Title: *TRANSMISSION OF HUMAN VALUES: A CROSS-CULTURAL INVESTIGATION OF GENERATIONAL AND RECIPROCAL INFLUENCE EFFECTS* , By: Homer, Pamela M., Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs, 87567547, Aug93, Vol. 119, Issue 3
Database: *Academic Search Premier*

TRANSMISSION OF HUMAN ***VALUES***: A CROSS-CULTURAL INVESTIGATION OF ***GENERATIONAL*** AND RECIPROCAL INFLUENCE EFFECTS

Contents

ABSTRACT. Considerable attention has been devoted to the study of human ***values*** in a variety of social sciences. In this study, similar value dimensions emerged in two cultural groups composed of 210 parents and student lineages. Using a structural equation approach, analyses compared the structures of value measurement in students versus parents across and within the American and West German cultures. Additional causal analyses examined the transmission of ***values*** between parents and students, including reciprocal influences. Value transmission varied across cultures and by the value domain. Among the American respondents, reciprocal influences were apparent for the esteem and social ***values***, but only the child to parent influence emerged for the hedonism ***values***. In contrast, there was little evidence of value transmission for the West German sample.

VALUES HAVE A PERVASIVE INFLUENCE on all aspects of human life, according to Rokeach (1973), who referred to a value as an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end state is personally preferable to its opposite. ***Values*** transcend specific situations and are ordered by relative importance (Schwartz, 1990; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990). Value systems are enduring organizations of beliefs concerning preferred modes of conduct or end states along a continuum of importance. Williams (1979) elaborated on this conceptualization by referring to value systems as "an organized set of preferential rules for making selections, resolving conflicts, and coping with needs for social and psychological defenses of the choices made or proposed" (p. 128). Value systems are central to the cognitive structure of individuals; they serve as bases for the formation of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors (Homer & Kahle, 1988; Rokeach, 1970), guide our presentations to others (Rokeach, 1973), and also justify or explain past conduct (Williams, 1979).

In spite of the generally accepted importance placed on the role of ***values***, their scope has received relatively limited empirical attention. Most research has concentrated on the effects of ***values*** on an item-by-item basis, thereby neglecting the complex nature of value structures. As Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) noted, an examination of human value systems has several benefits: (a) it provides more reliable indices of the importance of value domains which, in turn, are useful when investigating the effects of ***values*** on attitudes, behaviors, and various social structural variables; (b) it allows more comprehensive cross-cultural comparisons because value domains can cover the significant types of value content whose meanings are shared, whereas single ***values*** may be grounded in particular cultures; and (c) cross-cultural comparisons of structural relationships can help us to identify which domains are compatible or contradictory. Cross-cultural investigations of value structures are also valuable, because they establish the generality of findings and validity of interpretations derived from single-nation studies, forcing researchers to refine their interpretations to account for cross-cultural differences and inconsistencies not revealed in

studies of single cultures (Kohn, 1989). These same cross-cultural analyses can be further applied to examine ***generational*** differences in value structures.

Background

Value Transmission Effects

Little theory has been generated concerning value transmission or contrasts in terms of between-generation or within-family effects. Some studies support similarity in value orientations, whereas other studies question the notion of family transmission of value structures (Bengtson, 1975). Analyses of the 1960's student movement does provide some evidence of emerging alternative value orientations among youth (Bengtson & Black, 1973; Block, Haan, & Smith, 1969); however an investigation of ***values*** and interpersonal perceptions of high school seniors and their parents in the late 1960s found little evidence of value conflict (Thurnher, Spence, & Lowenthal, 1974). Rather, Thurnher et al. implied that any conflict between children and their parents is over means, not ends, and that the "generation gap" is more likely a myth. On the other hand, Youmans (1973) found age strata differences in value orientation, reported by rural and urban samples, including authoritarianism, dependency, achievement, religiosity, and anomie; a rural-urban ***values*** gap was also present. Laufer and Bengtson (1974) add that changes in ***values*** occur when new skills are required and new patterns of social organization arise. Earlier, Weiner (1971) suggested that youth are not in conflict about ***values*** and standards of conduct, but rather, that differences are restricted to trivial matters (e.g., clothing preferences).

Feather (1975) reported the results of two surveys of parents and their children collected in 1972 and 1973. Parents were found to assign greater importance to ***values*** concerning family, security, self-respect, and competence, whereas children placed more importance on excitement and pleasure, freedom, close companionships, and broad-mindedness. Differences were interpreted to be due in part to fairly universal adjustments that are made at different periods of the life cycle as one copes with biological changes, changing needs, and societal expectations related to changing responsibilities. At the same time, such differences could reflect unique sociocultural trends or events experienced by one generation and not the other. As Feather emphasized, however, these factors are difficult to disentangle.

Inglehart (1990) contends that the the process of value change reflects period effects (short-term fluctuations in the socioeconomic environment) superimposed on long-term cohort effects (conditions prevailing during a given group's formative years). Based on an impressive collection of national samples, Inglehart concluded that "the ***values*** of Western publics have been shifting from an overwhelming emphasis on material well-being and physical security toward greater emphasis on the quality of life" (p.5). Older birth cohorts consistently manifested value priorities that were more materialistic than those expressed by younger cohorts, and cohort analysis indicated that this was more the result of ***generational*** change than of aging effects.

There is no consensus regarding the magnitude of value (structure) differences between

generations. The differences do not necessarily reflect incongruences between parents and children; nor does within-family value concordance necessarily imply ***generational*** similarity at a societal level (Bengtson, 1975). In a study of 256 American parent-child lineages, Bengtson identified two underlying value dimensions: humanism/materialism and collectivism/individualism. Low to moderate family transmission effects were apparent for the collectivism/individualism dimension. Nevertheless there was little group variation by generation and little indication of parent-to-child transmission for the humanism/materialism factor. The author was neither able to identify marked ***generational*** differences nor strong familial similarity in value orientations. Recently, Grunert (1990) found that two ***values***-fun/enjoyment and security-discriminated most between students and parents across four cultures (Denmark, Japan, West Germany, and the United States).

Intergenerational similarities in ***values*** cannot necessarily be interpreted as evidence of parental influence because observed similarity may result from the influence of children on their parents. Unfortunately, traditional views of socialization have concentrated on the process of influence from parent to child without sufficient consideration of the possibility of mutual influence (Glass, Bengtson, & Dunham, 1986). Using a developmental aging perspective, Glass et al. (1986) examined attitude transmission across gender, political, and religious domains to assess the accuracy of direct socialization, status inheritance, and reciprocal influence models (using an American sample). Little convergence of parent-child attitudes with age emerged in cross-sectional analyses: (a) status inheritance processes accounted for a significant amount of the observed similarity between generations; (b) parent attitudes contributed to prediction of children's attitudes past childhood; and (c) child influences on parental attitudes were substantial and relatively stable, although the exact pattern of influences varied by attitude domain, and the forces producing similarities appear to change over time.

Values are similar to attitudes in that both are cognitions varying in specificity (***values*** being less specific than attitudes) that function to facilitate adaptation to one's environment (Homer & Kahle, 1988). Therefore, the processes by which attitudes are transmitted across generations may resemble the intergenerational transmission of ***values***, implying that the reciprocal influence between parent and child value transmission warrants further investigation. Similarity in ***values*** may be equally due to the influence of children on their parents as to the parent over child influence.

Cross-Cultural Effects

Value structures are at least in part derived from cultural influences. "Culture is a system of attitudes, ***values***, and knowledge that is widely shared within a society and transmitted from generation to generation" (Inglehart, 1990, p. 18). There is limited knowledge about the relative value structures of persons from different cultures. For example, sociological cross-cultural research has often focused on such constructs as social status, political and social movements, economic growth, educational systems, and demographic characteristics (Inglehart; Kohn, 1989). Even Inglehart's extensive study of personal ***values*** focused primarily on one relatively specific underlying dimension-materialism/postmaterialism.

According to Bond (1988), "Cultural-level groupings of psychological phenomena such as ***values*** often appear puzzling and are subject to considerable interpretive debate" (p.1009). From one perspective, the main challenge is to establish similarities in factor structure that can form the basis of cross-cultural comparison. Bond argued that this requirement is too restrictive because "it is unlikely that the coefficients of factorial congruence for all possible pairings from m cultures across n factors could all attain a common, high level" (p. 1009). In a summary of a series of cultural studies,' four dimensions were identified across cultures: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism versus collectivism, and masculinity versus femininity (Hofstede & Bond, 1984). After "deculturizing" the data to remove the cultural positioning effect, Bond (1988) found four underlying factors: competence versus security, personal morality versus success, social reliability versus beauty, and political harmony versus personal sociability.

Evidence pertaining to the importance of individualism versus collectivism is substantial (Kamakura & Novak, 1992; Schwartz, 1990; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990; Triandis, 1989) and is readily apparent in eight domains that resulted from smallest space analyses of ratings of Rokeach's (1973) Value Survey performed on seven cultural groups (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990). Schwartz and Bilsky also found evidence that the value conflict between the prosocial and achievement domains may be universal. The conflicts between restrictive conformity versus both self-direction and maturity were apparent in all sampled societies (Australia, Finland, Germany, Israel, Spain, and the United States) except Hong Kong. Partial support emerged for the hypothesized conflicts between own pleasure versus prosocial, achievement versus security, and hedonism versus altruism. Recently, Kamakura and Novak (1992) identified latent value system segments and a ***values*** map derived from a national probability sample of American adults consistent with Schwartz and Bilsky's psychological structure of human ***values***.

A materialistic/postmaterialistic ***values*** dimension has been identified across 10 countries, and stable cross-cultural differences were traceable to long-term differences in the environment of the respective societies (e.g., national security was ranked much higher by Hungarians than Americans) in Inglehart's (1990) comprehensive investigation. Kohn (1977,1989) found a consistent relationship between social structures and parental ***values*** (those ***values*** that parents would most like to see embodied in their children's behavior).[2] Support of a self-direction versus conformity to external authority continuum emerged in multiple studies, but self-direction played a more crucial role in explaining the relationships between social class and ***values*** in highly industrialized countries.

Generational Effects Across Cultures

Intergenerational cross-cultural comparisons of value structures are essentially nonexistent. Feather (1975) provided data comparing value rankings of parents and students across three cultural samples (America, Australia, and Papua New Guinea), but only at the univariate level. American parents ranked freedom higher than Australian parents, whereas Australian (male) students ranked equality, family security, and happiness higher than American (male) students. Overall, Americans appeared more materialistic, achievement-oriented, and salvation-minded than Australians. ***Generational*** comparisons of the Australian and Papua

New Guinea samples indicated that Papua New Guinea students were more concerned with some general social ***values***, orthodox religious ***values***, and ***values*** implying deference to authority. Australian students, however, assigned more importance to personal, humanistic types of ***values*** than the Papua New Guinea students. Results suggested that the Rokeach ***values*** instrument may be less appropriate for developing, less-affluent societies, such as Papua New Guinea.

Limitations of Past Research

In a close examination of the methodology of these various studies, many of the contradictory findings were easily resolved. Perhaps the most obvious factor was the lack of consensus about what constitutes a value. Researchers have applied the label "***values***" to a variety of concepts, including behaviors, personality traits, and perceptions. In fact, of the studies mentioned above, a limited number (Bengtson, 1975; Bond, 1988; Feather, 1975; Inglehart, 1990; Kamakura & Novak, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990) measured ***values*** similar to the approach of Rokeach, who delineates general underlying ***values*** that have a pervasive impact on all aspects of one's life. Kohnis research, for example, focused on "parental ***values***," which refer to the characteristics parents consider most desirable to inculcate in their children (e.g., honesty, happiness, dependability, neatness, good manners). The process by which general underlying ***values*** that influence all facets of life are transmitted between generations may differ from the specific, more time-dependent beliefs measured in many of the studies cited above.

Although underlying domains have been identified (e.g., Bengtson, 1975; Kohn, 1977; Glass et al., 1986; Inglehart, 1990; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987, 1990), in subsequent analyses researchers usually resorted to more simplistic approaches (e.g., created indices from factor scores) rather than explicitly incorporating the underlying measurement structures of a set of ***values***. Exceptions include Kamakura and Novak's (1992) application of a clusterwise extension of Thurstone's (1927) law of comparative judgment that revealed value-system segments representing four distinct consumer types embedded in a generalized value structure (but tested on American adults only). Schwartz and Bilsky (1987,1990) used a multidimensional scaling approach to identify their eight value domains, but this method could not be used to perform strict tests among the cultural groups.

More often, researchers have not gone beyond the simplistic, single-item analytic approach to examine the interrelationships among the elements in personal value structures. Inglehart's (1990) comprehensive account often relied on less sophisticated analyses and/or neglected to capture the full power of structural equation analyses by resorting to single-item indices used to represent a value dimension. Whereas Alwin and Jackson (1982a, 1982b) and Alwin, Jackson, and Krosnick (1985) investigated the underlying factor structure of parental ***values*** (using the same data as Kohn), their ***values*** were meant to capture phenomena different from the personal forces that influence all aspects of an individual's daily life (cognitive processing, behaviors, etc.).

In response to the issues identified above, the present study applied a structural equation approach to address the following primary objectives:

1. To identify underlying dimensions that characterize ***values*** in two generations (parent and child)
2. To assess the magnitudes of value dimension differences between parents and children
3. To examine the extent of within-family similarity and (reciprocal) value transmission between generations
4. To investigate these effects across those societies

The List of *Values* (LOV)

In an effort to overcome limitations associated with the most widely used method of ***values*** measurement, that of Rokeach (1973), a more parsimonious alternative, the List of ***Values*** (LOV), was developed and shown to be reliable in a test using a national sample (Kahle, 1983; Veroff, Douvan, & Kulka, 1981). More recently, the LOV was shown to be associated with a variety of attitudinal and behavioral tendencies (Beatty, Kahle, Homer, & Misra, 1985; Homer & Kahle, 1988) and was the measurement scheme used to identify Kamakura and Novak's (1992) value system segments. The LOV consists of nine ***values***: a sense of belonging, excitement, fun and enjoyment in life, warm relationships with others, selffulfillment, a sense of accomplishment, being well-respected, security, and selfrespect. These ***values*** were selected for their closeness to other respected measurement techniques (e.g., Rokeach), and because of their relevance and influence over people's daily lives.

Except for warm relationships with others, the LOV items correspond to one of Schwartz and Bilsky's motivational domains that serve individual or mixed interests (Kamakura & Novak, 1992). As suggested by Kahle (1983) and by Kamakura and Novak (1992), individuals may interpret warm relationships with others differently (i.e., as long-term, enduring, deep relationships with others or as close friends with whom one shares enjoyment). The warm relationships value, therefore, is a potential component of both the enjoyment and maturity domains. Self-fulfillment and self-respect represent the self-direction domain; accomplishment and being well-respected represent the achievement domain; enjoyment in life, excitement, and warm relationships represent the enjoyment domain; a sense of belonging and warm relationships represent the maturity domain; and security represents the security domain.

Method

Sample

Graduate and undergraduate students and their parents in the United States and West Germany participated in this cross-cultural study (data collected in 1988). I based the analyses on a total of 210 parent and student pairs (104 from the United States and 106 from West Germany). For the most part, the students were enrolled in business and communication classes and were predominantly from middle or upper middle class families.

At each location, a professor was responsible for administering the questionnaire and, for the West German sample, was fully involved in the translation and back translation

processes.

Survey Instrument

The first page of the questionnaire included instructions and the following cover story:

The following questionnaire items are designed to help us learn more about your ***values***, gift giving, leisure activities, and attitudes. We will be comparing the responses to these questions in different cultures and for different generations within each of these cultures.

The questionnaire consisted of six sections, including the ranking and rating tasks of the nine LOV items described earlier. The ***values*** ranking and rating tasks appeared in the first and fifth sections. The order of these tasks was randomly reversed so that approximately half the sample ranked the ***values*** first and the remaining half rated the ***values*** first. The second, third, and fourth sections included the assessments of gift-giving behaviors, leisure activities, and attitudes, respectively. I purposefully positioned these middle sections to separate the value ranking and rating tasks. The final section was devoted to demographic information.

In the ***values*** ranking task, subjects were asked to rank the nine LOV items according to their importance in their lives. Similarl***y***, they also rated the individual ***values*** on a nine-point scale ranging from very important to not at all important in daily life. The attitudinal measures were drawn from the 1980 VALS algorithm (Mitchell 1983). The research reported here used only the value ratings because of statistical assumptions and the study's objectives.

Translation was required for the West German sample. These questionnaires were first translated by a native speaker and then translated back into English. Both the initial translations and the back-translations were examined by at least two other independent bilingual speakers. Revisions were made until the professor responsible for the local translation was satisfied. The translated West German ***values*** instrument had been used previously in research and was also pretested.

Procedure

Students completed the self-paced questionnaire in a classroom setting. For their parents, the German students were given a second questionnaire enclosed in a university envelope along with a cover letter (on official university stationary) requesting cooperation. A self-addressed, stamped return envelope was also enclosed. To increase the probability that students would deliver the surveys, they were distributed shortly before the school's spring vacation. To insure an acceptable response rate from the American parents, the questionnaires were mailed to them directly, because the survey was administered at the beginning of the semester. For the United States, the response rate was 80% and for West Germany, 85%.

Analyses

Deculturing the data. When raw data from different cultures are pooled prior to exploratory factor analyses, the universal pattern of correlation among the variables is distorted (artificially increased, decreased, or reversed) by a cultural positioning effect (Bond, 1988; Leung & Bond, 1989). To remove this positioning effect, I first "decultured" the data by separately standardizing responses to each variable within each society. This procedure retains the intraculture correlations, while eliminating the cultural confound. A subsequent factor analysis then can identify the average pattern of association between any two variables across all individuals, regardless of culture (Leung & Bond, 1989).

It is important that each cultural subsample be represented relatively equally in a pooled factor analysis or the numerically superior culture(s) will have a larger impact on the final solution (Bond, 1988). The present study was composed of two cultural groups of approximately equal size and large enough to provide stable estimates in the LISREL analyses.

Structural equation and multivariate analyses. The factor structure modeled in all structural equation solutions was based on an initial exploratory factor analysis.[3] I obtained all of the parameter estimates by using maximum-likelihood confirmatory analysis (LISREL 7; Joreskog & Sorbom, 1989). LISREL performs multigroup analyses, thus enabling the proposed intergenerational and cross-cultural factor structure comparisons.

Additional multivariate analyses (MANOVAs) examined the generation and nation effects of value transmission and contrasts. After the value structure and MANOVA analyses were presented, I focused on the reciprocal transmission of ***values*** between parents and their children.

Results

Underlying Factor Structure

I examined several propositions concerning ***generational*** contrasts and withinfamily similarities in value structures. In the preliminary exploratory factor analyses, three underlying factors emerged that accounted for 65.6% of the matrix variance (Table 1). The factors were consistent with past research. Comparative analyses of ***values*** at the societal level indicated that the major dimension of value differentiation between national groups was in their relative emphasis on ***values*** that serve individual versus collective interests (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1984). Some ***values*** (e.g., mature love and wisdom) serve both interests (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987). A communal/individuation value distinction is also apparent in cross-cultural studies of ***values*** at the individual level (Triandis, 1985, 1989). The factor composed of a sense of belonging and warm relationships with others resembles a communal/collectivist or "social" factor. Fun and enjoyment in life and excitement were easily identified as "hedonistic" and individualistic ***values***. The final factor (a sense of accomplishment, self-respect, being wellrespected, security, and self-fulfillment) included individualistic ***values*** and ***values*** that were derived from both individual and communal sources that appeared to reflect "esteem."

I examined the accuracy of the measurement structure identified in the exploratory factor analyses by using LISREL 7. Following tradition, the scale of measurement for the constructs was established by fixing one of the factor loadings to 1.0. The error terms were constrained to be independent because LISREL modification indices indicated no pattern of error correlations or a priori measurement error theory. Furthermore, covarying error terms produce interpretational difficulties (Gerbing & Anderson, 1984). Models were estimated for the total sample, each ***generational*** subsample, each cultural subsample, and each generationallcultural subsample (Table 2).

The chi-square statistic represents the ability of the estimated parameters to reproduce the original variance-covariance matrix of the input data. A large chi square can be deceptive because of its dependence on sample size. "In very large samples almost any model with positive degrees of freedom is likely to be rejected as providing a statistically unacceptable fit" (Long, 1983, p. 75). All of the measurement models had p ***values*** less than .01, but the path coefficients between the indicator variables and their respective underlying constructs were all acceptable, with significant t ***values***, which implied that they were good indicators of their respective underlying constructs.

The chi-square and GFI assess the overall fit of the model to the data, however they do not assess whether or not each relationship is accurately determined. The modification indices provide a more detailed means to assess the accuracy of specific fixed and constrained paths in a model. The modification index associated with a parameter indicates the expected reduction in chi-square that would result if that single parameter alone were freed. Therefore, the modification indices can be examined in relation to a chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1989). Examination of the modification indices indicated that (a) overall, the modeled factor structure was accurate (i.e., little improvement in fit would have resulted by altering the hypothesized factor structure); (b) a sense of accomplishment had "mixed" loadings for the American subsample; and (c) self-fulfillment had "mixed" loadings for the West German subsample.[4]

I compared the measurement parameters in the two cultural subsamples by first estimating the model simultaneously for the American and West German groups.[5] The chi-square for this simultaneous model, X2(48) = 190.38, was compared with the chi-square of the model obtained by constraining the (lambda) factor matrix to be equal in the two groups, X2(54) = 2 11.1 8. A difference in chisquare test indicates that the factor patterns do vary, X[sup2](6) = 19.80, p < .01. A similar procedure constraining individual factor loadings to be equal in the two subcultures revealed that the most notable differences were for the factor loadings associated with the social value, warm relationships with others, X[sup2](l) = 6.10, p < .05, and two of the esteem ***values***-self-respect, X[sup2](l) = 11.99, p < .01, and security, X[sup2](l) = 4.40, p < .05. Constraining the intercorrelation matrices to be equal, x[sup2](54) = 225.09, demonstrated that the correlations involving the social factor (Psi [sub12] and Psi[23] also differed according to a change in chi-square test, X[sup2] (6) = 34.71,p < .01.

These measurement and factor structure comparisons were replicated for the student versus parent subsamples, the American student versus German student subsamples, and the

American parent versus the West German parent subsamples. The factor structures varied between the student and parent subsamples, X[sup2](48) = 153.49 versus x[sup2](54) = 169.40, change in X[sup2](6) = 15.91, p < .05, but not the intercorrelations among the underlying value factors, change in X[sup2](6) = 8.67, ns. Difference in chi-square tests revealed that the factor loadings creating this difference were warm relationships with others, X[sup2](l) = 3.99, p < .05 and excitement, X[sup2](l) = 9.95, p < .01.

The measurement factor patterns for the American and West German student groups differed, X[sup2](48) = 99.52 versus x[sup2](54) = 118.34, change in X[sup2](6) = 18.86, p < .01, as did the matrices of factor intercorrelations, constrained model, x[sup2](54) = 114.86, change in X[sup2](6) = 15.34, p < .05. Specifically, change in chi-square tests indicated that the estimates of the factor loadings associated with warm relationships with others, X[sup2](l) = 2.75, p < .10, and self-respect, X[sup2](l) = 5.09, p < .05 varied, as did the correlations between the social factor and the other two underlying factors, X[sup2](l) = 6.11, p < .01, and X[sup2](l) = 4.27, p < .05, for the correlations with esteem and hedonism, respectively.

Similar differences emerged from the analyses comparing the two parent subsamples. Both the factor structures and the factor intercorrelations differed (p < .01) between two cultural parent subsamples, X[sup2](48) = 129.97 versus x[sup2](54)= 147.22 and x[sup2](54)= 152.40, respectively. Again, the most apparent contradictions occurred for the two factor intercorrelations involving the social ***values***, change in X[sup2](l) = 11.99, p < .01, and 5.72, p < .05, for the correlation with esteem and hedonism, respectively. Estimates for three of the lambda paths also varied: self-respect, change in X[sup2](l) = 5.03, p < .05, security, change in X[sup2](l) = 4.15, p < .05, and warm relationships with others, change in X[sup2](l) = 2.92, p < .10.

Generational and Family Value Differences

An intrafamilial correlation may bias a MANOVA comparison between the ***generational*** categories. As shown in Table 3, this may not be problematic. Nevertheless the ***generational*** effect was examined in a repeated measures design in an effort to accommodate an intrafamilial bias: culture was treated as a between-subject factor, family as a within-subject factor, and the three value factors for the parents and students as repeated dependent measures. I created factor scales from the individual value items, and treated them as dependent variables to determine differences in the vectors of means caused by the generation and culture variables.

The overall main effects for culture and family, as well as the interaction effect, were significant, F(3,206) = 23.50, F(3,206) = 53.10, and F(3,206) = 2.55, respectively. The largest student-parent gap, and the most visible difference between cultures, occurred for the Hedonism factor. A summary of the effects is presented in Table 4, and the individual cell means are presented in Table 5.

The univariate findings and individual cell means provided insight into specific ***generational*** and cultural value differences. As reported by Grunert (1990), the two fun-

related ***values*** accounted for the largest effect between generations. The Culture x Generation interaction, $F(1,208) = 6.26$, $p = .013$, and generation and culture main effects, $F(1,208) = 130.19$, $p < .001$ and $F(1,208) = 31.87$, $p < .001$, respectively, indicated that the largest student-parent gap occurred for the Hedonism factor, and that fun-related ***values*** tended to be regarded as more important by students and Americans. A culture main effect emerged for the two remaining ***values*** factors, $F(1,208) = 6.92$, $p = .009$ and $F(1,208) = 13.48$, $p < .001$, for the Esteem and Social factors, respectively. The West German students and parents rated social ***values*** as more important and esteem ***values*** as less important than the American students and parents. I did not identify any other univariate effects at the univariate level.

Intrafamily Transmission of *Values*

I estimated parameters for the structural model presented in Figure 1 for the total sample and for each cultural group to examine the degree of value transmission within families, (Table 6). The measurement structures for the underlying student and parent value factors paralleled those presented earlier. The paths that represent parent to student transmission of ***values*** $Beta_{41}$, $Beta_{52}$ and $Beta_{63}$ were the estimates of primary interest. The parent and student Esteem factors were represented by eta[sub1] and eta[sub4] , respectively. Similarly, parent and student social ***values*** were represented by eta[sub2] and eta[sub5], whereas eta[sub3] and eta[sub6] represented the hedonistic parent and student ***values***.

For the total sample, the paths associated with social and esteem value transmission were not significant, but transmission of the hedonistic ***values*** was significant. For the American subsample, the fun-related value transmission path was significant, whereas the social and esteem value transmission paths were not. By contrast, there was no evidence of social or hedonistic value transmission for the West German subsample, but transmission of the esteem ***values*** was apparent.

I compared the value transmission paths in American and West German models by using LISREL's multiple-group procedure. A comparison of the simultaneous model, X[sup2](254) = 408.87, with a model constraining the beta matrices, X[sup2](255) = 411.78, indicated that the beta matrices did not vary, change in x[sup2](3) = 2.91, ns. Although visual examination of the beta estimates suggested stronger transmission of esteem among West Germans and stronger transmission of hedonism among Americans, formal tests of the individual value transmission paths failed to detect cultural differences in the parent to child influence for esteem ***values***, change in X[sup2](l) = 2.02, ns, social ***values***, change in X[sup2](l) = 0 05, ns, or hedonism ***values***, change in X[sup2](l) = 0. 11, ns.

A model that estimated the parent to child and child to parent effects was compared to the one-way causal model to determine the extent of value transmission from children to their parents. In terms of change in chi square, the reciprocal model was similar to the one-way parent to child causal model for the total sample, change in x[sup2](3) = 5.52, ns, superior for the American subsample, change in x[sup2](3) = 14.10, $p < .01$, and equivalent for the West German subsample, change in x[sup2](3) = 0.90, ns. According to the ratio of chi

square to degrees of freedom, however, the reciprocal and one-way models were similar (1.70 vs. 1.71 for the total sample; 1.75 vs. 1.82 for the American sample; and 1.45 vs. 1.43 for the West German sample). More important, when I accounted for the reciprocal value transmission, reciprocal transmission of esteem and social ***values*** was apparent and the child to parent influence dominated over the parent to child influence for hedonism among the American sample. Little value transmission was visible for any of the West German value factors, however (Table 7). Only the parent to child transmission of esteem ***values*** even approached marginal significance.

Cross-cultural comparisons of the reciprocal models paralleled those for the one-way influence models. Consistent with the varying transmission effects reported in Table 7, the simultaneous model X[sup2](246) = 393.87, and the model constraining the beta matrices yielded marginally different fits of the data, X[sup2](252) = 404.97, change in X[sup2](6) = 11.10,p < .10. Examination of the individual transmission effects indicated that the parent to child transmission of esteem and social ***values*** did differ between the two cultures, change in X[sup2](l) = 5.94 and 4.63, p < .05, respectively, and that only the child to parent influence differed for the transmission of esteem, change in X[sup2](l) = 4.63, p < .05, and hedonism, change X[sup2](l) = 3.29, p < .10. The other two path estimates did not vary at the p < .10 level.

Discussion

In this study, I examined the underlying structure of personal ***values*** that affect all aspects of daily life, including transmission effects, in a cross-cultural context. Contrary to much past evidence, a structural equation approach that incorporated the full underlying value structure was used to test the transmission effects between two generations and across two societies. Such intergenerational crosscultural comparisons of value structures have been essentially nonexistent.

Although the dimensional structure may be similar across generations and relatively similar across cultures, distributional differences did occur; but evidence of a "great gap" in ***values*** between generations was not present. As reported by Grunert (1990), the fun-related ***values*** were associated with the most distinct ***generational*** difference. Although similar dimensions were identified in the student and parent samples, some factor loadings and factor intercorrelations did vary between the two cultural groups. The presence of positive factor intercorrelations suggests that respondents may place similar importance on seemingly different modes of conduct or end states reflected by the measured ***values***.

The extent of cultural differences may be due at least partially to a cultural bias in the ***values*** measurement instrument. As a result, Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) recommended the need for more replications within and across cultures to determine what is universal in the structure of ***values*** and what is culture specific. Schwartz and Bilsky (1987,1990) provided impressive evidence that the discrimination between ***values*** as serving the individual's own interests versus those of the collectivity is universally meaningful; however their data revealed that security had a purely collective meaning among Germans, whereas Israelis viewed freedom as a security value, because "their individual freedom depends first and

foremost on the survival of their nation" (1987; p. 557).

Importance scores of the LOV ***values*** have predicted a variety of behaviors (Homer & Kable, 1988; Kable, Beatty, & Homer, 1986) that concur with Schwartz and Bilsky's (1987,1990) rejection of the alternative explanation that cultural differences are merely a result of the differences in the meanings of words. They found no indication of differences in meanings even for the Hong Kong sample. Overall, the current evidence indicates that the modeled factors were sufficient to capture the major distinctions among the measured ***values*** made by these parentchild lineages.

The most interesting contribution of the current study may be the investigations of mutual value transmission between parents and children. For Americans, the transmission of hedonistic ***values*** was especially dominated by children's influence on their parents. This is not surprising, because few parents are likely to preach the importance of hedonism to their children. Nevertheless, Ingelhart (1990) does note a shift toward a greater emphasis on the quality of life which naturally would include fun and enjoyment. The evidence of reciprocal transmission is consistent with the Glass et al. (1986) findings that reciprocal models provided a more accurate explanation of attitude transmission (i.e., a better fit to the data) and with Ekstrom, Tansuhaj, and Foxman's (1986) conclusion that "a child's influence can actually lead to internalized and lasting changes in ***values***, selfconcept and consumption behavior on the part of the parents" (p. 283).

Some trends always have initiated in the youth. For example, the young have been critical in influencing the older generations' acceptance of environmental protection (e.g., recycling) and in influencing their elders' attitudes toward drugs and alcohol abuse. Furthermore, parents often base decisions for purchasing technically complex products, such as computers, on the recommendations of their children. Many middle-aged women who were long conditioned to value belongingness and more collective ***values*** now see the importance of more individualistic ***values*** such as self-fulfillment and accomplishment, especially when they find themselves relatively unprepared to face divorce, single parenthood, or the need to be the primary wage earner, for example. As parents reach retirement age, they likely place less importance on ***values*** associated with the search for identity and achievement and focus more on pleasure-oriented interests.

In general, value transmission appeared to be stronger in the American subsample than in the West German subsample-perhaps at least partially reflecting unique sociocultural trends or events experienced by each culture and generation (cf. Feather, 1975). The West German generations probably developed more varying value structures as a result of experiencing more contrasting and turbulent social, economic, governmental, and philosophical environments. These data were collected prior to the unification of East and West Germany, and it can be expected that the current unpredictable environment will have drastic effects upon value structures and their transmission.

By using a structural equation framework, the current research overcame a major weakness of most survey research on ***values***; it treated the dynamic nature of value systems rather than merely describing them. Future challenges include replications across a larger variety

of cultures to determine those aspects of value transmission that are universal versus culture specific.

[1] The 21 cultures studied were Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Canada, England, Hong Kong, India, Japan, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Singapore, South Korea, Sweden, Taiwan, Thailand, United States, West Germany, and Zimbabwe.

[2] Multiple samples from Turin, Italy and the United States.

[3] Value ratings are likely to have built-in positive intercorrelations as a result of response biases. Therefore, it has been recommended that the positive correlations resulting from the ratings technique should be modeled with a methods factor in analyses of ***values'*** covariance structures (e.g., Alwin & Jackson, 1980, 1982b; Jackson & Alwin, 1980). In the present situation, this adjustment did not have a substantive effect on the results. Therefore, I presented the more parsimonious approach (i.e., not including a methods factor).

[4] For theoretical reasons and in order to retain an equivalent factor structure, these model specifications were used in all subsequent analyses. Freeing of these single indicators did not reduce the overall chi square sufficiently to alter the GFI or significance level of the models. Furthermore, all modification indices in the four culturaVgenerational subsamples were small and showed no indication of multiple loadings (these serve as the input into the value transmission models).

[5] The sample covariance matrices are analyzed in the multiple group analyses (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1989, p. 266).

Table 1
Summary of exploratory Analyses

	Factor Loading			
Deculturized data	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor3	%
Accomplishment	.745			
Self-respect	.718			
Being well-respected	.664			
Security	.707			
Self-fulfillment	.528			
Sense of belonging		.849		
Warm relationships		.700		
Excitement			.874	
Fun and enjoyment			.832	
Variance explained				65.6

Table 2
Summary of Estimates for Measurement Models(*)

Part I

Satandardized path Estimates	USA	West Germany	Student	Parent
Self-fulfillment (1)	.644	.636	.612	.646
Well-respected (1)	.735	.631	.656	.718

Accomplishment (1)	.695	.558	.606	.642
Self-respect (1)	.807	.440	.629	.647
Security (1)	.635	.314	.538	.533
Belonging (2)	.587	.416	.647	.620
Warm relationships (2)	.747	1.033	.642	.848
Fun and enjoyment (3)	.934	.831	.781	.844
Excitement (3)	.705	.848	.882	.631
Factor correlations				
Psi $_{12}$	.819	.256[**]	.611	.587
Psi $_{13}$	.441	.535	.607	.564
PSi $_{23}$	.685	.324	.381	.627
Chi ^{2}	101.80	88.58	60.12	70.15
df	24	24	24	24
p	.000	.000	.000	.000
GFI	.898	.917	.942	.935

Part II

Standardized path Estimates	US Student	US Parent	German Student	German Parent
Self-fulfillment (1)	.643	.659	.587	.621
Well-respected (1)	.751	.757	.495	.740
Accomplishment (1)	.675	.707	.628	.541
Self-respect (1)	.818	.817	.430	.466
Security (1)	.541	.725	.576	.288
Belonging (2)	.571	.653	.507	.424
Warm relationships (2)	.555	.870	.991	1.140
Fun and enjoyment (3)	.779	.931	.790	.758
Excitement (3)	.913	.528	.837	.761
Factor correlations				
Psi $_{12}$	.883	.803	.299(ns)	.163(ns)
Psi $_{13}$	.591	.501	.611	.576
PSi $_{23}$	.644	.742	.083(ns)	.362(ns)
Chi ^{2}	53.23	80.64	46.29	49.33
df	24	24	24	24
p	.001	.000	.004	.002
GFI	.897	.852	.912	.907

Part III

Standardized path Estimates	Total sample
Self-fulfillment (1)	.633
Well-respected (1)	.675
Accomplishment (1)	.632
Self-respect (1)	.638
Security (1)	.508
Belonging (2)	.580
Warm relationships (2)	.790
Fun and enjoyment (3)	.885
Excitement (3)	.771
Factor correlations	
Psi $_{12}$	.580
Psi $_{13}$	.499

PSi $_{23}$	.526
Chi ^{2}	133.28
df	24
p	.000
GFI	.933

[*] The numbers in parentheses indicate the underlying value factor. All estimates are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated otherwise. [**] $p < .10$

Table 3
Correlations Between Student and Parent ***Values***

Part I

Student ***values***	Parent value				
Sense of belonging	.211[*]	-.200[*]	-.091	-.045	-.117
Fun and enjoyment	.012	.206[*]	.157[*]	.195[*]	.104
Warm relationships	-.006	-.022	.076	.012	.027
Self-fulfillment	-.028	.001	.036	.041	.010
Being weel-respected	-.031	-.018	-.037	.026	-.041
Excitement	-.030	.113	.064	.165[*]	.016
Accomplishment	.019	.093	.004	.020	.085
Security	-.092	.136[*]	.018	.064	156[*]
Self-respect	.101	.008	.054	.087	.108

Part II

Student ***values***	Prent value			
Sense of belonging	-.176[*]	.043	.071	-.052
Fun and enjoyment	.101	.225[*]	.104	.119
Warm relationships	.016	.080	.014	.080
Self-fulfillment	-.067	.070	.014	.108
Being weel-respected	-.021	.106	.054	.093
Excitement	.031	.248[*]	.069	.109
Accomplishment	.127	.154[*]	.112	.188[*]
Security	.021	.149[*]	.133	.079
Self-respect	.032	.082	.122	.168[*]

[*] $p < .05$.

Table 4
Repeated Measures MANOVA Summary of
Cultural and Generation Effects

Source	df	Wilks's lamba	F	p
Culture	3,206	0.745	23.50	.000
Generation	3,206	0.564	53.10	.000
Culture x Generation	3,206	0.964	2.55	.057
	Univariate tests			
Culture effect				
Esteem factor	1,208		6.92	.009
Social factor	1,208		13.48	.000

Hedonism factor	1,208	31.48	.000
Generation effect			
Esteem factor	1,208	0.38	.541
Social factor	1,208	3.31	.070
Hedonism factor	1,208	130.19	.000
Culture x Generation effect			
Esteem factor	1,208	0.037	.848
Social factor	1,208	1.644	.201
Hedonism factor	1,208	6.262	.013

Table 5
Summary of Means (and Standard Deviations)
for the ***Values*** Factors[*]

Factor	Total (n = 420)	USA (n = 208)	German (n = 212)
Esteem factor			
Student	2.79	2.63	2.95
	(1.26)	(1.35)	(1.15)
Parent	2.72	2.54	2.90
	(1.26)	(1.41)	(1.06)
Social factor			
Student	2.84	3.23	2.45
	(1.48)	(1.41)	(1.44)
Parent	3.12	3.31	2.93
	(1.75)	(1.86)	(1.62)
Hedonism factor			
Student	3.57	3.25	3.88
	(1.99)	(1.91)	(2.02)
Parent	5.55	4.79	6.29
	(1.88)	(1.64)	(1.82)

[*] Measured by 9-point scales anchored by very important (1) and not all important (9).

Table 6
Summary of Estimates for Parental Influence Casual Models[*]

Standardized path estimates	Total	USA	West German
Parental value structure			
Self-fulfillment (1)	.641	.656	.612
Well- respected (1)	.696	.757	.720
Accomplishment (1)	.681	.702	.563
Self-respect (1)	.650	.821	.480
Security (1)	.495	.729	.298
Belonging (2)	.432	.652	.396
Waem relationships (2)	.907	.878	1.218[ns]
Fun and enjoyment (3)	.873	.929	.765
Excitement (3)	.632	.527	.753
Student value structure			
Self-fulfillment (4)	.643	.645	.555
Well-respected (4)	.718	.745	.495
Accomplishment (4)	.641	.672	.605
self-respect (4)	.651	.816	.458
Security (4)	.535	.538	.615

Belonging (5)		.617	.564	.447
Warm relationships (5)		.853	.560	1.127[ns]
Fun and enjoyment (6)		.847	.796	.811
Excitement (6)		.625	.910	.820
Factor correlations				
Psi $_{12}$		.581	.794	.128[ns]
Psi $_{13}$		.567	.508	.574
Psi $_{23}$		.626	.739	.337[ns]
Psi $_{45}$		.609	.882	.262[ns]
Psi $_{46}$		.595	.589	.591
Psi $_{56}$	.392	.677	.058[ns	
Structural paths				
Beta $_{41}$		.123[ns]	.077[ns]	.315
Beta $_{52}$		.064[ns]	.070[ns]	.025
Beta $_{63}$		.173	.210	.129[ns]
Chi ^{2}		215.05	229.28	179.59
df		126	126	126
p		.000	.000	.000
GFI		.903	.803	.847

[*] The numbers in parentheses indicate the underlying value factor. All estimates are significant ($p < .05$) unless indicated otherwise. [**] $p < .10$.

Table 7
Summary of Estimates of Reciprocal Effects[*]

	Esteem ***values***	Social ***values***	Hedonism ***values***
Parent to child influence			
Total sample	-.152	-.156	.019
USA sample	-.805(a)	-.806(a)	-.379
West German sample	.321	.229	.161
Child to parent infuence			
Total sample USA sample	.339	.205	.099
West German sample	.849(a)	.871(a)	.500[a]

[a] $p < .05$.

DIAGRAM: Figure 1. Model of reciprocal influence between generations (n[sub1] - n[sub3] = parental ***values*** factors; n[sub4] - n[sub6] = student ***values*** factors; ***y***[sub1] and ***y***[sub10] = self-fulfillment; ***y***[sub2] and ***y***[sub13] = being well-respected; ***y***[sub3] and ***y***[sub14] = security; ***y***[sub6] and ***y***[sub15] = sense of belonging; ***y***[sub7] anf ***y***[sub16] = warm relationships with others; ***y***[sub8] and ***y***[sub17] = fun and enjoyment in life; ***y***[sub9] and ***y*** sub[18] = excitement; Beta = paths representing value transmission; Psi = correlations among value factors; epsilon = measurement errors; Zeta = errors in equations.)

This research was supported in part by a Special Research Grant from the University of Texas at Austin.

I thank Robert M. O'Brien for his comments on an earlier version of the manuscript and Sharon E. Beatty for her assistance with this project.

Address correspondence to Pamela M. Homer, College of Business Administration, California State University, Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Boulevard, Long Beach, CA 90840.

REFERENCES

Alwin, D. E, & Jackson, D. J. (1980). Measurement models for response errors in surveys: Issues and applications. In K. F. Schuessler (Ed.), Sociological methodology (pp. 68119). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Alwin, D. E, & Jackson, D. J. (1982a). Adult ***values*** for children: An application of factor analysis to ranked preference data. In R. M. Hauser, D. Mechanic, A. O. Haller, & T. S. Hauser (Eds.), Social structure and behavior: Essays in honor of William Hamilton Sewell (pp. 311-329). San Diego: Academic Press.

Alwin, D. E, & Jackson, D. J. (1982b). The statistical analysis of Kohn's measures of parental ***values***. In K. G. Joreskog & H. Wold (Eds.), Systems under indirect observation: Causality, structure, and prediction (pp. 197-223). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Alwin, D. E, Jackson, D. J., & Krosnick, J. (1985). The measurement of ***values*** in surveys: A comparison of ratings and rankings. Public Opinion Quarterly, 49, 535-552.

Beatty, S. E., Kahle, L. R., Homer, R M., & Misra, S. (1985). Alternative measurement approaches to consumer ***values***: The List of ***Values*** and the Rokeach Value Survey. Psychology and Marketing, 2, 181-200.

Bengtson, V. L. (1975). Generation and family effects in value socialization. American Sociological Review, 40, 358-371.

Bengtson, V. L., & Black, K. D. (1973). Intergenerational relations and continuities in socialization. In W. Schaie & R Baltes (Eds.), Persorlality and socialization. San Diego: Academic Press.

Block, J., Haan, N., & Smith, M. B. (1969). Socialization correlates of student activism. Journal of Social Issues, 25, 143-177.

Bond, M. H. (1988). Finding universal dimensions of individual variation in multicultural studies of ***values***: The Rokeach and Chinese value surveys. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 1009-1015.

Ekstrom, K., Tansuhaj, P., & Foxman, E. (1986). Children's influence in family decisions and consumer socialization: A reciprocal view. In M. Wallendorf & P.Anderson (Eds.), Advances in consumer research (Vol. 14, pp. 283-287). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.

Feather, N. T. (1975). ***Values*** in education and society. New York: The Free Press.

Gerbing, D., & Anderson, J. (1984). On the meaning of within factor correlated measurement errors. Journal of Consumer Research, 11, 572-580.

Glass, J., Bengtson, V. L., & Dunham, C. C. (1986). Attitude similarity in three-generation families: Socialization, status inheritance, or reciprocal influence. American Sociological Review, 51, 685-698.

Grunert, S. (1990,July). Cross-cultural and inter-***generational*** differences in personal ***values***. Paper presented at the XVth Annual Colloquium of the International Association for Research in Economic Psychology, Exeter.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related ***values***. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1984). Hofstede's culture dimensions: An independent validation using Rokeach's Value Survey. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15, 417-433.

Homer, P.M., & Kahle, L. R. (1988). A structural equation test of the value-attitudebehavior hierarchy. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 638-646.

Inglehart, R. (1990). Culture shift in advanced industrial society. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jackson, D. J., & Alwin, D. F. (1980). The factor analysis of ipsative measures. Sociological Methods and Research, 9, 218-238.

Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1989). LISREL 7 user's reference guide. Mooresville, IN: Scientific Software, Inc.

Kahle, L. R. (Ed.) (1983). Social ***values*** and social change: Adaptation to life in America. New York: Praeger.

Kahle, L. R., Beatty, S. E., & Homer, P.M. (1986). Alternative measurement approaches to consumer ***values***: The List of ***Values*** (LOV) and ***Values*** and Life Styles (VALS). Journal of Consumer Research, 13, 405-409.

Kamakura, W. A., & Novak, T. P.(1992). Value-system segmentation: Exploring the meaning of LOV. Journal of Consumer Research, 19, 119-132.

Kohn, M. L. (1977). Class and conformity: A study in ***values*** (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kohn, M. L. (Ed.) (1989). Cross-national research in sociology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Laufer, R. S., & Bengtson, V. L. (1974). Generations, aging, and social stratification: On

the development of ***generational*** units. Journal of Social Issues, 30, 181-205.

Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (1989). On the empirical identification of dimensions for crosscultural comparison. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 20, 133-151.

Long, J. S. (1983). Covariance structure models: An introduction to LISREL. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Mitchell, A. (1983). The nine American lifestyles. New York: Warner.

Rokeach, M. (1970). Beliefs, attitudes, and ***values***. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human ***values***. New York: The Free Press. Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism critique and proposed refinements. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21, 139-157.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human ***values***. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 550-562.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of ***values***: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 878-891.

Thurnher, M., Spence, D., & Lowenthal, M. F. (1974). Value confluence and behavioral conflict in intergenerational relations. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 308-320.

Thurstone, L. L. (1927). A law of comparative judgment. Psychological Review, 34, 273-286.

Triandis, H. C. (1985). Collectivism versus individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural psychology. In C. Bagley & G. K. Verma (Eds.), Personality, cognition, and value: Cross-cultural perspectives of childhood and adolescence. London: Macmillan.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. Psychological Review, 96, 506-520.

Veroff, J., Douvan, E., & Kulka, R. A. (1981). The inner American: A self-portrait from 1957 to 1976. New York: Basic Books.

Weiner, I. B. (1971). The generation gap-fact and fancy. Adolescence, 6, 155-166.

Williams, R. M., Jr. (1979). Change and stability in ***values*** and value systems. In B. Barber & A. Inkeles (Eds.), Stability and social change (pp. 123-159). Boston: Little, Brown.

Youmans, E. G. (1973). Age stratification and value orientations. International Journal of

Aging and Human Development, 4, 53-65.

Received March 19, 1993

~~~~~~~~

By PAMELA M. HOMER, College of Business Administration California State University, Long Beach

Source: Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs, Aug93, Vol. 119 Issue 3, p345, 23p
Item: 9607240048

Top of Page

Formats: Citation HTML Full Text

29 of 35 Result List | Refine Search Print E-mail Save

Folder is empty.
~~~~~~~~