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ABSTRACT

Exploring Family Values

by

Jaime L. Carr

Dr. Christopher Heavey, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Psychology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

This exploratory study sought to develop an empirically based scale to measure family values (Family Values Scale), and to then begin to establish the validity of this instrument. This scale consists of two major subscales, Family Priority and Traditionality. Results indicate that these two subscales have acceptable internal consistency and temporal stability. Subjects were students from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (N = 380). Scores on the Family Values Scale were compared to scales measuring social desirability, self-esteem, satisfaction with life, perceived stress, social support, and psychological symptomatology. Results indicated that the Family Priority subscale is significantly related to satisfaction with life, social support, and psychological symptomatology. Further, the Traditionality subscale is significantly related to satisfaction with life. Neither subscale was related to stress. Limitations of this study and directions for future research are offered.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this time of divorce rates and worries about the health of the nation's children, we hear politicians and ordinary citizens alike extol the need for strong "family values." Unfortunately, those who use the term "family values" fail to provide a clear definition of that term. Thus several important questions remain: What kind of values make up family values? What kind of characteristics do people who hold differing kinds of family values possess? Are there gender, race, or class differences in the types of family values that are held? What kinds of behaviors are related to holding a particular constellation of family values? The purpose of this thesis was to take an important first step toward answering these questions by developing an operational definition of family values and a corresponding questionnaire to assess them. Second, the characteristics of people who hold different levels of family values were then explored.

The remainder of this chapter will discuss the concept of values and more specifically, family values. Prior research on family values will be reviewed, including ways in which this concept has been defined and subsequently measured. Correlates of family values will then be presented. Results from preliminary studies will be discussed, followed by a description of the current project.
Family Values

Interest in values, attitudes, and beliefs is not new to the field of psychology. Since the beginnings of social psychology, psychologists have taken an interest in these concepts. Perhaps the most widely used definition of the term value is that “a value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence” (Rokeach, 1973, p. 5). In this particular definition a value is seen as a kind of belief. Values and value systems are believed to have particular functions, such as serving as standards that guide behavior, as the core for decision making and conflict resolution, and as motivation to attain basic human needs (Rokeach, 1973).

The nature of human values can be broken down into several major points (Rokeach, 1973). First, a value is enduring. This stability, however, cannot be completely rigid or there would be no way for values to shift and change as society advances. It is believed that values endure because they are initially taught in an all-or-nothing manner. As a person matures and thinking patterns become more complex, different values may begin to compete against one another. Behavior is then based on the person’s evaluation of the importance of one or the other of the competing values that are activated by a particular situation.

A value is also a belief. More specifically, a value is a prescriptive/proscriptive belief. That is, a means or end of an action is evaluated as desirable or undesirable. These beliefs also have cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. The cognitive component allows the individual to have knowledge of the correct way to act. The affective component involves the emotions that are felt regarding the value. Finally,
values have a behavioral component in that they are the intervening variables that give rise to behavior when activated.

Values refer to *modes of conduct* or *end-states of existence*. These two concepts generally refer to beliefs regarding the desirable. Modes of conduct are "means" and can be thought of as *instrumental values*. Conversely, end-states of existence are "ends" and are termed *terminal values*.

Values are not only a *preference*, but they are *conceptions of the preferable*. A value represents a specific preference when there are two mutually exclusive modes of behavior (instrumental values) or end-states of existence (terminal values) that are compared with one another.

Finally, a value is a *conception of something that is either socially or personally preferable*. Values are used in everyday life and are versatile. It should be noted that while a person may be capable of stating a social or personal value, he/she does not necessarily want values to be applied equally to the self and others.

The terms values, attitudes, and social norms are often used interchangeably. The definition of a value has already been provided. Some researchers believe that values and attitudes are fundamentally similar (Campbell, 1963); and that values are actually special cases of attitudes (Newcomb, Turner, & Converse, 1965). However, other researchers (Rokeach, 1973) distinguish values from attitudes in two primary ways. While a value refers to a single belief of a specific kind, an attitude is an organization of several beliefs that are focused on an object or situation. Social norms only refer to behaviors. As stated previously, values have behavioral, as well as cognitive and affective components. Also, values are capable of transcending particular situations, while norms state how people are
to behave in specific situations. Finally, values are internal and of a personal nature, and conversely norms are external and consensual within a particular society.

Considering the above definition of values, “family values” can be conceptualized as the belief that particular modes of conduct or end-state of existence related to the family are preferable. However, this general definition of family values still fails to delineate what those particular values are, or whether they are related to particular characteristics within individuals. Examining research that addresses “family values” does little to clarify this issue. The research that has been done on family values has been inconsistent in terms of the definition of family values and the way that family values have been measured. Generally there have been two ways that the literature has addressed this topic. One is in regards to acculturation. Specifically, some research has examined the ways in which values related to the family change as new immigrants become acculturated in the United States. Second, family values have been examined as they relate to a variety of other constructs (e.g., delaying parenthood, spirituality, the coming out process of gay adolescents). Of primary interest here is this second way that family values have been addressed in the literature.

Operationalization, Measurement, and Correlates of Family Values

The term “family values” has been operationalized and measured in a variety of ways in research from the past 10 years. One study examined parenthood motivation and family values as they related to delayed parenthood (Dion, 1995). The primary goal of this research was to determine whether the age at which a woman decided to have her first child was related to 1) family values, and 2) the motivation to be a parent. More specifically, the hypotheses regarding these two constructs were 1) that delayers (women
who had their first child later in life) perceived that parenthood would bring positive psychological benefits; and 2) that delayers and non-delayers would differ in their family values.

Family values were defined as "beliefs regarding the nature of family relationships, specifically, the relative emphasis on individual versus group concerns in the context of the family" (Dion, 1995; p. 318). Individualistic beliefs related to the family include valuing self-reliance as a goal of child-rearing, encouraging children in individual pursuits outside of the family, and not endorsing the idea that the individual should put family pursuits ahead of individual goals. Conversely, a group-oriented view would indicate that the individual values collective goals and gives priority to family needs.

One hundred fourteen women were administered an interview and a set of questionnaires. The interview consisted of questions regarding demographic variables, the importance of having a child, and information regarding the specifics of the pregnancy. Questionnaires included measures of work importance, parenthood motivation (including the perceived benefits of having a child), well-being, and family values. Family values were measured by 20 attitudinal items from an instrument designed to measure individualism versus collectivism in the areas of family, neighborhood, and school (Breer & Locke, 1965). These items were reworded for clarity and responses were based on a Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The author reports a coefficient alpha for this 20-item scale of .75. High mean scores on this questionnaire were believed to be indicative of stronger attitudes toward an individualistic view of family functioning.
Results from this study indicate that delayers did not demonstrate greater motivation toward parenthood than non-delayers did. The results for family values indicated that delayers held stronger individualistic beliefs about the family than non-delayers did, after controlling for such variables as level of education, length of relationship with significant other, and relationship quality.

A recent Gallup poll (The Gallup Organization, 1998) indicated that "the world is a long way from sharing a global set of family values." In this 1998 opinion survey individuals from 16 countries were asked a series of four questions. While no direct definition of family values was offered, the research discussed the way that family values were measured. Family values were assessed with the following questions:

1) Do you think it is, or is not, morally wrong for a couple to have a baby if they are not married?

2) What do you think is the ideal number of children for a family to have?

3) Suppose you could only have one child. Would you prefer that it be a boy or a girl?

4) For you personally, do you think it is necessary or not necessary to have a child at some point in your life in order to feel fulfilled?

Data were collected through random samplings of the adult populations of those 18 years of age and older (based on about 1000 interviews) from 16 countries throughout the world (i.e., Canada, Colombia, France, Germany, Great Britain, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Lithuania, Mexico, Singapore, Spain, Taiwan, Thailand, and the United States). The authors reported a sampling error of plus or minus three percentage points.
Results indicated that there were diverse opinions regarding the morality of unmarried couples having children. Ninety-five percent of Icelanders surveyed indicated that it is not wrong, and 84% of Indians indicated that it is wrong to have a child out of wedlock. Americans appeared to be evenly divided on the issue (47% indicated that it is wrong, and 50% indicated that it is not wrong). The perceived ideal number of children also varied widely. Attitudes ranged from 69% of participants from Iceland preferring three or more children, to 12% of participants from India preferring three or more children. Again, the United States was more evenly divided in their opinion; 50% indicated that zero to two children would be ideal and 41% indicated that three or more children would be ideal. While most adults indicated that the sex of an only child would not matter, there was a general moderate preference worldwide for the sex of a child to be male, among those making a choice. In the U.S. 42% had no opinion, 35% preferred a boy, and 23% preferred a girl. With the exception of the United States, a majority of adults within the countries surveyed believe that having a child is necessary for personal fulfillment. In America 46% of those surveyed believe this to be the case, while 51% do not believe a child is necessary for fulfillment. Additionally this report stated that there were generally no gender differences in the responses to the questions with the exception of sex preference for an only child. Men generally prefer an only child to be a boy whereas women have no clear sex preference.

Newman and Muzzonigro (1993) examined the impact of traditional family values and racial and ethnic identification on the coming out process of gay male adolescents. The purpose of the study was to measure stages of the coming out process, and identify whether racial identification and coming from a family with traditional
family values impacted this process for gay adolescents. No conceptual definition of family values was offered. Participants were 27 gay male adolescents between the ages of 17 and 20.

As in the previous study by The Gallup Organization (1998), family values were defined by the responses to certain questions with no a priori definition of the term. Individuals were categorized as being from "high traditional" or "low traditional" families based on answers to questions regarding importance of religion to their family, importance in the family that the youth get married, importance the family places on having children, and whether English was the language spoken at home. No rationale was given for including this last question. Responses used to determine high traditional/low traditional families were rated on a 5-point scale from "very important" to "not at all important." Ratings were then given 2-points for every "very important" or "important" response. Two additional points were given if a language other than English was spoken at home. Scores ranged from 0 to 8. Those below the mean of 4.29 were categorized as low traditional, and those above the mean were categorized as high traditional.

Results from this study indicated that individuals from traditional families felt different from other boys to a larger degree than did those from less traditional families. High traditional families were also perceived as being less accepting of homosexuality in general, and they were believed to react to the coming out of the adolescent with more disapproval.

The relationship among gender, religiosity, and family values was examined by Jensen and Jensen (1993). They hypothesized that there are gender differences in perceptions of the family and that religious affiliation (i.e., denomination) and overall
religiosity would help explain these gender differences. They went on to predict that highly religious men and women would indicate a greater importance of women and the traditional female role to the family. Other than being mentioned in the title, “family values” is not mentioned again in this article and is never specifically defined.

Participants were 3,882 university students from five universities in the United States. The Preparation for Marriage Questionnaire Booklet was the instrument used in this study. This questionnaire contains items to assess values and attitudes on the importance of money, family, intimacy, female employment, autonomy, and marital roles. It can be assumed that the dependent variable of “importance of the family” was the authors’ operationalization of family values. Results from this study indicated that women, Latter Day Saints, and those who are more religious scored higher on importance placed on the family, lower on materialism, and higher on value placed on the traditional family role. It is not clear from this research how these conclusions were reached based on the findings from this study. In discussing these results the authors concluded that their study confirmed that more religious persons have stronger family values.

Chia, et. al. (1994) constructed a Cultural Values Survey and subsequently made a comparison of family values among Chinese, Mexican, and American college students. The authors posited that the foundation for values in many cultures is rooted in family and/or religion. They believed that in the cultures that were examined, the family is the primary source of values transmission. American values can be distinguished from Chinese and Mexican values by the individualistic nature of these values, in that greater emphasis is placed on individual achievement and goals over those of the family.
Participants in this research were 124 Caucasian American college students, 138 Mexican college students, and 193 Taiwanese college students. While the authors discussed that values typically come from the family, they did not define or specifically talk about "family values." To measure values, they constructed a 45-item Cultural Values Survey. The questions were made up of those from a larger questionnaire developed at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. No further information is provided regarding this larger instrument.

The questions from the Cultural Values survey were subjected to a principle components factor analysis with a varimax rotation. Seven components were extracted that accounted for 51% of the variance in the 45 items. The first component was labeled "Family Solidarity" and was made up of items that stress importance of family, family cohesiveness and loyalty, cooperation, and the value of hard work. Component 2 was "Executive Male" and reflected attitudes that men are decision-makers and the heads of households. The emphasis was on traditional divisions of labor within the family unit, as well as the males controlling all decisions in the family, including whether to allow the wife to work. The third component was "Conscience" and reflected items that stress the importance of the family conforming to moral and social standards. Component 4 was "Equality of the Sexes" and included items that do not support sexual stereotyping of behavior. Component 5 was "Temporal Farsightedness" and was associated with items that emphasize the importance of the past for the family and individual, delay of gratification, and the place of the family in the community in relation to the past. The sixth component was labeled "Independence" and was composed of items that reflect importance of material goods, fun and excitement, freedom, and the value of hard work.
The final component was "Spousal Employment" and reflected attitudes that spouses should make their own decisions regarding employment.

The results of this study indicated that there were distinct differences among American, Chinese, and Mexican college students on the Cultural Values Survey. American college students scored highest on independence and sexual equality, and lowest on executive male, followed by Mexicans, then Taiwanese. Americans also scored lower on family solidarity. Gender differences were found on independence, sexuality, and executive male for all three groups. American and Mexican men scored higher on executive male and independence, and lower on sexual equality than women. For the Taiwanese students, women scored highest on executive male, lowest on sexual equality, yet highest on independence.

Family values were examined idiographically in three articles (Dancy & Wynn-Dancy, 1994; McAdoo & McWright, 1994; Waxer, 1996) in that these researchers did not presume a shared definition of family values. The transmission of family values as they relate to the African American family was discussed in two non-empirical articles (Dancy & Wynn-Dancy, 1994; McAdoo & McWright, 1994). The term family values was used throughout both papers, yet was not formally defined. There was discussion of values regarding the family being transmitted through intergenerational connectedness, where grandparents are the connection between the past and the future (Dancy & Wynn-Dancy, 1994). Their role is to transmit values related to the family through the use of proverbs. In a related article, spirituality is discussed as the vehicle for transmitting family values by the Black elderly to their communities (McAdoo & McWright, 1994). Family values were discussed as being encompassed in spiritual values. References were
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made to values that encourage harmony and cooperation within the family, strong kinship bonds, and flexibility in family roles.

Waxer (1996) discussed cultural, family, and personal values in terms of their impact on decision-making for different “life decisions.” This article was based on the notion that in multicultural counseling there is a repeated interaction among cultural, family, and personal values in clients’ life decision-making. In an effort to test this assumption, the author asked 290 introductory psychology students to indicate the degree to which cultural, family, and personal values entered into their decision-making process with regard to life issues that may occur in a counseling context.

Respondents were asked to indicate to what degree their cultural heritage, their family, and their personal values entered into decision-making on 20 life decisions. Ratings were based on a scale that ranged from 0 (no influence) to 10 (maximum influence). Ratings were made for each life area for cultural, family, and personal values. Rather than the author providing a pre-set definition of family values, each subject in this study was allowed to use his or her own definition of family values. This personal definition was never elicited from the subjects, but the expectation was that it was utilized in their decision-making process. Results from this study indicated that participants ranked personal values as having the strongest impact on decision-making, followed by family values and cultural values.

Evaluation of Research on Family Values

An examination of the research on family values indicates that there are not only varied definitions of family values, there are many different ways that researchers have chosen to measure this construct. Additionally, researchers have chosen a variety of
constructs with which to compare family values. A summary of the definitions, measurement, and correlates of family values is provided below.

Definitions of family values. Only one of the studies discussed in the previous section specifically defined family values. Dion (1995) provided a definition that distinguished between those who place an individual versus a collective emphasis on their views of the family. The remainder of the studies offered no specific definition of family values (Chia, et. al., 1994; Dancy & Wynn-Dancy, 1994; The Gallup Organization, 1998; Jensen & Jensen, 1993; McAdoo & McWright, 1994; Newman & Muzzonigro, 1993; Waxter, 1996). Family values were discussed in an indirect way in these studies. For example, the Gallup Organization (1998) discussed responses to questions that were related to children and their importance. The assumption here is that family values are those values related to having and raising children. Newman and Muzzonigro (1993) chose to present their results based on the dichotomy of those who came from high traditional versus low traditional families. It can be assumed that their view of family values is traditional versus non-traditional, based on the questions that they asked regarding religiosity, marriage, having children, and speaking English in the home. The view of family values as predominantly traditional values was also evident in Jensen and Jensen’s (1993) research where the questions that they asked their participants were related to importance of money, family, intimacy, female employment, autonomy, and marital roles. Chia, et. al., (1994) mentioned that values typically came from the family, though they did not discuss family values, per se. Based on an examination of the components extracted from the factor analysis of the Cultural Values Survey, three general areas related to family values were evident. One emphasized independence and
equality (Equality of the Sexes, Independence, and Spousal Employment), one emphasized family cohesion (Family Solidarity), and one emphasized traditional values (Executive Male, Conscience, and Temporal Farsightedness). The two non-empirical articles about values transmission in Black families (Dancy & Wynn-Dancy, 1994; McAdoo & McWright, 1994) used the term family values repeatedly and discussed them as they related to spiritual values and harmony, cooperation, kinship, and flexibility of family roles. Thus, there are a variety of ways that researchers chose to conceptualize family values, some of which are more direct than others. In general it appears that family values are defined along several dimensions, including traditionality, independence (and individualistic versus collectivist orientation), and priority of the family/children.

**Measurement of family values.** Most of these studies, rather than offer a conceptual definition of family values, chose to operationalize their ideas of family values through their choice of measurement. Three of the studies chose items from pre-existing measures to assess family values (Dion, 1995; Jensen & Jensen, 1993; Chia, et. al., 1994). Only one study provided a detailed account of the measurement of values (Chia, et. al., 1994) that included a factor analysis and description of the components of the Cultural Values Survey. The Gallup Organization (1998) measured family values with four questions and offered no information regarding the psychometric properties of this scale. Newman and Muzzonigro (1993) measured whether their participants were from high traditional versus low traditional families based on several traditional dimensions of family. Waxer (1996) did not directly measure the type of family values that his participants held, but assumed that they had their own definition in mind when
answering the questions regarding the impact of family values on decision-making.

Measurement of family values in these articles was varied in the choice of constructs on which to focus, and on methodology. What is evident from these studies is that there currently is no consistent way to measure family values.

**Family values related to other constructs.** Family values have been examined in relation to a variety of constructs and with a variety of populations. The research has examined the family values of adult women (Dion, 1995); adults 18 years of age and older from around the globe (The Gallup Organization, 1998); gay adolescent boys (Newman & Muzzonigro, 1993); and college students (Chia, et. al., 1994; Jensen & Jensen, 1993; Waxer, 1996).

Results from these studies were as varied as the constructs to which family values were related. To summarize from above, women who delayed parenthood were more individualistic in their beliefs regarding the family (Dion, 1995). Gay adolescents from highly traditional families perceived their families as having problems with homosexuality in general and with their coming out as gay, more specifically (Newman & Muzzonigro, 1993). Americans, in comparison to other adults across the world, were evenly divided on the morality of out-of-wedlock births, desire for a small or large family, and believing that children are necessary for fulfillment (The Gallup Organization, 1998). For Black Americans, values related to the family are transmitted by the elderly through proverbs (McAdoo & McWright, 1994). Additionally, family values are part of spiritual values that are related to harmony, cooperation, kinship and flexible family roles (Dancy & Wynn-Dancy, 1994). For college students, life decision-making appeared to be guided by individual, family, and cultural values, in that order (Waxer,
1996). Also, American college students endorse values related to independence more so than Mexican or Chinese college students (Chia, et. al., 1994). Finally, Jensen and Jensen (1993) reported that in their study of college students, those who are female, from conservative religions, and perceive themselves as highly religious, value the traditional family.

Purpose and Preliminary Studies

The purpose of this thesis was to create a scale that would operationalize family values and would allow for an examination of the characteristics of individuals who hold differing family values. Based on a review of previous research, "family values" was examined from two perspectives: 1) priority placed on the family, and 2) traditional views of the family. Priority placed on the family (family priority) was defined as those attitudes that reflect a person's priority on having a family (including children) and the desire to place the needs of their family ahead of their own needs. Traditionality was defined as those attitudes that encompass traditional American views of family structure and functioning, for example a two-parent household, or division of labor along gender lines. It should be noted that there are two basic directions that the measurement of family values can take. One is in reference to family of origin and the other is in reference to current or future family constellation. This study focused on the latter.

Preliminary Studies

A series of preliminary studies were conducted in an effort to begin the operationalization of "family values" and to aid in the creation of items for a scale. In Study I, 100 college students were asked to provide their own definition of family values.
and to list their personal values. This effort yielded little useful information for two reasons. First, there was little consensus as to the definition of family values. Second, the values that the students listed appeared to be “rules” set forth by parents rather than values. Students listed such “family values” as eating right, not drinking to excess, and not breaking curfew.

The decision was made to create a list of attitudinal statements to reflect the conceptualization that family values consist of traditional values related to the family (traditionality component) and values that indicate priority placed on the family (family priority component). For the purposes of this study I decided to limit the study of “family values” to the study of the current family and/or future family. Family values from a person’s family of origin were not examined in the present study. Study II involved the creation of a 39-item scale that represented a traditional family values dimension, a family priority dimension, and a priority placed on children dimension. Additionally, two dimensions that were thought to impact family values were also included, egalitarianism in relationships and career priority. This version of the scale was administered to 170 undergraduate students. Items were eliminated from this version of the scale by rational and statistical consideration.

Study III involved the administration of a new 28-item version of the scale to 228 undergraduate students (Carr, Heavey, & Mizrachi, 1998). Another examination was made of the three constructs. Based on a re-examination of the items from the priority placed on children dimension, a decision was made at this point to place those items within the dimensions of traditionality and family priority. The results from this study also resulted in another item being discarded from the final scale. The dimensions to
measure egalitarianism in relationships and career priority were retained within the scale. The current 27-item version of the scale will be discussed in the following section.

Present Study

The purpose of this study was to begin to examine the psychometric properties of the 27-item Family Values Scale (FVS), in an effort to develop a potential operational definition of family values. Additionally, a subsample of participants were administered the scale on two separate occasions to establish the temporal stability of the measure. The relationship of different aspects of family values to other personal characteristics was also explored. More specifically, the goals of this thesis were to 1) examine the psychometric properties of the FVS, 2) examine convergent and discriminant validity of the scale, and 3) begin to examine correlates of the FVS.

The current study involved administering the current 27-item version of the Family Values Scale (FVS) to 380 undergraduate students. The scale was re-administered to a subset of 75 subjects one week after initial administration to determine the test-retest reliability of this instrument. Emphasis was placed on the two main subscales: Family Priority and Traditionality. The Egalitarianism and Career subscales were not addressed in the current study because they are less central to the common meaning of the term “family values.” In addition to completing the FVS, participants were asked to complete a variety of measures that included instruments to assess personal characteristics such as religiosity, traditionality, conservatism/liberalism, and satisfaction with life; social desirability; and intrapsychic and interpersonal functioning such as psychological symptomatology, perceived stress, and social support.
In examining the correlates of the FVS, I began to explore the implicit assumptions of many who use the term “family values” that holding these values is “good” or “healthy.” Therefore, I examined whether there were relationships between scores on the Family Priority (FP) and Traditionality (T) subscales and other indicators of health or psychosocial well-being. Specifically, I examined the relationship between the FP and T subscales of the FVS and perceptions of social support, stress, self-reported psychological symptomatology, and satisfaction with life.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses for this project are presented for 1) psychometric properties of the FVS, 2) convergent validity, 3) discriminant validity, and 4) correlates of the FVS.

Psychometric Properties of the FVS

1. The FVS will be comprised of two distinct subscales: a) Family Priority, and b) Traditionality.

2. The FVS subscales will have acceptable internal consistency alpha coefficients.

3. The FVS will have acceptable temporal stability over a 1-week time period.

Convergent Validity

1. Higher scores on the Traditionality (T) subscale will be significantly positively related to higher scores on religiosity and perceived traditionality. Higher scores on T will be significantly negatively related to scores on the conservatism/liberalism item (lower scores on this item indicate more perceived conservatism).
**Discriminant Validity**

1. There will be no relationship between scores on the Family Priority (FP) subscale and scores on religiosity, perceived traditionality, and conservatism/liberalism.

2. There will be no positive relationship between scores on FP and T and scores on the social desirability scale.

**Correlates of the FVS**

1. Higher scores on FP and T will be related to higher scores on the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS).

2. Higher scores on FP will be related to higher scores on perceived social support as measured by the Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (ISEL, see Methods section). There will be no relationship between T and the ISEL.

3. Higher scores on FP will be related to lower scores on the Global Severity Index (GSI) of the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) (an indication of overall psychological symptomatology). There will be no relationship between T and the BSI.

4. Higher scores on FP will be related to lower scores on the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS). There will be no relationship between T and the PSS.
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METHOD

Participants

Participants for this study were 380 University of Nevada, Las Vegas undergraduates. Students were recruited from introductory psychology classes and received research participation credit as part of the requirements for their class. Participation was voluntary and there was no penalty for withdrawing from this study. Anonymity of volunteers was guaranteed. Participation lasted approximately one hour and included administration of a variety of paper and pencil inventories.

Instruments

Instruments for this study included a demographic questionnaire, the FVS, and questionnaires to assess satisfaction with life, perceived stress, psychological symptomatology, social support, and socially desirable responding. Each of these instruments is explained below and a copy of the entire protocol is provided in the Appendix. Participants were administered a demographic questionnaire that elicited information on age, sex, marital status, race, and family constellation. Additionally, there were questions to examined perceived conservatism/liberalism, perceived religiosity, and
perceived traditionality. The extent to which respondents felt that they are liberal or conservative was assessed by the item: “Using the following scale, please indicate the extent to which you consider yourself to be liberal or conservative.” Respondents were asked to indicate their response on a 9-point scale that has “Very Conservative” at one end and “Very Liberal” at the other. Responses in the middle of this 9-point item were taken to mean that respondent considers himself/herself to be neither conservative nor liberal. Possible response range for this item was 1 to 9. The mean response for this item was 5.30 (SD = 2.02; range = 1 – 9).

Religiosity was examined by the sum of the responses to three questions. Specifically, these questions were: “Using a scale from 1 to 10, how closely do you follow the rules and practices of your religion?”; “Using a scale from 1 to 10, how important are your religious beliefs to you?”; and “Using a scale from 1 to 10 how religious a person do you consider yourself to be?”. Responses for the three items ranged from 1 = Not at All to 10 = Extremely. Possible response range was 3 to 30. For the current study, the mean for religiosity was 16.10 (SD = 8.29; range = 3 – 30).

Traditionality was measured by one question: “How traditional a person do you consider yourself to be?” with responses being rated on a scale from 1 = Not at all Traditional to 10 = Extremely Traditional. Possible response range was 1 to 10. The mean for the traditionality item was 5.57 (SD = 2.27; range = 1 – 10).

The Family Values Scale (FVS) is comprised of two major subscales, Family Priority (FP) and Traditionality (T). The FP subscale (11 items: 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22, 24) is conceptualized as placing a priority on having a family and willingness to sacrifice for the good of one’s family, and the T subscale (8 items: 4, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16,
17, 20) is conceptualized as a constellation of beliefs related to the desirability of a “traditional” family structure. Instructions for the FVS were as follows: “Please circle the number that represents the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. By “family” we mean your current or possible future spouse and/or children.” Items that comprise each subscale are listed in Table 1.

Respondents rated each item on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = Strongly disagree to 7 = Strongly agree. Subscale totals are scored by adding the total of all responses for each item. Scores on FP have a possible range from 11 to 77 and scores on T have a possible range from 8 to 56.

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) is a 5-item scale designed to measure overall life satisfaction. This scale has acceptable internal consistency (.87) and test-retest reliability over a 2-month period (.82). The scale has been shown to be positively correlated with other measures of subjective well-being. Respondents rate themselves on a 7-point scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

The Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (ISEL) is a 48-item measure of perceived availability of potential social resources (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983). This theoretically based instrument was created specifically to measure a range of socially supportive elements which college students might find in their relationships. Respondents are asked to indicate whether each statement is probably true or probably false. This measure assesses the availability of four functions of social support and also provides an overall measure of support.
Table 1

Items in Family Priority and Traditionally Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Priority</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being married is one of my top priorities in life. (Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parents should place the well-being (health and happiness) of their children before their own. (Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I consistently do (or plan to) put my spouse’s well-being ahead of my own. (Item 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I definitely want to get married (or I am happy that I am married). (Item 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I definitely want to have children (or I am happy that I have children). (Item 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I expect some of my greatest joys in life to come from marriage. (Item 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I believe that my family is/will be the most important thing in my life. (Item 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Raising children is one of my top priorities in life. (Item 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I expect to get a great deal of satisfaction from raising children. (Item 21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am prepared to sacrifice my personal happiness for the good of my family. (Item 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I believe family should come before all else. (Item 24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditionally</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All families should practice some form of organized religion. (Item 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If a couple gets divorced, the children are best off living with the mother. (Item 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Only married couples should be allowed to have or adopt children. (Item 11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Couples with children should stay married even if they are unhappy. (Item 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Couples should not have sex before they get married. (Item 14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People shouldn’t live together before they get married. (Item 16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Marriage should be forever, regardless of what happens. (Item 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is best if one parent stays home to raise the children. (Item 20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each subscale is comprised of 12 items. The four subscales represent the following four dimensions of social support: 1) *tangible*, which measures perceived availability of material aid; 2) *appraisal*, which measures perceived availability of someone with whom one can talk about one’s problems; 3) *self-esteem*, which measures perceived availability of a positive comparison when comparing oneself to others; and 4) *belonging*, which measures perceived availability of people to do things with. Cohen and Hoberman (1983) report acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha) for each of the subscales and the total scale (Total Scale = .77; Tangible Scale = .71, Belonging Scale = .75, Self-esteem Scale = .60, and Appraisal Scale = .77).

The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) is a 14-item scale designed to assess the appraisal that events in one’s life are stressful. PSS items measure the degree to which people find their lives unpredictable, uncontrollable, and overloading. Internal consistency coefficient alpha for this scale was reported as .84, .85, and .86 on three samples (two of college students, one of participants in a smoking cessation program) (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983).

To determine the extent to which participants were responding in a socially desirable manner, we administered the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). This is a 33-item self-report scale with a true/false response format. Items answered True are given a 2-point rating and Items answered False are given a 1-point rating. Certain items are reverse scored so that more socially desirable responding is given a higher score. Higher overall scores indicate more socially desirable responding. This scale measures socially desirable responding in a non-psychiatric
population and was normed on college students. The reported internal consistency for this scale is .88 and the test-retest reliability at a 1-month interval is .89.

Procedure

Participants in this study were administered a packet of questionnaires in groups of approximately 15-20 over a period of 2-3 months. They were instructed to fill out the questionnaires in the order in which they were presented. A researcher was available during administration to answer any questions that a participant may have had. There was no penalty for discontinuing participation. A subset of 75 participants was asked to return one week after the initial administration of the questionnaires in an effort to examine the temporal stability of the Family Values Scale.
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RESULTS

There were a total of 380 respondents in this study, 52.9% were women (n = 201) and 47.1% were men (n = 179). Ages ranged from 17 to 59 (mean = 20.54, SD = 4.56). Approximately 57% of respondents were Freshmen, 23.7% were Sophomores, 13.4% were Juniors, and 5.5% were Seniors. The majority were single (93.4%, n = 355) and approximately 6% had children. Racial/Ethnic composition was 60.5% Caucasian, 14.7% Asian American, 7.4% African American, 5.0% Hispanic, 1.6% Native American, and 10.5% responded to the “other” category.

Psychometric Properties of the FVS

Characteristics of the FP and T subscales were examined through a confirmatory factor analysis, an examination of internal consistency alpha coefficients, a between-scale correlation, and test-retest reliability. The mean for FP was 59.85 (SD = 12.74, range = 11-77), and the mean for T was 27.04 (SD = 9.87, range = 8-56). Factor analysis identifies a small number of factors from a much larger group of interrelated variables (George & Mallery, 1999). A principal components analysis with varimax rotation, extracting two factors, was run for the current data set. Only the 19 variables that make up the T and FP subscales were entered into the analysis. The first
factor included all items from the FP subscale, had an eigenvalue of 5.695, and accounted for 29.97% of the variance. Eigenvalues indicate the proportion of variance accounted for by each factor. The percent of variance accounted for by a given factor is calculated by dividing the eigenvalue by the number of variables. The second factor contained all items from the T subscale, had an eigenvalue of 3.23, and accounted for 17.01% of the total variance. See Table 2 for the rotated component matrix. Total variance accounted for by the entire factor analysis with two subscales was 46.98%. Thus the factor analysis supported the rationally derived factor structure of the FP and T subscales.

Examination of the Scree Plot indicated that the two components that were predicted fell on the steep portion of the graph. A Scree Plot plots the eigenvalues on a bicoordinate plane (George & Mallery, 1999). In interpreting this graph, the scree (the factors deposited on the base of the landslide) is ignored and only the values on the steeper portion should be interpreted. Additionally, KMO and Bartlett's tests were run for the data set. The KMO test measures whether the distribution of the values is adequate to conduct the factor analysis. KMO for this data set was .88. Any distribution over .7 is deemed adequate (George & Mallery, 1999). Bartlett's test of sphericity is a measure of multivariate normality of the set of distributions. If p < .05 for this statistic the data are considered to be approximately multivariate normal and are acceptable. Bartlett's test for the current data set was 3299.21 (df = 171; p < .001).

Standardized alpha coefficients for the 11-item FP subscale was .90 and for the 8-item T subscale was .76. A Pearson correlation was run between FP and T, indicating that FP and T are moderately related (r = .39; p < .01). The temporal stability of the FP and T
Table 2

Rotated Component Matrix of FVS Subscale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>2.297E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>3.596E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>3.442E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>7.944E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>-2.793E-02</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>6.544E-02</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>6.901E-03</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subscales was examined over a 1-week time period. Pearson correlations were run between total scale scores from Time 1 and Time 2. The correlation between Time 1 and Time 2 was \( r = .91 \) (\( n = 75 \)) for FP and was \( r = .79 \) (\( n = 75 \)) for T. These results indicate that the FVS subscales have acceptable internal consistency and temporal stability.

Construct Validity

Construct validity is defined for a given measure by defining a construct and, at the same time, developing an instrument to measure that construct (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1993). By showing a relationship between one test and other tests and measures, information about what an instrument really means can be gained. Construct validation takes place over time and is not meant to be completed in one study. In order to establish construct validity, two more specific types of validity need to be examined, convergent validity and discriminant validity. Both were examined in the current study.

Several measures were used to begin to establish construct validity for the FVS. These measures included a religiosity measure, a perceived traditionality measure, and a conservatism/liberalism measure. Additionally, socially desirable responding was examined.

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity is established when a measure is associated with other instruments that measure similar or related constructs. Measures are expected to "converge" on the same thing (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). For the current study, it was hypothesized that higher scores on the T subscale would be significantly positively
correlated with higher scores on religiosity and perceived traditionality, and negatively related to scores on the conservatism/liberalism item.

Pearson product moment correlations were run between T and total scores on religiosity, perceived traditionality, and conservatism/liberalism (see Table 3).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Perceived Traditionality</th>
<th>Perceived Cons/Lib</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditionality</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Lib/Cons = Perceived conservatism/liberalism
N = 380; ** p < .01

All correlations were in the expected direction, and all were significant at the p < .01 level. Individuals scoring higher on T also scored higher on religiosity and perceived traditionality, and lower on conservatism/liberalism (indicating that they perceived themselves to be more conservative). Because the first item in the T subscale asks the respondent specifically about their values concerning organized religion (Item 4), the correlation between T and the religiosity measure was re-assessed after removing that item from the T subscale. The relationship between religiosity measure and the revised T subscale remained nearly the same, in that those who perceived themselves as more religious also scored higher on T (r = .46, p < .01). Because there was no significant change in the strength or direction of the relationship, Item remains in the T subscale.


**Discriminant Validity**

Discriminant validity helps to establish the uniqueness of the measure (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1993). For the current study, it was hypothesized that scores on the FP subscale would not be related to scores on religiosity, perceived traditionality, or the conservatism/liberalism item. Additionally, it was predicted that there would be no positive relationship between scores on FP and T and the social desirability measure.

Pearson product moment correlations were run between FP and total scores on religiosity, perceived traditionality, and conservatism/liberalism (see Table 4).

**Table 4**

| Correlations between FP and Religiosity, Traditionality, and Conservatism/Liberalism |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                   | Religiosity | Perceived Traditionality | Perceived Cons/Lib |
| Family Priority Subscale          | .26**       | .35**                    | -.14**             |

Note: Lib/Cons = Perceived conservatism/liberalism
N = 380; ** p < .01

The hypotheses for the relationship between FP and religiosity, perceived traditionality, and conservatism/liberalism were not supported. Individuals scoring higher on FP also scored higher on religiosity and perceived traditionality, and lower on conservatism/liberalism (indicating that they perceived themselves to be slightly more conservative). These results are similar to those for the T scale. Partial correlations were run between FP and religiosity, perceived traditionality, and conservatism/liberalism controlling for T. This was done to determine whether the reason that the correlations between FP and these variables was significant was because FP was somewhat related to
T. This assumption was confirmed for religiosity and conservatism/liberalism (pr = .06 and .01, respectively), but not for perceived traditionality (pr = .23).

Pearson product moment correlations were run between FP and T and the total score on the social desirability scale. The FP subscale was significantly negatively related to social desirability \( (r = -.15; p < .01) \), and the T subscale was not related to social desirability \( (r = .05; \text{NS}) \). The hypotheses for the relationship between FP and T and the social desirability scale were upheld. Higher scores on FP and T are not associated with a positive response bias. In fact, higher scores on FP are related to lower scores on the social desirability measure.

**Correlates of the FVS**

It was hypothesized that higher scores on the FP subscale of the FVS would be associated with higher scores on the SWLS (a measure of life satisfaction) and higher scores on the ISEL (a measure of perceived social support). Additionally, it was predicted that higher scores on FP would be associated with lower scores on the BSI (an indication of overall psychological symptomatology), and lower scores on the PSS (a measure of perceived stress). There was no predicted relationship between the T subscale and scores on these measures.

Pearson product moment correlations were run between scores on the FP and T subscales and the SWLS, total ISEL, the global severity index of the BSI, and the PSS. Table 5 presents the results of this analysis.
Table 5

Correlations between FP and T and the Satisfaction with Life, Interpersonal Support Evaluation List, Brief Symptom Inventory, and Perceived Stress Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family Priority</th>
<th>Traditionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWLS</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEL</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSI</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 380; ** p < .01

Most of the hypotheses for the FP subscale were supported. Those who scored higher on FP were more satisfied with their lives, perceived themselves to have more social support, and had fewer psychological symptoms than those who scored lower on FP. However, there were no relationships between scores on the FP subscale and perceived stress. Additionally, the hypotheses for the T subscale were supported in all but one case. There was no relationship between T and perceived social support, psychological symptomatology, or perceived stress. However, there was a significant positive relationship between T and the SWLS. Those who had higher scores on T also perceived themselves to be more satisfied with their lives.

Additional Analyses

In an effort to determine whether marital status had any relationship to scores on T and FP, a new variable was created. Those who had indicated that they were single, separated, or divorced on the demographic were aggregated into one category labeled
“single” (n = 212), those who had indicated that they were dating or were engaged were aggregated into one category labeled “relationship” (n = 149), and those who indicated that they were married were left as their own category labeled “married” (n = 19). This new variable was then entered into a one-way ANOVA (marital status X FVS subscale). There was an significant main effect for FP (F (2, 377) = 3.66; p < .05), but not for T. For post-hoc comparisons, Dunnett’s C was used because of the non-homogeneity of variance. There was a significant difference between those who were married and those who were single on the FP subscale. There was no difference between those who were single and those who were in a relationship on FP. This finding indicates that those who are married have a higher mean score on FP than those who are single. Consistent with previous findings, there is no relationship between scores on T and marital status.
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DISCUSSION

This research attempted to establish the psychometric properties of a scale measuring family values (Family Values Scale (FVS) Carr, Heavey, & Mizrachi, 1998), to examine the convergent and discriminant validity of the subscales of the FVS, and to examine potential correlates of the FVS. Previous research on “family values” has been inconsistent in regards to the operationalization of family values, the measurement of family values, and the examination of correlates of family values. Emphasis was placed on examining current or future family constellation rather than family of origin.

**Psychometric Properties**

Based on the factor analysis and examination of internal consistency, the FVS appears to be comprised of two distinct subscales that measure values related to Family Priority (FP; 11 items) and Traditionality (T; 8 items). Family priority can be defined as those attitudes that reflect a person’s priority on having a family (including children) and the desire to place the needs of their family ahead of their own needs. Previous studies indirectly defined family values as the emphasis placed on having children (The Gallup Organization (1998), similar to items in the present study.

Traditionality can be defined as those attitudes that encompass traditional American views of family structure and functioning, for example a two-parent household,
or division of labor along gender lines. Newman and Muzzonigro (1993) and Jensen and Jensen (1993) emphasized the traditional nature of family values, as does the T subscale in the present study.

A previous study (Chia, et al, 1994) conducted an exploratory factor analysis based on a 45-item scale. Items for the scale were taken from a previous measure, unlike the present study, which chose to rationally define and then statistically confirm items for the FVS. Chia et al., (1994) extracted 7 factors that accounted for 51% of the variance. The 7 factors from Chia, et al.'s study were: Family Solidarity, Executive Male, Conscience, Equality of the Sexes, Temporal Farsightedness, Independence, and Spousal Employment. These factors can be compared to FP and T in the present study. FP examines constructs similar to those in the Family Solidarity factor, which emphasized the importance of the family. T examines constructs similar to Executive Male (which reflects the traditional view of the male being the decision maker and head of the household) and Conscience (which reflects views that the family should conform to moral standards).

Additionally, the hypotheses that the Family Priority and Traditionality subscales of the FVS would have acceptable internal consistency and test-retest reliability were both confirmed.

Construct Validity

Previous research on family values has not systematically examined the validity of instruments used to measure family values. The current study is a first attempt at doing so, specifically by examining both the convergent and discriminant validity of the FVS subscales. It is recognized that the process of establishing the construct validity of a
measure is a process meant to be carried out over time, and the current efforts are only
the first step in this process.

The hypotheses that were proposed to establish convergent validity for the T
subscale were supported in the present study. Individuals who perceive themselves as
more religious, more traditional, and less liberal, also score higher on T. This indicates
that T is measuring traditional values related to the family. Findings for the T subscale
are consistent with the results from the Jensen and Jensen (1993) study. Their finding was
that those who are female, from conservative religions, and perceive themselves as highly
religious have traditional family values. The present study also found that those (both
men and women in the current study) who hold more traditional family values (as
measured by T) also perceive themselves as more conservative and religious. The
relationship with perceived religiosity remained even when Item 4 ("All families should
practice some form of organized religion.") was removed from T and the correlation re-
analyzed.

In attempting to establish discriminant validity, it was predicted that there would
be no relationship between FP and scores on Religiosity, Perceived Traditionality, and
Conservatism/Liberalism. This hypothesis was not confirmed. Results indicate that there
was a positive relationship between higher scores on FP and higher scores on Religiosity,
Perceived Traditionality, and Perceived Conservatism/Liberalism. However, the
relationship between FP and Religiosity and Perceived Conservatism/Liberalism was
lower than the relationship between T and these same variables. It may be that those who
place an emphasis on their family are more likely to practice a religion and follow its
practices, though not at the same level as those who subscribe to traditional family
values. The same may hold true for conservatism/liberalism. Another explanation for the fact that the correlations for FP and T were similar may be that FP and T are related to one another. This assumption was partially confirmed through an examination of a partial correlation controlling for T. Controlling for T eliminated the relationships between FP and religion and conservatism/liberalism and decreased the relationship between FP and perceived traditionality.

Socially desirable responding was examined in the current study. It was predicted that there would be no positive relationship between the subscales of the FVS and the measure of social desirability. Results indicated that there was no relationship between T and the social desirability measure, and a negative relationship between FP and this measure. A positive response bias does not appear to be present based on the population studied.

**Correlates of the FVS**

Family values have been examined in conjunction with a variety of other constructs and with a variety of populations, e.g., women and delayed parenthood (Dion, 1995); the coming out process of gay adolescent males (Newman & Muzzonigro, 1993), life decision-making in college students (Waxer, 1996); and religious conservatism and traditionality in college students (Jensen & Jensen, 1993). The present research used college students to examine family values, just as Waxer (1996) and Jensen and Jensen (1993) did.

The correlates examined in the current study were unlike those in previous research. This study focused on the relationship between family values and perceptions of social support, stress, satisfaction with life, and psychological symptomatology. These
measures were chosen because those who talk about "family values" would imply that holding these values is "good" for people. If this is true, then high scores on the FP subscale should be related to general measures of health and well-being. Therefore, it was predicted that social support and life satisfaction would be higher in those scoring higher on FP, and that psychological symptoms and stress would be lower in those scoring higher on FP. There was no predicted relationship between the T subscale and these constructs.

Those who are satisfied with their lives (higher SWLS scores) also score higher on both subscales of the FVS. It may be that life satisfaction allows an individual to place value on the more intangible concepts of family. Those who are not as satisfied with their lives may be focusing their energies on more tangible issues such as work, money, or housing. Those who don't have to worry about the basic necessities in life may be more able to consider concepts such as life satisfaction. The reverse may also hold true, those with strong family values may have better lives because of their values. There may also be a third unexamined variable that is influencing this relationship.

Related to the above idea is the notion that those who are satisfied with life and who place a priority on their family (high scores on FP) also consider themselves to have more overall social support and less psychological symptomatology. It may be that a combination of social support and family priority allows the individual to deal with minor psychological symptoms such as anxiety and depression. Whereas those who do not feel supported and who do not prioritize family are more vulnerable to these minor psychological problems. Again, however, the correlational nature of these data precludes
us from drawing any firm conclusions. There was no relationship between higher scores on T and the ISEL, BSI, or PSS.

There does not appear to be a relationship between stress (as measured by the PSS) and either subscale. It may be necessary to have a more sensitive or specific measure of stress (e.g., a measure of daily stress) in order to fully examine the relationship between stress and family values.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Some limitations in the present study include the subjective nature of the derivation of items for the FVS, and the unrepresentativeness of the population studied. Efforts had been made to find previous work that had generated items to examine family values. Because of the paucity of this kind of research, the current project, by necessity, started from the beginning with a rational consideration of items. This research is only a first step in the long process of creating an attitudinal measure. It may be that a new set of items needs to be generated and re-examined in conjunction with some or all of the items from the current FVS. Our generation of items may have failed to capture some aspects of family values that others may find relevant. The generalizability of the current study to the general population is limited in that college students were examined. In order to generalize to an adult, community-dwelling population, there needs to be a much larger sample size of this population. Additionally, family of origin was not examined in the current study. I chose instead to look at current or future family of the respondents. At some point it may prove useful to examine whether the type of family values that an
individual is taught in their family of origin, differ in any way from those subscribed to in
that person's current or future family.

The current study is the first step in examining the validity of the subscales of the
FVS. Future research needs to continue with this process of examining the convergent
and discriminant validity of this measure. The items used by Chia, et al., (1994) may be a
good way to do this. To further establish the temporal stability of the measure, the test-
retest period should be extended to 6 months to 1 year. Also, the current study did not
examine the convergent validity of the FP subscale. Behavioral correlates of the FVS will
also need to be examined. There may be particular behaviors exhibited by those scoring
higher or lower on the FVS subscales. Examining whether there are behavioral
differences associated with "family values" will allow researchers to determine whether
these values are "good" in some meaningful sense.

As stated earlier, future research should administer the scale to a community
dwelling adult population to extend the generalizability of the findings. Another way to
generalize the findings may be to follow the current subjects over time to see whether
family values change as this population matures and begins to establish their own
families. Further, FVS scores may be related to behaviors having to do with the family
such as getting married, having children, and attending church.

There may also be practical applications to this research on family values. Once
there is more evidence of the validity of this measure, researchers can begin to examine
the role that family values plays in the complex relationships among social support,
coping, stress, and psychological symptomotology. Family values may be another
resource that those suffering from chronic illness could use in their coping. Clinicians
may be able to use this scale in family therapy. Couples going through pre-marital counseling may be given the scale to see where there may be differences in family values, and those differences may be discussed in order to prevent future conflicts over the importance placed on the family. Families who are in distress may have conflicting family values. Clinicians may be able to help families find ways to move toward understanding each person's values and their subsequent relationship to behavior.

In summary, this research project was a first attempt to establish the reliability and validity of the Family Values Scale (Carr, Heavey, & Mizrachi, 1998). It appears that based on the measures that were used and on the population studied, the FVS subscales have good temporal stability and internal consistency. Additionally, the validity of the subscales is beginning to be established.
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APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE PACKET FOR FAMILY VALUES PROJECT
Subject # ______________

Demographic Questionnaire

1. How old are you? __________

2. What year are you in school? (Choose one.)
   ___ Freshman
   ___ Sophomore
   ___ Junior
   ___ Senior

3. What is your sex? (Circle one.) Male Female

4. What is your marital status? (Check one.)
   ___ Single
   ___ Dating
   ___ Engaged
   ___ Married — How long? ___
   ___ Separated
   ___ Divorced

5. Which of the following describes your racial/ethnic background?
   ___ African American ___ Hispanic
   ___ Asian American ___ Native American
   ___ Caucasian (White) ___ Other (specify) __________

6. Do you have any children? Yes No
   If yes, how many?_____

7. How many children are in your family of origin?
   Number of brothers ____ Number of sisters ____

8. Father’s education (highest grade completed) _______

9. Mother’s education (highest grade completed) _______

10. Were your parents legally married? Yes No

11. Were your parents ever divorced? Yes No
    If yes, how old were you when they divorced? ____

12. What is your political affiliation? (Choose one.)
    ___ Democrat ___ Independent
    ___ Republican ___ Other (specify) __________
13. What is your religious faith?
   ____ Jewish  ____ Hindu
   ____ Catholic  ____ Protestant (specify) __________________
   ____ Muslim  ____ Other (specify) ________________________
   ____ Buddhist  ____ None

14. Using a scale from 1 to 10, how closely do you follow the rules and practices of your religion?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   Not at all  Closely  Extremely
   Closely

15. Using a scale from 1 to 10, how important are your religious beliefs to you?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   Not at all  Important  Extremely
   Important

16. Using a scale from 1 to 10, how religious a person do you consider yourself to be?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   Not at all  Religious  Extremely
   Religious

17. Using a scale from 1 to 10, how "traditional" a person do you consider yourself to be?
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   Not at all  Traditional  Extremely
   Traditional

18. Using the following scale, please indicate the extent of to which you consider yourself to be liberal or conservative.
   4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4
   Very  Very
   Conservative  Liberal
Family Values Scale (FVS)

Please circle the number that represents the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. By “family” we mean your current or possible future spouse and/or children.

1. I want to have a marriage where my partner and I are as equal as possible.
   
   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

2. I expect to devote most of my time to my career.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

3. Being married is one of my top priorities in life.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

4. All families should practice some form of organized religion.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

5. Parents should place the well-being (health and happiness) of their children before their own.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

6. When thinking about major life decisions, my first thought is how they will impact my career.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

7. If a couple gets divorced, the children are better off living with the mother.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

8. I consistently do (or plan to) put my spouse’s well-being ahead of my own.

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree

9. I definitely want to get married (or I am happy that I am married).

   Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly Agree
10. I definitely want to have children (or I am happy that I have children).

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

11. Only married couples should be allowed to have or adopt children.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

12. Couples with children should stay married even if they are unhappy.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

13. I expect some of my greatest joys in life to come from marriage.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

14. Couples should not have sex before they get married.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

15. I believe that my family is/will be the most important thing in my life.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

16. People shouldn’t live together before they get married.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

17. Marriage should be forever, regardless of what happens.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

18. Raising children is one of my top priorities in life.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

19. Married couples should share child-care responsibilities equally.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

20. It is best if one parent stays home to raise the children.

   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree
21. I expect to get a great deal of satisfaction from raising children.
   
   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

22. I am prepared to sacrifice my personal happiness for the good of my family.
   
   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

23. I am willing to do whatever it takes to be successful.
   
   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

24. I believe family should come before all else.
   
   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

25. Married couples should share household chores equally.
   
   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

26. It is important to me that my partner and I have an equal say in family matters.
   
   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree

27. Having a successful career is my top goal in life.
   
   Strongly Disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Strongly Agree
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