with the dynamics of value education in the schools.

Teacher selection, training and placement must take into account the potential impact of value disclosure in the classroom. Do educators know how they are disclosing their values? Are these values in harmony with or enabling to the greatest good of the human enterprise? Are students learning and achieving excellence in an appropriate value
environment? Are students presented with an intentional overall balance in faculty values? These are just a few of the implied concerns which all aspects of education must take into account. Value education, therefore, must be broader than a clarification of values. It ought to encompass all phases of the teacher-learner process. Because education is dependent upon the appropriate utilization of its human resources, further studies will be needed to assist educational decision makers who manage these and related areas.

Further studies are also needed to determine how classroom leaders rank and act out the value, "equality." Because this value is essential to the future of a free society, it was regarded as being a desired component of an educator's influence. Additional data representative of other populations is required before further judgments are to be made. This information may also be helpful to teacher training and instructional goal setting.

The relationship between self-disclosure and influence was found to be complex. The researcher found no significant differences between the samples when considering only the degree of disclosure. This lack of difference seems to indicate a need to develop a more refined instrumentation, design, and analysis of disclosure. Questions related to the content, authenticity and intensity of an educator's disclosure should be the focus of this more complete analysis. Conclusions resultant from these studies may assist in providing a better understanding of how personal values are appropriately disclosed to students, and how that disclosure may relate to a student's attributing a positive regard to their instructors.
Further research is also needed in order to better understand the variables of "positive regard" or "influence." It may be necessary to develop what Feather (1975) identified as a multi-trait and multi-method analysis of influence. Several measures would then be employed to better describe educator influence and its greatest impact on students. This may provide a more adequate basis from which to research the relationship of self-disclosure to an educator's influence on students.

The science of education seems to hold that some areas of academic inquiry more naturally provide an environment for an educator's self-disclosure. Such conclusions were not tested in this study. Further research is needed to analyze how academic areas relate to increased or decreased faculty disclosure. Findings from this kind of research may provide teacher-educators with some basis for overcoming value education problems as they relate to the various disciplines.

This study confirmed the conclusions of previous research by evidencing a self-orientation to faculty values. However, longitudinal studies are needed to further describe these conclusions. It is not clear to this researcher whether this tendency toward self-orientation in value preferences is reflective only of a recent trend, or whether it mirrors a more basic quality of higher education. Additionally, this researcher asks whether higher education, its administration and faculty, would be more positively regarded by students if they created a learning society based upon the values of other directedness, service and equality. The answer to these questions could be available through further value oriented studies conducted within the educational institutions of this society.
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APPENDIX A

ROKEACH VALUE SURVEY
VALUE SURVEY

Instructions:
Below you will find 18 values listed in alphabetical order. Please arrange them in order of their importance to you as guides for your life. Study the list carefully and pick out the one value which is most important to you. Place a number one (1) in front of that value. Then pick out the value which is of second most importance to you. Place a number two (2) in front of that value. Continue until you are finished. The value of least importance to you should have a number 18 in front of it.
Work slowly and think carefully. If you change your mind feel free to change your answer by erasing or scratching out the number and putting in the new one. The final result should show how you really feel.

A COMFORTABLE LIFE (a prosperous life)
AN EXCITING LIFE (a stimulating, active life)
A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (lasting contribution)
A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)
FAMILY SECURITY (taking care of loved ones)
FREEDOM (independence, free choice)
HAPPINESS (contentedness)
INNER HARMONY (freedom from inner conflict)
MATURE LOVE (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
NATIONAL SECURITY (protection from attack)
PLEASURE (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
SALVATION (saved, eternal life)
SELF-RESPECT (self-esteem)
SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)
TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)
WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)
Below is another list of 18 values. Please arrange them in order of importance, the same as before.

AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)
BROADMINDED (open-minded)
CAPABLE (competent, effective)
CHEERFUL (lighthearted, joyful)
CLEAN (neat, tidy)
COURAGEOUS (standing up for your beliefs)
FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)
HONEST (sincere, truthful)
IMAGINATIVE (daring, creative)
INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
INTELLECTUAL (intelligent, reflective)
LOGICAL (consistent, rational)
LOVING (affectionate, tender)
OBEDIENT (dutiful, respectful)
POLITE (courteous, well-mannered)
RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
SELF-CONTROLLED (restrained, self-disciplined)
Dear

Throughout my eight years of ministry on this campus, I have been interested in the relationship of values to higher education. Now, I am writing to you asking for your assistance in understanding that relationship.

My doctoral research will be an investigation of a student's ability to perceive faculty values, and to analyze the influence this perception has on students.

The instrumentation is a paper-pencil test, the Value Survey*. It allows for the ranking of 18 values, and requires approximately ten minutes to complete.

To gather the data, I am asking you to use this instrument in the randomly selected class noted below. During this ten minute period, you and your students would complete the Survey using the simple, self-contained instructions. Your rankings will indicate your own values, while the students rankings will describe the order of values they perceive you to be holding.

To insure confidentiality, I will not report out individual faculty rankings, or specific class perception results; but I will make them available to you personally, if you wish.

The first three weeks of November are the target dates for the gathering of data. I will be calling you personally for confirmation of your participation and discussion of further details.

I am deeply appreciative of your assistance.

Cordially,

Rev. Don Van Hoeven
Campus Minister

Doctoral Committee
Dr. Rodney Roth, Chairperson
Dr. Ernest Stech
Dr. John Flynn
Dr. Kenneth Simon

Educational Leadership
Communications Arts and Sciences
Social Work
College of Education

Class: ____________________________  Section: ____________________________

October 14, 1975

Dear:

This note is a follow up to my request for your participation in my doctoral research project.

Because it is too complicated to reach everyone in the random sample by phone, I have chosen to write for confirmation and class size.

Your selected class was_______________________________________
Section__________.

If this class or section is not taught by you, I will need to randomly select another which you do teach. You may indicate on the enclosed card such problems.

If it is accurate, I would appreciate a class size indication. This will help me to prepare the Survey materials for your particular section. I intend to send these materials to you toward the end of the month in order that you may use the Survey anytime you choose during the first three weeks of November.

You may return the enclosed card to me at Kanley Chapel.

I am most appreciative of your help.

Sincerely,

Don Van Hoeven

DVH:cev

Enclosure
FACULTY PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT
AND CLASS SIZE CARD

INSTRUCTOR ________________________________

CLASS ________________________________

SECTION ________________________________

SIZE OF CLASS ________________________________
Enclosed are the materials needed to participate in the value research project of Don VanHoeven, doctoral student in educational leadership.

This packet contains:

1. Instructions to be read at the time of administration (green sheet)
2. An Instructor's Value Survey (yellow sheet)
3. _______surveys to be distributed to students (white sheets)
4. A large return envelope for student surveys
5. A small return envelope for instructor's survey

VALUE SURVEY ADMINISTRATION PROCESS:

In the first three weeks of November, in the class period selected by you, the instructor, it is suggested that:

a. A student proctor be appointed to assist in the research process

b. Near the end of the selected class period allow time for the proctor to do the following:

1. Read to the class the first instructions ("A") on the green sheet
2. Distribute a student survey (white sheet) to each student
3. Distribute to the instructor the Instructor's Value Survey (yellow sheet) and the small return envelope
4. After distribution of the Survey to the instructor and students, read the instructions "B" to the class (green sheet)
5. Collect all the surveys from the students, seal them in the large return envelope; and place them in the Campus Mail

ALLOT TEN (10) MINUTES FOR THE ACTUAL RANKING OF VALUES (DURING THIS PERIOD IT IS SUGGESTED THAT THE INSTRUCTOR LEAVE THE ROOM, COMPLETE THE SURVEY, AND RETURN IT IN THE MAILER PROVIDED.)

THIS RESEARCH PACKET NEED NOT BE OPENED UNTIL THE TIME OF ADMINISTRATION
VALUE SURVEY ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS
"A"
(To Be Read By The Proctor Prior To Distribution)

YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO SHARE IN A STUDY OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF VALUES. THE NUMBER ON THE SURVEY THAT YOU WILL RECEIVE IDENTIFIES IT AS BELONGING TO THIS CLASS. YOU ARE NOT TO SIGN YOUR NAME. I WILL READ THE INSTRUCTIONS WHEN ALL THE SURVEYS HAVE BEEN DISTRIBUTED, AND COLLECT THE SURVEYS WHEN YOU ARE FINISHED.

VALUE SURVEY ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS
"B"
(To Be Read By The Proctor After The Distribution)

THIS IS A SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF THE VALUES WHICH YOU THINK YOUR INSTRUCTOR HOLDS. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS IN THIS STUDY. THE BEST ANSWER IS YOUR HONEST CHOICE ABOUT WHICH VALUES ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOUR INSTRUCTOR. BELOW IS A LIST OF 18 VALUES. FROM THIS LIST YOU ARE TO MAKE YOUR CHOICES ABOUT WHICH VALUES ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOUR INSTRUCTOR. STUDY THE LIST CAREFULLY. THEN PLACE A 1 NEXT TO THE VALUE WHICH YOU THINK IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOUR INSTRUCTOR. PLACE A 2 NEXT TO THE VALUE WHICH IS SECOND MOST IMPORTANT TO YOUR INSTRUCTOR. DO THIS FOR EACH OF THE VALUES. THE VALUE WHICH IS LEAST IMPORTANT SHOULD BE GIVEN THE NUMBER 18.

WORK SLOWLY AND CAREFULLY. IF YOU CHANGE YOUR MIND, FEEL FREE TO CHANGE YOUR ANSWERS. REMEMBER, HOWEVER, TO USE EACH NUMBER ONLY ONE TIME. THERE ARE TO BE NO TIES.

WHEN YOU FINISH, THE NUMBERS SHOULD SHOW THE ORDER OF VALUES YOU HONESTLY BELIEVE TO BE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOUR INSTRUCTOR.
INSTRUCTOR'S VALUE SURVEY
(To Be Completed By The Instructor)

Date of Administration

Desire to receive profile of class results ______yes, ______no

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

Study the list carefully. Then place a 1 next to the value which is most important to you, place a 2 next to the value which is second most important, etc. The value which is least important should be ranked 18. There are to be no ties.

Work slowly and carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. The end results should indicate your best ranking of these 18 values.

1. A COMFORTABLE LIFE (a prosperous life)
2. AN EXCITING LIFE (a stimulating, active life)
3. A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (lasting contribution)
4. A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
5. EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)
6. FAMILY SECURITY (taking care of loved ones)
7. FREEDOM (independence, free choice)
8. HAPPINESS (contentedness)
9. INNER HARMONY (freedom from inner conflict)
10. MATURE LOVE (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
11. NATIONAL SECURITY (protection from attack)
12. PLEASURE (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
13. SALVATION (saved, eternal life)
14. SELF-RESPECT (self-esteem)
15. SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)
16. TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)
17. WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)
18. A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
A SURVEY
PERCEPTIONS OF YOUR INSTRUCTORS VALUES
(To Be Completed By Students)

This is a scientific study of the values which you think your instructor holds. There are no right or wrong answers in this study. The best answer is your honest choice about which values are most important to your instructor.

Below is a list of 18 values. From this list you are to make your choices about which values are most important to your instructor.

Study the list carefully. Then place a 1 next to the value which you think is most important to your instructor. Place a 2 next to the value which is second most important to your instructor. Do this for each of the values. The value which is least important should be given the number 18.

Work slowly and carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. Remember, however, to use each number only one time. There are to be no ties.

When you finish, the numbers should show the order of values you honestly believe to be most important to your instructor.

_____A COMFORTABLE LIFE (a prosperous life)
_____AN EXCITING LIFE (a stimulating, active life)
_____A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (lasting contribution)
_____A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
_____EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)
_____FAMILY SECURITY (taking care of loved ones)
_____FREEDOM (independence, free choice)
_____HAPPINESS (contentedness)
_____INNER HARMONY (freedom from inner conflict)
_____MATURE LOVE (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
_____NATIONAL SECURITY (protection from attack)
_____PLEASURE (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
_____SALVATION (saved, eternal life)
_____SELF-RESPECT (self-esteem)
_____SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)
_____TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)
_____WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)
_____A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
APPENDIX D

A LISTING OF THE KENDALL COEFFICIENT OF CONCORDANCE: "W" SCORES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.32895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.32932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.54971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.39046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.31957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.39077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.36026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.26691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.53301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.45053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.55363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.46588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.38485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.40271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.35261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.45036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.36636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.43000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.27655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.42032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.41797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.32977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.39026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.31307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.37761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.40591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.39704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.36594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.47892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.32514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.35354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.35085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.24578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.29827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.38873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.44897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.41222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.29219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.68973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.37885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.36176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.43262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.25008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.45148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.28761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.48797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>.33656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>.30162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>.38877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>.38952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>.46534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>.39750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>.21124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>.42112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>.55780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>.45350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>.37154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>.49167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>.45812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>.24116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>.33274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>.45337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>.44647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Classes listed as inclusive of those who responded with useable data*
APPENDIX E

A LISTING OF THE
PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT
CORRELATION COEFFICIENT SCORES
## CORRELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1566</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.7019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5380</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>.8085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.1589</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.3315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5541</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.2867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3879</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.7184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.0713</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.0075</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.4714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.5738</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.5320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.1550</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.3752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.6945</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.4912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.4180</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.6076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.1022</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.5157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.7769</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.5516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.4037</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.6887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.7944</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.5240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.4613</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.5448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.7152</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.2901</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.4934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.5026</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>.5600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.0289</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.2718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.2416</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.0960</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>.1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.5583</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.4525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.7283</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.4600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.5212</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>.2294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-.1187</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.3211</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.4609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.3609</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>.5963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.3986</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.2693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.6918</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.6409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.3574</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-.0247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.1775</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.6313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.5319</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-.3604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.1957</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.0836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.7970</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>.5412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.3038</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>.3106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>.2516</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.4572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>.3475</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.2457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>.3693</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.3313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>.8854</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.4530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>.6364</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.5851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>.5619</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.5444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>.6243</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.2074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>.4171</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.6288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>.3306</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.3725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>.2901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>.7703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>.0816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>.6226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>.2178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>.3118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>.4605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>.5083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>.4533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>.4928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>-.4881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>.1166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>.5813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>.6244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>.6309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>-.0114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>.5728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>.5418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>.3787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>.8020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>.5787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Classes listed are inclusive of those who responded with usable data*