

THE SACRED AND THE EXPEDIENT

ADOLFO A. CRITTO

THE SACRED AND THE EXPEDIENT

by

Adolfo A. Critto

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy, in the
Faculty of Political Science
Columbia University
1963

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to the following persons, whose generous help I have benefited at various stages of the present study:

- Professors: Allen H. Barton, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Juan Linz, Robert K. Merton, Hans L. Zetterberg, of Columbia University.
- Bill Bowers, Patricia Horan, Nancy Jessen, Corrine Kirschner, Burton Raffel and May Tsao, who constantly helped me.
- Raúl Basaldúa, Susana Cáceres, José Castillo, Jerome Carlín, Eva Chamorro, Ralph Della Cava, Betty Frisman, Paolo Ferneti, Osvaldo Fonro, Myriam Gottardi, Harriet Greenberg, Edgard Kausel, Patricia Kendell, Professor Otto Klineberg, Ron Malavski, Ana Belén Moreno, Tony Obershall, María Teresa Silva, Louise Cohen, and Professor Pitirim Sorokin, who have provided me valuable help in various occasions.
- Many friends, professors and fellowstudents (in the United States, Argentina and Spain) who have helped me, and whose names would cover several pages.
- My parents, brothers, sisters and relatives

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	i
<u>Table of Contents</u>	ii
PART I: <u>VALUE CLUSTERS</u>	
<u>CHAPTER I - DESCRIPTION OF TWO VALUE CLUSTERS</u>	4
<u>CHAPTER II - THE LOGICAL BASIS OF THE VALUE CLUSTERS</u>	29
<u>CHAPTER III - THE EMPIRICAL STUDY</u>	54
<u>CHAPTER IV - THE QUESTIONNAIRE</u>	75
PART II <u>SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND VALUE ORIENTATIONS</u>	
<u>CHAPTER V - THE RELIGIOUS FACTOR</u>	114
<u>CHAPTER VI - SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL FACTORS</u>	153
<u>CHAPTER VII - AMERICAN AND ARGENTINES</u>	225
<u>CHAPTER VIII - THE THEOCENTRISM-ANTHROPOCENTRISM</u> <u>UNDERLYING DIMENSION</u>	312

<u>APPENDIX I:</u> 1. English version of the questionnaire.	336
2. Spanish version of the questionnaire.	
<u>APPENDIX II:</u> Brief intellectual story of the present study	353

BIBLIOGRAPHY	363

PART I
VALUE CLUSTERS

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTIONS OF TWO VALUE CLUSTERS

There is a long tradition in the social sciences of concern with the problem of the variety of values. Dimensions put forth to characterize differences between types of societies or social relations have pointed in a more or less direct way to their value orientations.

Examples of such dimensions are Toennies' Gemeinschaft- Gesellschaft; Durkheim's Organic and Mechanical Solidarity and the folk-culture versus urban civilization dichotomy used by Redfield.

Such dimensions are intended not only to express differences between two types of societies, but also to indicate different stages of evolution of Western societies as observed by the authors of the distinctions. It any given time some societies are considered as more advanced in the evolutionary process than others.

In the contemporary Western world American society has often been pointed out as a conspicuous example of "Gesellschaft type of society, displaying "organic solidarity", and urban civilization. It is considered a fore-runner in the evolution from one type of Western society to another. By the same token, Latin American countries have been pointed out as still representing, to a certain extent, the other pole of these dimensions, and as lagging behind in this evolution.

Max Weber's description of the values which conditioned the development of modern capitalism is relevant for the characterization of American society, which is one of the most advanced representatives of capitalism and the economic rationalism which accompanies it.

Max Weber maintained that the spirit of modern capitalism resulted from the ethos of certain influential branches of Protestantism (mainly ascetic Protestantism). He defined the spirit of modern capitalism as "that attitude which seeks profit rationally and systematically in the manner which we have

illustrated by the example of Benjamin Franklin".¹ He was referring to Franklin's considerations about the value of time as a means for making money ("time is money") and the value of credit; Franklin also insisted in the fact that "industry, frugality" and "punctuality and justice in all dealings" are means for economic advancement: "The good paymaster is lord of another man's purse".²

Weber states that "the most important opponent with which the spirit of capitalism" has had to struggle was "traditionalism".³ By traditionalism he means that a man does 'not by nature' wish to earn more and more money, but simply to live as he is accustomed to live and to earn as much as is necessary for that purpose".⁴ He characterizes it as the principle of satisfaction of traditional needs, as opposed to the principle of acquisition (struggle for profit free from the limits set by no needs).⁵

Latin American societies have often been pointed out on representatives of this traditionalism which accepts work as a necessary evil for satisfaction of needs, rather than for the seeking of profit rationally and systematically through hard work, discipline and rational planning.

Various writers have taken on themselves the task of describing the values of American and/or Latin American societies, contrasting them with each other or with values of other societies. The following pages contain a selection of such descriptions.

Variations in Value Orientations

In Variations in Value Orientations Florence Kluckhohn and Fred L. Strodbeck report's systematic study of differences among value orientations of five communities in the American Southwest.

¹ Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (Ch. Scribner's sons, N. York, 1958), p.64.

² Ibid., pp. 48-50.

³ Ibid., pp. 58-59.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 60

⁵ Ibid., pp. 63 – 64.

⁶ One of these communities is Spanish-American and it is the one which is given most careful and detailed consideration study. The other communities are: two American-Indian, one

⁶ (Evenston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Co., 1961)

Mormon and one Texan.

The Spanish-American community shows value orientations which still resemble Latin American (Mexican) rather than American values. Its dominant value orientations stand in sharp contrast to those of the Texans and the Mormons, whose dominant value orientations seem closer to the American dominant orientations.

Variations in Value Orientations contains a theory of variations in value orientations and a report of the empirical study which served as a basis for the development of that theory ("participant-observer" research by Florence Kluckhohn since 1936) and later for testing it (using a questionnaire).

Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck make the following theoretical assumptions, which are also accepted in the present study:

There is a limited number of common human problem for which all peoples at all times must find some solutions,

While there is variability in solutions of all the problems, it is neither limitless nor random but is definitely variable within a range of possible solutions.

All alternative of all solutions are present in all societies at all times but are differentially preferred.⁷

They select as crucial common human problems the following:⁸

1. What is the character of innate human nature? (human nature orientation): Range of variations: Good, Good-and-Evil, Neutral and Evil.
2. What is the relation of man to nature (and supernature)? (man-nature orientation). Range of variations: Mastery-over-Nature, Harmony-with-Nature, and Subjugation-to-Nature.
3. What is the temporal focus of human life? (time orientation). Range of variations: Past, Present and future
4. What is the modality of Human activity? (activity orientation). Range of variations: Being, Being-in-

⁷ Ibid., p. 10.

⁸ Ibid., p. 11.

Becoming and Doing.

5. What is the modality of man's relationship to other men? (relational orientation). Range of variations:

Linearity, Individualism and Collaterality.

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck state:

In American middle-class society there is, for example, the association of the dominant orientations Individualism, Future time, Mastery-over-Nature, Doing and Evil (or Good-and-Evil) mutable human nature, with a most extensive elaboration of patterning in the economic-technological sphere. In traditional Spanish-American society, in contrast, one notes the, association of the dominant orientations of Linearity . Present time Subjugation-to-Nature, Being and Good-and-Evil mutable human nature, with a strong stressing of a fusion of the religious and recreational behavioral spheres.⁹

Spanish-Americans

This statement by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck is illustrated and explained throughout the study describing the Spanish-Americans as accepting their dependence upon "Natural" and "Supernatural" forces (Subjugation-to-Nature orientation); as concerned with the present rather than anxiously planning future achievement (Present time orientation); as more concerned with what a person is or feels than with what he performs or achieves (Being orientation); and as emphasizing dependence upon others rather than detached cooperation (Lineal orientation, although Individualistic orientation is dominant even above Lineal orientation).

The characterization of the value orientations of Spanish-Americans society is to a great extent based on F. Kluckhohn's field research in the Spanish American community "Atrisco". Some manifestations of such value orientations that she found in Atrisco are the following:

Performance and success vs. obedience

No record of outstanding accomplishment was ever regarded by 'los Atrisqueños' as a substitute for a son's or daughter's fully compliant and obedient attitude to parents. A daughter might make a good marriage, a son might become more successful financially than others of his

⁹ Ibid., p. 343. In pp. 29-30 they make a similar statement, referring to "the United States as one example of a total culture" instead of "American middle-class society".

age; but should either fail to adhere to the standards of filial respect, he or she was a "mal hijo" or "mala hija" (bad son or bad daughter).¹⁰

She reports how a son of Juan Atrisco was considered a bad son when he succeeded in business and politics but disobeyed his father; "when later he failed in his business and came back to Atrisco and showed himself more respectful to his father's wishes, he was forgiven much of his past behavior".¹¹

These statements show the great emphasis placed by the "Atrisqueños" upon submission and commitment to sacred objects (family in this case) and the low value assigned to performance and achievement. This conclusion is reinforced by other observations of Kluckhohn, as follows:

It was easy to note that the great love expressed for children did not depend upon their level of performance as compared with others ... Spanish American children ... were as rigorously trained for dependent behavior as the average Anglo-American child is schooled for independence.¹²

She also reports how a sister continued to accept the authority of her older brother "even though the brother made a complete failure of his livestock business end in spite of the still more serious matter of having been imprisoned recently at the age of sixty-old years, for having sexual relations with a thirteen year old village girl".¹³ This shows how what a person "is" (including being submissive) is more important than what a person does in the value scale of that community. And what a person is does not depend upon what that person does, but on his inherent value or sacredness for the actor.

Family vs. career

Family problems have mainly a moral and affective signification while job advantages have mainly an instrumental significance. For this reason among Spanish-Americans family problems rather than job advantages are important enough to determine a change of residence. A manifestation of this

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 196.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., p. 197.

¹³ Ibid., p. 197.

orientation is reported by Kluckhohn as follows:

In the earlier study of Atrisco, family dissension, chiefly that between eldest and younger brothers, was shown to be the main cause of emigration. Almost never did a man leave the village primarily to better himself economically or to take a job which appealed to him more than the one he had at home.¹⁴

Dependence

The emphasis on dependence upon authority is found not only in family relationships. Indeed

Kluckhohn observes:

The habits of dependence which a majority of Spanish-Americans -and Mexicans- are taught early and thoroughly by their family system, by "patron" control, and by a very paternalistic type of Catholicism are not easily abandoned.

.....
There is no question that Linearity has been until quite recently the dominant relational Orientation in Spanish-American society.¹⁵

The Spirit of Capitalism

Spanish-Americans' "Being"-orientation is illustrated in the following way:

Note also this statement made in 1941 by Leonard and Loomis about the evaluation of work on the part of the people of El Cerrito, a Spanish-American village far removed in space from Atrisco: 'Among the native people the values attached to such practices as thrift and hard work as ends in themselves have never attained the importance they have with other groups of people'. Work is simply a means of accomplishing that which is valued or desired, and as such these people realize its importance. It is not believed that it adds to the moral fiber of the individual. Furthermore, the mere accumulation of material goods adds little to the popular esteem for an individual'.

.....
Contrary to what many strongly job-oriented Anglo-Americans think, Spanish-Americans are not at all lazy, and they have, by and large, been, responsible workers if the definition of responsibility is relative to their own rather than Anglo-American value orientations. Mainly, theirs has been responsibility of dependent behavior which does not require long-range planning or much initiative for the overcoming of obstacles.¹⁶

In this statement Kluckhohn is indicating that the "Being" orientation of Spanish-Americans is a

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 199.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 204.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 207.

result of the fact that they attach greater value to non-instrumental dependence than to instrumental achievement.

Speaking about the Spanish-Americans' attitudes towards money and property Kluckhohn states that "the typical 'Atrisqueño' in 1936 had little inclination to save money or build up property holdings" and he had "no ability for handling his own monetary affairs".¹⁷ She adds:

It takes more of a sense of future time than the Spanish-Americans of New Mexico had in 1936, or even today, to comprehend the concept of interest on invested moneys.¹⁸

Clearly this description shows among Spanish-Americans an attitude diametrically opposed to the preachings of Benjamin Franklin which Max Weber considered a conspicuous expression of the spirit of capitalism.¹⁹

This lack of capitalistic spirit on the part of Spanish-Americans can be exemplified with another observation by Kluckhohn:

Whenever a family did happen to have a small surplus which a trader or 'patrón' could not control, or if it received a windfall, of some kind, the overwhelming odds were that it would use the money immediately for some highly desired item.²⁰

In-group solidarity and dignity

The lack of capitalistic spirit is linked with an emphasis on other values to which instrumental achievement is subordinated. This can be illustrated with some of the observations of Kluckhohn, speaking about Spanish-Americans who was successful in his restaurant business, but his brothers and his father were not doing well;

All of these persons have been in some sense dependent upon this one son. Thus, in spite of his relative success there is not too much that he can count on for the economic mobility of his own immediate family.²¹

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 217.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Op. cit., pp. 48 – 50 and 64.

²⁰ Op. cit., pp 223.

In Atrisco "even in bad times, people managed to get along because they helped each other".²² She

adds:

In Atrisco in 1936 where there was still community integration in spite of impending economic disaster, there was only one family which was accepting government aid, and it was roundly criticized. A characteristic remark was this one made by an Atrisco woman: 'Now take my father, he is 'muy pobre' (very poor), but no one has to give him anything. He has almost nothing, just what he gets when he herds. You know herding is hard, but he and my brothers get along ... If my brother Andrés has work, and my daddy has work and Frankie doesn't, then they all live together, too ... And what those Texans (referring here to the Texans of Homestead, very many of whom were accepting government relief in 1936) do is really awful'.²³

Such observations add support to the idea that not laziness but lack of instrumental motivation is the source of Spanish-American's attitude towards work and performance. It is clear that they emphasize an ideal of "dignity" (in this case: not receiving government aid) more strongly than they do economic interests. This emphasis on dignity and on the value of an attitude of respect for sacred values is also exemplified by Kluckhohn's account of a fiesta in Atrisco:

Some villagers took umbrage at the attentions a Spanish-American from Railtown was drunkenly trying to shower on me ... Certain members of the community took action. He was upbraided, and he so took it to heart that the next evening he fully apologized as he has been instructed to do.²⁴

From this incident it becomes clear that what is important to Spanish-Americans is the orientation of the person: What was important in the cited instance was not only to prevent violation of what they considered sacred standards of respect to a lady, but also to repair the violation by apologizing. This was demanded by the dignity both of the 'Atrisqueños' and of their guest. There were no instrumental interests involved in apologizing, but this act had a great importance in the non-instrumentally dominated value scale of Spanish-Americans.

Sacrifice and work, but for different values

²¹ Ibid., p. 226.

²² Ibid., p. 227.

²³ Ibid., pp. 27-8.

Probably one of the best examples of the non-instrumental nature of the values that Spanish-Americans hold, instead of the spirit of capitalism, is the importance that these otherwise hedonistic people attach to religious penance and sacrifice. Speaking about appeals to the saints Kluckhohn says:

A prominent part of the appeal is the act of penance which the individual (or a group of individuals) carries out to evidence his own good faith and gratitude.²⁵

Indeed, acts of penance usually imply sacrifice of time (which for Franklin equals "money"), energies and instrumental opportunities:

When work is required for the sake of non-empirical goals Spanish Americans do not appear to be lazy: thus, for preparing the annual fiesta of the patron saint;

Almost always, all those whose help was solicited appeared. Work with sheep or cattle or on jobs of one sort or another was put aside for a day or so if at all possible, and everyone poured his efforts into getting the work of the church done.²⁶

Another example of this orientation towards non-empirical goals, can be seen in the following observation reported by Kluckhohn:

The rebuilding of the old schoolhouse to make's new church when the old church burned showed again the strength of the religious traditionalism. It is inconceivable that an Anglo-American community which had dwindled to a population of twenty-five adults and some twenty-five children would life interests. It is a community of fate (Schicksal). One may say that within the ores of the relationship the parties act and are treated as a unit of solidarity. They share benefits and misfortunes in common, not necessarily equally, because Gemeinschaft relations perfectly well admit both of functional and of hierarchical differentiation. But it is the specific field of application of the communistic principle, to each according to his needs, from each according to his abilities.²⁷

Speaking about the purpose in entering into or adhering to the relationship, Parsons adds:

Gemeinschaft obligations ... are typically unspecified end unlimited.

.....
Institutional sanction is concerned rather with attitudes than with specific acts. The letter are judged primarily as expressions of these attitudes.... What we enjoin primarily are attitudes such as "love", "respect", "filial piety" and the like. The acts formally forbidden are those held to

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 233-234.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 235.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 236-237.

²⁷ The Structure of Social Action (Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1949), pp. 688-689.

be particularly incompatible with the "proper" attitudes, those formally enjoined a minimum expression of such an attitude, In the Gesellschaft relation on the other hand, attitudes are specifically irrelevant. It is the sphere of "formal legality".²⁸

Traditionalism

The value orientations of the Spanish-Americans from Atrisco seem to contain what Max Weber has called traditionalism as opposed to the spirit of capitalism, that is, the desire to live as one is accustomed to live and to earn as much as is necessary for that purpose, without high achievement motivation, rational planning, and systematic and rational pursuit of profit.²⁹

Folk society

The description of Atrisco also seems close to Redfield's characterization of the folk type of society:

Such society is small, isolated, nonliterate, and homogeneous, with a strong sense of group solidarity. The ways of living are conventionalized into that coherent system which we call 'a culture'. Behavior is traditional, spontaneous, uncritical, and personal; there is no legislation or habit of experiment and reflection for intellectual ends. Kinship, its relationships and institutions, are the type categories of experience and familial group is the unit of action. The sacred prevails over the secular; the economy is one of status rather than of the market.³⁰

Mormons and Texans

The Mormon and Texan communities near Atrisco were characterized -in contrast with the Spanish-American- by the following dominant value orientations: emphasis on overcoming natural obstacles and building a man-made world (Mastery-over-Nature orientation); emphasis on rational use of time and instrumental planning for the future (future orientation); emphasis upon the "activities which result in accomplishments that are measurable by standards conceived to be external to the acting individual" (Doing orientation); independence from various types of traditional authorities (relegating the

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 690 – 691.

²⁹ Max Weber, op. cit., chapter II.

³⁰ Robert Redfield "The Folk Society", The American Journal of Sociology, 52 (January 1947), p. 293.

Lineal orientation to the less dominant role).

Reporting on the values of these two communities, Strodtbeck says:

Both communities are now in contact with the current culture of the United States, and both were developed by persons who were of the main stream of north European, Protestant migrants of America.³¹

He concludes that there are only "slight differences in the reported value orientations between the Mormon and Texan samples", and he adds :

One doubts that the slight differences observed could be maintained if the Church were not present in Rimrock. The Mormon who relinquishes his active commitment to the Mormon priesthood -the so-called Jack Mormon- it very much like a Texan.³²

Texans Individualistic Achievement

Speaking specifically about the Texan community, Strodtbeck states:

It is almost as if the stakes toward their middleclass ideal which they had taken were so slight that they emphasize the great distance of their goal rather than the magnitude of their advance.³³

He also states:

Psychologically, being lower status simply means that one is less ashamed of the outhouse, oil lamps, and wood stove which remain from the early pioneering period.³⁴

The strong orientation towards individualistic achievement in the Texan Community is clearly illustrated in the following observations by F. Strodtbeck:

The rare situations in which work is exchanged between two families are frequently sources of tension without regard to the relative status of the families involved.³⁵

Strodtbeck points out the Texans' lack of inclination to contributing their work for a new gymnasium which was illustrated in speeches to the effect that: "I've got to look after my own farm and own family first; I can't be up here building a gymnasium". They were willing to work on the gymnasium"

³¹ Op. cit., p. 260.

³² Ibid., p. 283.

³³ Ibid., p. 260.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 260.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 261.

on a purely business basis at a dollar an hour".³⁶

Still speaking about the Texan Community, Strodtbeck adds:

If the men had anything to do at which they would make money, it is almost certain that they would not be loafing. The thing that they are not disposed to do is to make work just to keep busy.³⁷

Mormons: community-minded achievement

Mormons appeared to be more inclined than Texans to community work and to consider hard work as a value in itself. Strodtbeck comments:

An essential tenet of Mormonism deals with time quite simply: Things can be better in the future if man keeps working to improve them.³⁸

In order to illustrate the Mormons' orientation to time Strodtbeck reports that one of the Mormon interviewees "stressed time and again that he kept busy, that when he turned from a private task he would undertake a community task".³⁹

Although it follows from these observations that the orientation of the Mormon community is less individualistic than that of the Texan group, it is clear that Mormons are no less concerned than Texans with expedience and instrumental achievement. Indeed, Strodtbeck observes:

There is a clear consensus for pragmatic results in community activity. The best available machinery and the most competent men are called to do the job.⁴⁰

They work on community projects "as if they were carrying out a personal business venture".⁴¹

Empirical Test

The differences described between Spanish-Americans, Texans and Mormons were tested with the use of a questionnaire which was applied in all three communities.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 268.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 277.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 268.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 273.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 263.

⁴¹ Ibid.

The results of this test largely corroborate the above characterization showing Spanish-Americans as primarily oriented to Present, Subjection-to-Nature and Being, and more oriented to Linearity than to Collaterality (in the relational value orientation). According to the results of this research the dominant value orientations of the Mormons and the Texans are Individualistic, Future Oriented, Mastery-over-Nature, and Doing.

One may ask at this point: to what extent do the patterns of value orientation of the Spanish-Americans from Atrisco reflect the patterns of value orientation of Latin American societies in general? To what extent do the patterns of value orientation of the Texan and Mormon communities studied reflect the patterns of value orientation of American society as a whole?

F. Kluckhohn and F. Strodtbeck consider that the dominant orientations in "American middle-class society or in "the United States as one example of a total culture" are largely the same as those common to the Texan and the Mormon group, that is: "Individualism, Future time, Mastery-over-Nature, Doing, and Evil (or Good-and-Evil) mutable human nature".⁴² On the other hand, they assume that the values described for Atrisco are largely similar to the value orientations dominant in "traditional Spanish-American society", that is: Linearity, Present time, Subjugation-to-Nature, Being, and Good-and-Evil mutable human nature".⁴³

Various studies dealing in one way or another with Latin American values characterize these countries in a way approximating Kluckhohn's and Strodtbeck's characterization of the value orientations dominant in Atrisco. Studies dealing with American values contribute observations in harmony with Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's description of the values of the Texan and Mormon communities which they studied.

This would suggest that the findings of "Variations in Value Orientations" can be generalized to Latin American and American cultures as a whole, to a certain extent.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 29 - 30.

The following pages are an attempt to show how these other studies complete the picture of the values of both cultures, suggesting that the conclusions of Variations in Value Orientations can be largely applied to Latin America as a whole or to American society as a whole.

Universalistic-achievement vs. Particularistic-ascription.

Non-empirical Goals vs. Secular Instrumental complex.

In his The Social System, Parsons contributes observations important for the characterization of the value patterns of Latin American and American societies.

Speaking in general terms Parsons states:

It is possible for the achievement goals to be non-empirical. Unless, however, as in the case of Calvinism, these non-empirical goals give rise to direct empirical implications (the Kingdom of God on earth which can be taken as immediate goals, the effect is to displace the whole emphasis from the occupational achievement complex and thus alter the character of the society profoundly. The activities oriented to the primary achievements can no longer be rational-instrumental but must assume a symbolic-ritual character. This possibility has probably been most fully realized in Catholic Christianity where the church has been an organization for the realization of non-empirical goals. This throws the main emphasis away from the secular instrumental complex and puts a premium on its stabilization through traditionalism and/or authoritarianism rather than its continuing development. By the same token the pressure against giving affectivity and diffuseness prominent places decreases. This may well have something to do with the fact that the Latin countries with their Catholic background, have proved relatively unsusceptible to the development of industrial patterns and that in certain respects, in spite of their religious Transcendentalism, they have leaned in a 'hedonistic' direction.⁴⁴

These considerations would suggest that their Catholic background leads Latin American societies (as well as other Latin countries) to emphasize non-empirical goals, and leads them "away from the secular instrumental complex, while affectivity and diffuseness take prominent places".

Parsons considers the Spanish-American social type as a good example of Particularistic-ascriptive pattern, which he describes in a way that emphasizes the concern for expressive interests rather than concern for shaping the situation through achievement.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 343.

⁴⁴ The Social System, pp. 190 - 191.

He states:

The absence or the achievement emphasis even further inhibit the development of instrumental orientations and the structures associated with them ... The overwhelming preponderance of emphasis is thrown in the expressive direction. These are above all the artistically oriented societies ... The individualism is primarily concerned with expressive interests, and hence much less so with opportunity to shape the situation through achievement. There tends to be a certain lack of concern with the remoter framework of the society, unless it is threatened.⁴⁵

Goal-Achievement vs. Diffuseness

Parsons characterizes the Universalistic-achievement pattern, dominant in American society, as involving a primary concern for instrumental achievement, and limitation of other solidarities or loyalties (kinship or friendship) to what is compatible with the achievement orientation.

It also involves the avoidance of diffuse expressive orientations (outside the family).

Referring to the universalistic-achievement pattern Parsons states:

We may speak of the valuation of a pluralistic and/or individualistic system of goal-achievement through instrumental actions as the primary concern of people holding such a value-orientation pattern.⁴⁶

He adds that "the basic reward in the occupational role system is 'success'"⁴⁷ He also states:

Intrasex friendship as diffuse attachment is much less prominent, probably because it can too readily divert from the achievement complex.

.....
It may be suggested that expressive orientations are less dangerous -outside the family- in specific rather than in diffuse forms, and that this has something to do with the proliferation of 'entertainment' in industrial societies. In these forms the actor can take his gratifications piecemeal, as it were, without incurring the obligations inherent in diffuse attachments.⁴⁸

Insisting on the instrumental function of freeing oneself from diffuse attachments, Parsons states:

The segregation from the fusing involved in diffuseness either of generalized status ascriptions or of affective attachments, seems to be essential to the mobility of personnel and facilities and the allocation of rewards by achievements, which this pattern requires.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 198 - 199.

⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 183 - 184.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 186.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 189.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 190.

Enlightened Self-interest

More than a century ago de Tocqueville wrote:

In the United States hardly anybody talks of the beauty of virtue, but they maintain that virtue is useful and profess that men ought to sacrifice themselves for their fellow creatures because it is noble to make such sacrifices, but they boldly aver that such sacrifices are as necessary to him who imposes them upon himself as to him for whose sake they are made.

.....
They therefore do not deny that every man may follow his own interest, but they endeavor to prove that it is the interest of every man to be virtuous.

.....
They show with complacency how an enlightened regard for themselves constantly prompts them to assist one another and inclines them willingly to sacrifice a portion of their time and property to the welfare of the state.

.....
The principle of self-interest rightly understood perhaps prevent men from rising far above the level of mankind, but a great number of other men, who were falling below it, are caught and restrained by it. Observe some few individuals, they are lowered by it; survey mankind, they are raised.⁵⁰

In these few sentences de Tocqueville stated in different words some of the central ideas pervading the above descriptions of American dominant values. Indeed, he is saying that Americans emphasize the idea of doing things because it is useful, instrumental and expedient to do so, rather than because they have to do it or feel morally obliged to do it. This emphasis on instrumentality and expedience above the "lofty idea of the duties of man" or the "beauties of virtue" leads the actor nevertheless to submit himself to the group with "regularity, temperance, moderation, foresight and self-command".

Other Studies

Ideologies and Rigid Principles

Albert U. Hirschman observes that since Americans are no longer ready to become partisans of ideological systems as in other times, they are "out of phase with the mood prevailing in Latin America. For, there, ideologies are in their accustomed roles, holding men in their grip, pushing them into actions

⁵⁰ Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, (New York, Vintage books, 1961), ppl.

that have important effects".⁵¹ This statement suggests that what is important for

II, pp. 129-131.

⁵¹ "Ideologies of Development in Latin America", in Latin American Issues. A. O. Hirschman (ed.) (New-York, The Twentieth Century Fund, 1961), p. 36.

Latin Americans is the orientation of the individual himself while in the United States what is important is practical action, disregarding orientations which add nothing to practical action and are worth little or nothing without practical action. This supports the thesis that Latin Americans show an expressive orientation to "Being" (rather than "Doing") and supra-empirical goals. Hirschman also states:

Part of the mutual difficulties between Latin America and the United States may derive from this disparity. Given our present distaste for ideology, we are unwilling to grant that certain convictions which may seem naive to us can be held with the utmost sincerity and intensity.

.....
Latin Americans, on the other hand, frequently misinterpret our actions. They look for the 'system' behind our policies and impute to us rigid principles which we have long decisively qualified or given up. Mutual awareness of the disparity in intellectual climate should be helpful in mitigating such misunderstanding and frictions.⁵²

Performance and Guilt Feelings

John P. Gillin observes:

For a Latin American who has 'done his best', failure is due to the inscrutable ways of "fate" (or 'the will of God'). It is not his personal fault.⁵³

What Gillin' observes is not so much a manifestation of fatalism (as he calls it) but a manifestation of the Latin Americans' belief that the value of one's

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ "Some Signposts for Policy", in Social Change in Latin America Today, (New York, Vintage Books, 1961),p. 47.

actions depends upon their orientation, and not upon their results

For this reason, as Gillin observes:

If he fails, after having made a 'good try' he is not torn by feelings of guilt, conscience, or inadequacy, which play a large part in the psychological aftereffects of failure in North American culture.⁵⁴

Spiritual or Transcendental Values

Gillin makes additional observations about Latin Americans, which are closely in line with other descriptions reported in the present chapter. He observes:

Of far more importance (than the mechanistic arts) to most middle-status Latin Americans are what they often call spiritual or transcendental values - "the something beyond".

.....
For Latin Americans, to be alive is to feel strongly.⁵⁵

He also speaks about Latin Americans' "search" for "the ultimate" and "something beyond"⁵⁶ manifested in their preference for literary material and their lesser interest in financial letters, as well as their slight interest in utilitarianism or pragmatism.⁵⁷

Speaking about Latin American "middle-group" people Gillin says that "they habitually expend enormous amounts of personal energy when engaged in something they consider valuable or interesting".⁵⁸

These statements show Gillin's perception of the emphasis on non-empirical goals and the general lack of pragmatic interests or instrumental orientation among Latin Americans.

The Soul

Gillin states:

A Latin American, when first confronting an unfamiliar individual, typically "sees" in him

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 40 - 41, 43.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 42.

⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 42 - 43.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 40.

a "soul" whose essence he must endeavor to understand and respect for what it is.

Each person has a certain endowment of dignity, honor, and valor which merits respect from others and which he must safeguard at all cost, even death. This is the value usually described as dignidad de la persona, literally, "dignity of the person". It refers, however, to inner dignity rather than to social or other outward prestige. Originally no doubt, the influence of the Catholic Church, with its strong emphasis upon the soul, contributed heavily to the definition of this value. As a part of the middle-strate culture, it has now lost any exclusively religious connotations and has become a secular guide to conduct.⁵⁹

This description is in line with what Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck call "Being" orientation, and helps explain why in Latin American societies there is a high concern for characterizing persons in terms of the criterion of sacredness, as a "good" or "bad" person, a "friend" or an enemy.

Not Keeping Up his Guard

Gillin observes:

Traditionally, for the middle-status individual, only those with whom he feels an intimate, personal relationship are trustworthy ... The impersonal confidence which, say, a customer has toward a salesman of a large, established corporation in the United States is not yet a general feature of the middle-statue pattern.

.....
Generally speaking he (the middle-status Latin American) feels that members of his family or of a larger kin group understand his inner uniqueness and provide the sort of intimate contact that does not require him to "keep up his guard".⁶⁰

This can help to explain the in-group solidarity and out-group hostility or mistrust, characterizing many of the aspects of social life in Latin America. It is in line with the emphasis on diffuse attachments over instrumental concerns.

Expressive Orientation

Tomás R. Fillol uses the scheme of value orientations reported in "Variations in Value Orientations" to describe "The Argentine National Character". He emphasizes the dominance of the following orientations in Argentina: Subjugation-to-Nature, Present, Being, Individualistic and Good-and-

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 30.

Evil. This harmonizes with the Kluckhohn description of the Spanish-Americans from Atrisco.

Illustrating the Argentines' orientations, Fillol observes:

Whether Good or Bad, an individual is only perfectible through charity and devotion, never by means of his work, enterprise, or material achievements.

.....
Great success is obtained by waiting by hoping, by the favor of th saints, or by luck -not primarily by thrift, work and enterprise.⁶¹

This lack of "spirit of capitalism" is linked with the Argentines' orientation to "Be" rather than to "Do" or "Accomplish" which is also observed by Fillol.

Conclusion

These several investigations suggest that the values dominant in Latin American societies correspond to those found by Kluckhohn and Strodbeck in Atrisco, and those observed by Parsons, Hirschman and Gillin for Latin America, as well as some observations by Fillol for Argentina.

The studies also suggest that the values dominant in American society as a whole are those found by Kluckhohn and Strodbeck in the Mormon and Texan communities which they studied, and those observed by de Tocqueville, Parsons, Hirschman and Gillin.

Indeed, these observations by various authors are congruent when they are not identical. They also overlap with traditional bi-polar characterization of social relations and social values (Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft:mechanic-organic solidarity: traditionalism versus spirit of capitalism; folk-culture versus civilization).

Why do these values tend to cluster in that way (if they really do) and why do the clusters tend to correspond to sociological characterization of two basic types of societies or social relations?

Clyde Kluckhohn states:

Some of the deepest and most pervasive of personal and cultural values are only partially

⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 32 - 33.

⁶¹ T. R. Fillol, Social Factors in Economic Development, p. 9.

or occasionally verbalized and in some instances must be inferential constructs on the part of the observer to explain consistencies in behavior.⁶²

Are there, in American and Latin American cultures, any deeper dominant values which should be made more explicit both in their content and in their consequences for other values and for behavior?

Some answers to these questions will be suggested in the next chapter.

⁶² T. Parsons and E. Shils, ed., Toward a General Theory of Action (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1962), p. 397.

CHAPTER II

THE LOGICAL BASIS OF THE VALUE CLUSTERS

The Principle of Limit

After considering the important place given in social science to the distinction between the two types of value clusters outlined in chapter I (exemplified by the American and the Latin American cultures in the Western world), one may ask: are these two syndromes a result of processes in which various value elements happened to combine in these ways as a result of factors external to them; or are they, to an important extent, the result of the tendency of value elements to cluster precisely in that way?

The choice between these two alternative explanations of the clusterings has important implications. From the first explanation, it would follow that value clusters radically different from the two described above are equally likely to occur if appropriate external factors are present. If this position is taken, in its extreme, one would conclude that the probability that a given element from one of the two dominant clusters might appear in real life associated with another element in the same cluster is no greater than the probability of its being associated, in real life, with an element of the other value cluster.

From the second explanation (i.e., the tendency of the value-elements to cluster precisely in such ways) one would conclude that the described value clusters or others not very different from them, are more likely to occur -under any circumstances- than value clusters radically different (for instance containing half of the elements of one of the two clusters described and half of the elements of the other) In any case, from this second explanation, the conclusion emerges that the probability that a given element from one of the two described value-clusters appears associated (in real life) with another element in the same cluster is greater than the probability of it's being associated with an element of the opposite value cluster.

The corollaries of the first explanation differ less from those of the second explanation when it is accepted that the external factors determining the value clusters have a limited variability.

The following pages report on some answers given to the questions just raised.

Sorokin states the principle of limited possibilities of change as follows:

It is reasonably certain that an enormous number of sociocultural systems and processes have a limited range of possibilities in their variation, in the creation of new fundamental forms.⁶³

Explaining the principle of limited possibilities of change, Sorokin writes:

The main types of society, of sociocultural systems and processes, are very limited in their number. Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft, society with "mechanical-organic" solidarity; religious-secular; hunters-pastoral-agricultural-industrial; clan-tribe-state-international federation;

.....
Cultural anthropologists, ethnologists, historians, and sociologists have been confronted with a host of facts to which they have given the name of cultural convergence, meaning by it an essential similarity of cultural traits of various cultures, due neither to borrowing nor to common origin, nor to any contact of these cultures, but generated more or less independently. M. K. Kostovtzeff, A. J. Toynbee, R. Lowie, R. Thurnwald, A. Goldenweiser and many others rightly sought an explanation of the phenomena of convergence in the "principle of limited possibilities" of culture variations, an Goldenweiser and Thurnwald put it.⁶⁴

Starting from his "principle of limit" Sorokin explains his rhythmic theory of change as a result of the fact that the reason or cause of a change of any sociocultural system is in the system itself, and the less numerous are the immanent possibilities of change of a system, the more pronounced is the rhythmical character of its processes.⁶⁵

Sorokin's "Social and Cultural Dynamics" is based on the assumption that the Ideational, Idealistic and Sensate systems are the only possible forms of cultural (logico-meaningful) integration.

Referring more concretely to value patterns, Parsons defines five possible pairs of pattern-alternatives of value orientation, claiming that this set is exhaustive of the relevant logical possibilities on

⁶³ Pitrim Sorokin, Social and Cultural Dynamics (New York: Bedminster Press, 1962), Vol. IV, p. 710.

⁶⁴ Ibid., pp. 706 - 708.

⁶⁵ Ibid., chap. 15.

that level of generality.⁶⁶ He considers these "polar alternatives of possible orientation-selection"⁶⁷ defining the character of the relations to the role-partners.⁶⁸ On the level of the "collectivity-integrative sub-type of the moral type of evaluative action-orientation".⁶⁹ This level is one in which "neither cognitive nor cathectic but evaluative interests themselves have primacy",⁷⁰ and "the limits of permissiveness for action" are defined.⁷¹

Furthermore Parsons considers that by combining two of these pairs of pattern-alternatives (the Universalism-Particularism and the Ascription-Achievement) which are particularly relevant to the value-orientation pole of the reference system,⁷² one can obtain four fundamental "types of social value-orientation"⁷³. He says that these are "all the types which tend to emerge when major types of cultural development in the literate cultures have occurred".⁷⁴

In this scheme of possible types of social-value orientation, Parsons points to Latin American societies as examples of the dominance of the Particularistic-Ascription pattern, and American society as an example of dominance of the Universalistic-Achievement pattern.⁷⁵

The tendency of values to appear in a limited number of forms is expressed by F. Kluckhohn and F. Strodtbeck as follows:

First, it is assumed that there is a limited number of common human problems for which all peoples at all times must find some solution.... The second assumption is that while there is variability in solutions of all the problems, it is neither limitless nor random but is definitely variable within a range of possible solutions.⁷⁶

⁶⁶ Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Ill.; Free press), p. 66.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 59.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 58.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 59.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 50.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 51.

⁷² Ibid., pp. 102 - 4.

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 101, 181.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 182.

⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 182 - 191, 198 - 200.

⁷⁶ Op. cit., p. 10.

F. Kluckhohn and F. Strodbeck tentatively single out five problems "as the crucial ones common to all human groups".⁷⁷ These problems have been described above as Human Nature orientation, Non-Nature orientation, Time orientation, Activity orientation and Relational orientation.

An important difference between Sorokin's approach and the approaches by Parsons and Kluckhohn and Strodbeck can be expressed as follows:

Sorokin is concerned mainly with a single control logical dimension (Ideational, Idealistic, Sensate) which is responsible for the overall clustering and logic-meaningful integration of cultural elements. Parsons, F, Kluckhohn and Strodbeck are concerned with several possible types of value patterns, which result from combining plurality of dimensions. They do not claim that certain combinations of value orientations have a greater probability of

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 10.

occurring as a result of their logical convergence.

The two value clusters observed as dominant in American society and in Latin American societies appear as two of the relatively few possible value combinations in the schemes of Parsons and F. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck. However, it is assumed that value orientation clusters other than these two would have no less probability of occurring, provided the appropriate external circumstances are present. Parsons singles out as an example of a social structure associated with the universalistic-ascription pattern the German social structure.⁷⁸ He considers that the classical Chinese social structure fits very closely the particularistic-achievement pattern.⁷⁹ The Zuni and the Rimrock Navaho communities are pointed out by F. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck as differing both from the American value patterns and the Spanish-American value patterns.

Instead of claiming that a given rank order of value orientations is more logically congruent than others and consequently should tend to occur more, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck state:

The "strain towards consistency" -better termed a tendency toward consistency- which has long been accepted as a basic principle in sociological analyses is not, according to this conceptualization simply a pull in the direction of dominant values but is instead a prevailing influence of one type of rank ordering upon variant orderings which have the same component parts.⁸⁰

The lack of a specific direction or logical trend to cluster in a determinate way -speaking about combinations of value orientations- is explicitly stated by F. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck: "The range of alternatives of the activity orientation varies independently from those of the man-nature, time, and human nature orientations".⁸¹

Two Central Ideas or Major Premises

This study will not enter into the discussion of how many different value clusters are possible or

⁷⁸ Op. cit., p. 193.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 195.

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 342.

the differential degrees of appropriateness of various dimensions combined in order to characterize different value clusters. Instead, the study starts with the assumption that there is a central idea in each of the two value clusters outlined above for the American and Latin American societies. It is assumed that this central idea serves as a logical link among the various elements contained in each value cluster.

Why should the Spanish-Americans from Atrisco emphasize obedience above success, family above career, dependence above thrift and hard work, in-group solidarity and dignity above performance? Why should they be ready to sacrifice and to work hard only for non-empirical goals? Why should they lack interest in future achievement and detached cooperation?

The answer hypothesized here is that this results from their taking the value and justification of man and of his actions to be received by man from a supra-empirical principle or power to which man has to submit himself. For convenience this assumption will be called the theocentric major premise since it is centrally oriented to the idea of the super-natural from which men derives justification.

This theocentric central idea or major premise explains why Latin Americans emphasize non-empirical goals, expressive orientation, affectivity and diffuseness in Parsons' terms. It also explains Latin Americans' emphasis on ideologies and rigid principles, as Hirschman observes. It is for the same reason that Latin Americans place emphasis on feeling strongly, on "the ultimate", spiritual or transcendental values, the "something beyond", literary material, the soul, dignity, self-respect and intimacy, as Gillin reports. For the same reason they emphasize charity and devotion, waiting and hoping, rather than achievement, as Fillol remarks.

Why should (as reported in Variations in Value Orientations") the Mormons and Texans from the Rimrock area emphasize hard work, optimum instrumental use of time, instrumental achievement, with an individualistic or community-winded emphasis? Why should they emphasize mastery over nature, instrumental planning for the future, and independence?

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 16.

The answer postulated here is because they assume that the value and justification of man and his actions results from himself through his expedient activity or performance producing empirical results. For convenience this assumption will be called the anthropocentric major premise, since it is basically oriented to man as the cause of his own justification.

The anthropocentric major premise explains the primary concern for instrumental achievement, limiting other solidarities or loyalties to what is compatible with a basic achievement orientation and avoiding diffuse attachments outside the family, characterizing American value patterns in Parsons' terms. This major premise also explains Americans' rejections of moral obligation as the basic motivation for action, and their "enlightened

First, even if other combination of dominant values are possible in a culture or sub-culture, the combination will tend to approach the pattern of one of the other cluster described (in so far as each of these clusters is logically harmonious with the corresponding major premise), as a result of the fact that the theocentric and anthropocentric major premise are the two basic alternative solution to the problem of the relation of man to his own justification.

Second, the high degree of overlapping among the poles of various dimensions (Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft; Organic-Mechanic solidarity; Ideational-Idealistic-Sensate mentality of culture; folk-culture-urban civilization; etc.) used for differentiating societies along one bipolar axis is not an accident resulting from the particular societies that the various authors had in mind; rather, such overlap is seen here as the result of the universality and importance of the common human problem (relation of man to his own justification) for which the theocentric and the anthropocentric major premises are the two polar alternative solutions. However, it is recognize at the same that the peculiar intensity of the relevance of this dimension in the modern world may be linked to the fact that in our times the rapid and successful industrial, scientific and economic development of certain societies offers as spectacular contrast with the scarce empirical achievements of other societies.

This study also assumes that the dominance of the theocentric or anthropocentric value orientations is a matter of emphasis or degree rather than a black-and-white difference. Indeed, as F. Kluckhohn and Stroutbeck say: All alternatives of all solutions are present in all societies at all times but are differentially preferred".⁸² Moreover: "No individual, any more than any society, can live wholly or always in accord with the patterns which express a single profile of value orientations".⁸³

Previous Statements of This Distinction

The distinction between the two central ideas or major premises (theocentric and anthropocentric) underlying the two value clusters described in chapter one, has been stated by Max Weber as follows:

We must be clear about the fact that all ethically oriented conduct may be guided by one of two fundamentally differing and irreconcilably opposed maxims: conduct can be oriented to an 'ethic of ultimate ends' or to an 'ethic of responsibility' ... There is an abysmal contrast between conduct that follows the maxim of an ethic of ultimate ends -that is, in religious terms 'The Christian does rightly and leaves the results with the Lord'- and conduct that follows the maxim of an ethic of responsibility, in which case one has to give an account of the foreseeable results of one's action.

You may demonstrate to a convinced syndicalist, believing in an ethic of ultimate ends, that his action will result in increasing the opportunities of reaction, in increasing the oppression of his class, and obstructing its ascent -and you will not make the slightest impression upon him. If an action of good intent leads to bad results, then, in the actor's eyes, not he but the world, or the stupidity of other men, or God's will who made them thus, is responsible for the evil. However a man who believes in an ethic of responsibility takes account of precisely the average deficiencies of people; as Fichte has correctly said, he does not even have the right to presuppose their goodness bad perfection. He does not feel in a position to burden others with the results of his own actions so far as he was able to foresee them; he will say: these results are ascribed to my action. The believer in an ethic of ultimate ends feel 'responsible' only for seeing to it that the flame of pure intentions is not quenched.⁸⁴

This concern for "seeing to it that the flame of pure intentions is not quenched of the person who "does rightly and leaves the results with the Lord" (or with another non-empirical power or principle) in what has been called above theocentric major premise. The tendency towards an exclusive emphasis

⁸² Ibid., p. 10.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 21.

⁸⁴ Max Weber, "Politics as a Vocation" in From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. (Gerth and Mills, ed.; New York: Galaxy Book, 1958), pp. 120-121.

on the results ascribed to one's action is what has been called in this study 'anthropocentric major premise.

The same distinction between two logically opposed principles (one emphasizing the value of commitment to non-empirical and absolute principles; the other emphasizing the value of performance and results) is made by Sorokin, as follows:

A. From the nature of the ideational mentality, the following characteristics or the Ideational ethical system follow.

(1) It is not and cannot be intended merely to increase the sum of sensate happiness, comfort, pleasure and utility. These are imaginary and therefore cannot be the end of the principles of Ideational ethics.

(2) The Ideational system of ethics must be and usually is absolute. Since it is intended to bring its followers into unity with the supreme and absolute value, its commands are also absolute. They are the supreme value that cannot be turned into a means for anything and anybody. Therefore relativism, expediency, and anything that limits them is heterogeneous to such ethics. Fiat iustitia: et perest mundus is their spirit.

(3) Its principles are considered as emanating from God or some other supersensory absolute value. In most cases, they are given as the Commandments of God (or gods).

B. The nature of the Sensate mentality determines the opposite characteristics of the Sensate ethical system.

(1) The aim of such a system of ethics can be only an increase of the total sum of a man's (or a group's) sensate happiness, comfort, utility, and pleasure. Since there is no reality except the sensory and no value except the sensory value, sensate happiness remains the only value which can be secured by Sensate ethics.

(2) Such a system can be but relativistic, because with the changing sensate conditions the ethical rules must change also; rules that serve the purpose in one set of conditions cease to serve it in different circumstances; therefore they can and should be replaced by rules that fit the new situation. Hence, relativism, expediency, and changeability of the rules of Sensate ethics.

(3) They always appears as man-made rules, having, no other authority behind them. If they are reasonable and serve the purpose of happiness, they are useful. If they do not serve that purpose, they should be discarded.

.....
Sensate ethics can be called ethics of happiness; Ideational ethics, the system of absolute principles.⁸⁵

Sorokin clearly refers himself to what was called above theocentric major premise, when he describes the emphasis on "supersensory absolute values" (which may or may not be considered of divine origin) demanding absolute submission. He refers to what was called, above, the anthropocentric major premise when he describes the emphasis on expediency, and the relativistic orientation towards norms, which are changeable in accordance with the criterion of expediency.

Importance of the distinction

The two major premises postulated contain what Clyde Kluckhohn calls "the group's own definition of the ultimate meaning of life".⁸⁶ They contain existential judgments. They are conceptions of the "desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action".⁸⁷ Consequently the theocentric and anthropocentric major premises fail in the category of what C. Kluckhohn calls value orientations.⁸⁸ They represent the two basic alternative value orientations possible on the highest level of generality of the definition of the ethically desirable. It is for this reason that Weber states "All ethically oriented conduct may be guided by one of two fundamentally differing and irreconcilably opposed maxims: conduct can be oriented to an 'ethic of ultimate ends' or to an 'ethic of responsibility' "(Italics mine).⁸⁹

Sorokin says that "the enormous number and variety of ethical systems created by numerous thinkers quite naturally and easily fall into one of these classes".⁹⁰ These classes are the two poles (ethics of happiness and system of absolute principles) characterized above, and an intermediate type (Idealistic ethics) on the same dimension.

Such considerations justify the central importance that the present study attaches to the distinction between the theocentric and anthropocentric major premises.

Cognitive emphasis

The anthropocentric and theocentric assumptions are called "major premises" in order to

⁸⁵ Op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 481 – 483.

⁸⁶ T. Parson and F. A. Shils, ed., Toward a General Theory of Action (New. York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1962), p. 410.

⁸⁷ Ibid. p. 395.

⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 395, 409-410.

⁸⁹

emphasize their cognitive primacy. Indeed, a person under

⁹⁰ Sorokin, op. cit., p. II, p. 483.

social pressure to accept the theocentric assumption or major premise, and accepting it, is not for that reason more altruistic or well-meaning than another. A criminal is not less a criminal because he recognizes the legitimacy of the norms that he is violating. As C. Klukhohn states:

Values and motivation are linked, but only rarely do they coincide completely. Values are only an element in motivation and in determining action; they invariably have implications for motivation because a standard is not a value unless internalized. Often, however, these implications are in the nature of interference with motivation conceived in immediate and purely personal terms.⁹¹

Consequently, no moral evaluation of individuals accepting one of the other major premise (and the value cluster deriving from it) can be made on that basis.

Value Orientations Logically Derived from the Two Major Premises

Some of the relations of man to objects around him are universal presenting “problems common to all human groups”, in connection with the general problem of man’s relation to his own justification. These universal relations considered most crucial in the present study are the relation of man to other man, and his relation to ideas and ideologies. Within the category of relation of man to other men, there are sub-categories of relationships equally universal: relations to family, to friends, to peers, to fellowmen and -at another level- the relationship between two individuals with different degrees of involvement in personal relationship.

There are many other common human problems (at various levels of generality) that one could consider. However, those mentioned above are considered in this study crucial for the solution of the basic problem: the relation of man to his own justification.

The solutions to these common human problems can be logically harmonious with the theocentric

⁹¹ Op. cit., p. 400.

major premise or with the anthropocentric major premise .⁹²

⁹² If the value of man and of his actions depends upon his conformity with supra-empirical norms of principles (theocentric major premise), the persons who are seen as executors of supra-empirical mandates and the ideas which are seen as expression of the supra-empirical norms are considered sacred (that is, they have an absolute value not because of intrinsic instrumental abilities or properties of the persons or ideas, but as a result of their position in relation to the supra empirical- power); the persons or ideas which are considered to be in conflict with supra-empirical principles are considered anti-sacred, and they deserve hostility. Consequently, conformity with supra-human norms or principles has to be realized thorough unqualified respect and loyalty to persons and ideas who are seen as executors or expressions of the supra-empirical mandates, and, for the sake of them, hostility to their enemies or to the opposed ideas.

If the value of man and of his actions depends upon his instrumental performance, he does not have to classify persons and ideas into sacred and anti-sacred according to their position in relation to supra-human principles. One simply has to consider persons and ideas neutral elements of the environment; behavior will be valuable to the extent that the actor is able to adapt himself successfully to that human and cultural environment; a successful adaptation will be one maximizing the actor's instrumental expedience (in his activity oriented to individual or collective goals). Consequently, not unqualified commitment to sacred persons and ideas, but detached adaptation to people and ideas in general, is the valuable attitude towards them derived from the anthropocentric major premise.

The following value orientations will be especially considered in the present study:

Relation of man to other men: The theocentric solution of orientation emphasizes that man is morally obliged to give of himself (love, friendship, loyalty) and commit himself without or conditions to other people. The anthropocentric solution emphasizes that man has to relate to other men in a detached way in order that such relation may not interfere with his instrumental concern but rather may help him to achieve empirical results.

Relation of man with his family:

Relation of man to his friends:

Relation of man to his peers:

Relation of man to his fellowmen

The theocentric and anthropocentric solutions for these four problems are only special applications, for each type of relationship, of the theocentric and anthropocentric solutions for the problem of the relations of man to other men.

Unilateral involvement and reciprocity: The theocentric solution emphasizes the value of giving oneself (in love, friendship, concern, loyalty, etc.) as being the full accomplishment of the actor, even if unilateral. The anthropocentric solution emphasizes the value of receiving (approval, esteem, love, popularity, etc.), and thus unilateral involvement is a waste.

Relation of man to ideas: The theocentric solution emphasizes the absolute value (perfect harmony with reality, justice and goodness) of the "right" ideas. The anthropocentric solution emphasizes the relativity of the value of ideas, depending upon variations in the empirical world, and the criterion of expedience.

The theocentric solutions or orientations emphasize the value of norms in so far as they are moral obligations, and they also emphasize the importance of accepting them on moral grounds. The anthropocentric solutions or orientations emphasize the value of norms in so far as they are practical and expedient, emphasizing their human origin.

In this way there are two clusters (one theocentric and the other anthropocentric) of value orientations resulting from the application of the theocentric and anthropocentric major premises to a set of seven crucial common human problems.

Each of these value orientations can be subdivided further; for instance, the problem of the relation of man to his family includes the more specific but equally common human problems of relations to parents, to children, to siblings, to relatives, etc..

For each of the alternative solutions of each of the seven common human problems outlined one can distinguish various aspects. For instance, the relation to parents involves the following specific problems: loving them, living with them, obeying them, following their advice, following their traditions, conflicts between parent's expectations and children's personal achievement or need for independence; contingency of love for parents, etc..

Strain toward Consistency

The preceding discussion involved the assumption that there exist a strain toward consistency which leads individuals accepting the theocentric or the anthropocentric major premises, to accept also specific values and value orientations logically derived from such major premises. It has also been assumed that the strain towards consistency is not strong to bring all value elements into line with the central ideas of major premise.

The strain or trend toward consistency will have a central place in this study, where it will be considered in general terms as the tendency of individuals or groups to accept values which are logically consistent with each other and logically consistent with the major premise that they accept.

Universalism-Particularism

At this point it is appropriate to add some comments for justifying the use of the concepts developed in this chapter for characterizing the American and Latin American value patterns, instead of

just using such a well-known frame of reference as is provided by the Parsonian universalism-particularism pattern variable.

The distinction between universalism and particularism, although useful for the characterization of the differences between Latin American and American societies, cannot be taken as the main basis for explaining the contrast between their values. Indeed, from the characterization developed in the preceding pages results that the central distinctive element of the Latin American value cluster is accepting norms as a matter of principle (supra-empirical) which demands rigid and unconditional submission, whatever the practical results. In the case of American dominant values no such rigid dependence upon non-empirical entities is accepted, but a consideration of circumstances and expected empirical results seem more important for the characterization of the desirable and valuable. If this is the case, the differences between American and Latin American value patterns do not derive from the fact that in Argentina more than in the United States the relations between individuals explain the norms that bind them, and "discrimination is made between those objects with which ego stands in a particularistic relationship and other object possessing the same attributes"⁹³ (particularism). On the contrary, the acceptance of certain norms on moral grounds by Latin Americans leads them to consider that they ought to disregard the particular type of relationship that they have with the person affected by their compliance with the norm; indeed, there is a tendency for a moral commandment to be considered absolute,

⁹³ Parsons, The Social System, p. 63.

not admitting limitations based on special circumstances. This will be clarified with the following illustration.

Along the attempts at empirical assessment of universalism and particularism, perhaps the best known for its imaginative methodological devices is Stouffer's study of conflicts of norms.⁹⁴ Stouffer devised a questionnaire in which the student-respondent was presented with a hypothetical situation in which a proctor found a student cheating. The respondent was asked if other students would approve or disapprove of various attitudes of the proctor, ranging from dismissing reporting the cheater, to acting as if nothing had happened. Respondents were also asked about the approval or disapproval if the cheater were an intimate friend of the proctor instead of an ordinary student. They were also asked about what they would do in each case (ordinary student and close friend) if they themselves were proctors. In this way the choice of the students could be established between the universalistic norms of honesty and the particularistic loyalty to friend.

Bartlett H. Stoodley replicated the study with an equivalent random sample of undergraduate students of the University of Philippines. Contrary to what he expected, the Christian Filipinos showed more universalistic orientation than the American students according to the test. Acts A and B were the most severe measures the proctor would take. The percentage of Filipino respondents who thought that students would approve of acts A or B if the cheater were an ordinary student is slightly lower than the percentage of Americans no thought students would approve of such acts. However, if the cheater is a friend of the proctor: "About 10 per cent less (than in tree case of an ordinary student) of respondents (Filipino) think that the student would approve act A, and just about the same proportion (as in the case of an ordinary student) think that the student would approve act B. In the American sample there is a drop of 30 per cent in respondents who think that the student would approve act A and a decline of almost 40 per

⁹⁴ S. A. Stouffer: "An Analysis of Conflicting Social norms", Amer. Sociol. Rev., 1949, v. 14, pp. 707 – 717.

cent in those who think that they would approve act B".⁹⁵

This can be seen in the following table:

TABLE 1. --- Per cent of Filipino and American respondents who think students would approve of specific acts

	Act A		Act B	
	American respondents %	Filipino respondents %	American respondents %	Filipino respondents %
The cheater is an ordinary student	69	62	87	78
The cheater is a friend of the proctor	33	55	53	79

Similar results were obtained when the students (M) were asked what they do if they themselves were proctors. These results were further reinforced when the (M) were asked what they would do if the cheater were their elder brother (who is an authority in relation to the younger brothers in the Filipino family structure). Stoodley reports that "there was no mitigating, in contrast to when the cheater was a friend, and it is possible that there is some tightening".⁹⁶ He adds: "Filipino respondents treated elder brothers in just about the same way that they treated close friends".⁹⁷

Since Philippine society has had an important Spanish and Catholic influence, as have Latin American societies, one might think that Stoodley's findings would be applicable to Latin American students. The empirical research carried out in the present study provides some support for this supposition. Indeed, after describing the situation of a student who has great difficulties in a course, the respondents (American and Argentine university students) are asked to agree or disagree with the following statements:

⁹⁵ Bartlett B. Stoodley, "A cross-cultural study of structure and conflict in Social Norms", in *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 65 (1959-60), p.439.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

14- "The successful student is morally obliged to offer help to his classmate who is in difficulty".

15- "You would feel guilty if you did not offer such help and he failed the course".

Then, assuming that the student having difficulty is a close friend of the other student, the respondent is asked about the extent of this agreement with the following statements:

16- "The successful student is morally obliged to offer help to his close friend".

17- "You would feel guilty if you did not offer help and your close friend failed the course".

If the attitude of American were more universalistic than that of Argentines one would expect that the increase in agreement with item 16 in comparison with item 14 would be larger for Americans than for Argentines. One would expect the same thing to occur with the greater agreement with item 17 than with item 15. However, in May 1962 the opposite result was predicted because Argentines, more than Americans, "would tend to consider the whole matter as a matter of principle".

As predicted, friendship increased agreement with the items more for Americans than for Argentines, as shown in the following table:

⁹⁷ Ibid.

TABLE 2 - Means of the Answers of Americans compared with the means of the answers of Argentines. (The means range from 1 -extreme agreement- to 5 -extreme disagreement-).

Item	Moral obligations towards the:	Americans' means	Argentines' means
14	Ordinary student	3.53	1.60
16	Close friend	2.72	1.13
	Difference	<u>.81</u>	<u>.47</u>
15	Ordinary student	2.86	1.94
17	Close friend	1.97	1.28
	Difference	<u>.89</u>	<u>.62</u>

It is clear, then, that Filipino and Argentine respondents (in the two examples presented) show a stronger adherence than American respondents to universalistic norms, at least in these two specific cases. Indeed, they take the obligations much more as a matter of principle than as a matter of loyalty to persons with whom they stand in a particularistic relationship. Once having accepted the moral grounds of the norm, Argentine and Filipino respondents -more than American respondents- tend to treat close friends and elder brothers

in the same way as they treat ordinary students.⁹⁸

The Latin Americans emphasis on the importance of particularistic relationship and obligations is not by necessity correlated with a lack of emphasis on universalistic norms. On the contrary, even particularistic norms and obligations are usually only rationalizations of universalistic norms. The consideration that the value and justification of man derives from supra-empirical powers of principles to which one has to submit oneself completely, leads to an emphasis on both universalistic and particularistic norms, provided that these norms are seen as related to the supra-empirical powers or principles.

Values and Statures

Why should Americans tend to accept the anthropocentric value orientations and Latin the theocentric value orientations?

The reason suggested here is double: First, the in American culture is associated with the acceptance of the theocentric major premise and theocentric value orientation towards fellowmen, family and ideas, as a result of the influence of the Catholic doctrine and tradition. Latin American culture is also

⁹⁸ Another pair of items in the present study will further corroborates these conclusions. Referring to the case of a student who is cheating in an examination in the university and a classmate who reports him, the respondent is asked about the extent of his agreement with the following statements:

7- "You would disapprove of the action of the student who reports the cheater".

12- "If the two students were close friends, you would disapprove of the action of one reporting the other".

The means of the answers for Americans and Argentines are as follows (they range from 1 –strongly agree- to 5 –strongly disagree-):

	Americans	Argentines
Item 7 (ordinary student)	2.96	1.62
Item 12 (close friend)	2.68	1.74
Difference	.28	-.12

In this case also the orientation to an universalistic norm is less affected by the particularistic relation to a friend in the case of Argentine respondents than in the case of American respondents.

associated with acceptance of the theocentric major premise and theocentric value orientation towards family relationships, as a result of the pre-industrial type of Social organization in Latin America. Second, Latin American culture is associated with a theocentric orientation towards friends, peers and reciprocity, as a result of the strain towards logical consistency with the acceptance of the theocentric major premise.

Conversely, in relation the American culture one can say: First, American culture is associated with acceptance of the anthropocentric major premise as a result of the secularization following the influence of "Ascetic Protestantism". American culture is also associated with acceptance of the anthropocentric major premise and anthropocentric value orientations towards family and friends as a result of the industrial social organization and style of life in American society. Secondly, American culture is associated with the acceptance of the anthropocentric orientation towards fellowmen, peers, reciprocity and ideas as a result of the strain towards logical consistency with the acceptance of the anthropocentric major premise and the value orientation towards family and friends.

Belonging to other groups or categories of people -besides belonging to a determinate culture- may be associated with acceptance of the theocentric or anthropocentric major premises, or with the acceptance of theocentric or anthropocentric value orientations. Two types of such association will be distinguished here:

First, direct association will exist when one of the distinctive or essential characteristics of the group of is associated with the acceptance of one of the major premises and/or one or more of the value orientations. Consequently, members of that group or category are expected to accept the corresponding major premise or value orientation(s). High religiosity for instance is directly associated with the acceptance of the theocentric major premise because it involves an emphasis on the supernatural as the source of man's worth, value and justification. The female role is directly associated with the theocentric major premise because (at least in the United States and Argentine) women are expected more than men to be oriented to devoting themselves to the family and other spiritual scopes, rather than oriented to

instrumental achievement. They are also expected to be more submissive and dependent than men.

Second, indirect association will exist between belonging to a determinate group or category of people and accepting a determinate major premise or value orientation when the following conditions are present: (1) the particular major premise (theocentric or anthropocentric) or value orientation is not directly associated with belonging to a determinate group or category of people; (2) the particular major premise or value orientation is in the same direction as a major premise or value orientation directly associated with belonging to that group or category. That they are in the same direction means here that they are both theocentric or both anthropocentric. The indirect association results from the strain towards consistency between the orientation (or major premise) directly associated (with belonging to the group or category) and other orientations (or major premise). The following illustrations will help to clarify this point. Theocentric value orientations towards peers, reciprocity or friendship are only indirectly associated with high religiosity, as a consequence of the direct association between high religiosity and the theocentric major premise. Theocentric orientations towards friends, peers, reciprocity and ideas are only indirectly logically associated with female role, as a consequence of direct association between female role and the theocentric major premise and the theocentric orientation towards family. They are not directly associated with the female role because there is nothing of what constitutes the female role which could involve a direct emphasis on commitment to friends, peers or ideas, or on a theocentric attitude towards reciprocity.

The direct or indirect association between major premises and/or orientations, and belonging to a certain group or category of people is not empirically tested in the present study. The distinction is deduced from existing knowledge of the characteristic of such groups or categories of people without claiming any scientific rigour.

This study does not attempt to establish which of the two elements -(1) belonging to a determinate group or category; (2) accepting a determinate value- is the strongest, which brings the other into line.

However, some causal directions seem obvious: In the case of sex and age the strong element is belonging to a given sex or age group. One does not change sex or age as a consequence of values. The religious affiliation, the type of community where one grows up and socio-economic status usually depend upon social factors (especially family background and nationality) rather than upon the value orientations of the respondent. Political affiliation, political involvement, career orientation, primary group integration (with friends) and exposure to academic psychology (especially Freudian psychology) can be as much a consequence as a cause of the value orientations of the individuals, and thus in such cases one can speak about a two-way influence. The same can be said about the type of university attended because, although the individuals are old enough to choose according to their own values, parents still have an important influence in the decision.

Concluding Questions

We shall be concerned, then, with the following questions:

Do the empirical clusterings of values described above as dominant in American and Latin American cultures correspond to reality?

Are the theocentric and the anthropocentric major premises truly the central ideas of these two empirical clusterings of values?

How are theocentric and anthropocentric value orientations associated with various social positions?

Does the clustering itself of values obey to a strain towards logical consistency of values around one or the other major premise?

The empirical research reported in the following chapters explores answers to these questions by use of a questionnaire data for aggregates of American and Argentine university students.

Such broad and important questions cannot, of course, be definitively answered by the limited evidence in hand but the provisional results can be of some help for future studies which may try to

answer such questions with more and better resources.

CHAPTER III

THE EMPIRICAL STUDY

Choice of Research Techniques

Among the various methods used to assess values empirically, two main types can be distinguished:

1. Qualitative field method: The researcher studies a whole culture (including its of institutions, document, habits of life, etc.) relying heavily on direct observation and from this study he infers the dominant and variant values in that group. This can be exemplified by F. Kluckhohn's study of the village of Atrisco, as follows

The study was an intensive one and extended to all aspects of village life. Family relations, social organization in general, formal education programs, religious activities, the economic system, and relations with other communities were all studied by means of observation and the kind of indirect interviewing which the participant-observer technique requires. Since I was fortunate enough to gain access to the records of traders, cattle and sheep dealers, county and state agents, and the Dennis Sheep Company which hired a number of village men, the material on the ways of making a living, on income and expenditures, on buying habits, and other matters relating to the economy was extremely detailed. But for all of this concern with a description of village life the values or value orientations of 'Los Atrisqueños' were the subject of greatest interest, and the data collected were interpreted within a conceptual framework of basic values.⁹⁹

2. Quantitative method. The research is based mainly on counts and statistical operations using standardized quantifiable indicators. Allen H. Barton reviews various kinds of indicators of values of individuals, classifying them in the following categories: (a) explicit abstract elements of standards, criteria, or goals; (b) specific evaluative statements about particular objects; (c) statements of probable behavior in hypothetical situations; (d) reported or observed behavior.¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, the method of content analysis provides for of quantitative analysis of collective data (literature, mass media, linguistic

⁹⁹ Variations in Value Orientations, p. 178.

¹⁰⁰ "Measuring the Values of Individuals", Religious Education (New York: The

analysis, etc.).¹⁰¹

Reference will be made below only to a few of the best known empirical studies of values relevant to the present research, in order to characterize the particular methods chosen.

This study was originally conceived on the basis of the author's qualitative observations of various cultural manifestations (including interpersonal behavior, institutions, etc.) in American and Argentine cultures. However, the observations lacked the intensity and systematization which characterize F. Kluckhohn's observations in Atrisco since 1936. As a result of the lack of a systematic and intensive method of observation, such originating observations will not be reported here.

The survey method was chosen for assessing values. Most of the indicators of values chosen were "specific evaluative statements about particular objects", according to Barton's classification of indicators of values.¹⁰² Indeed, the indicators consist mainly of the expression of the actor's conceptions of what is right, desirable or obligatory in relation to specific situations in life which are presented to him in a questionnaire. Some of the ideas of how to present these situations to the respondents have been derived from the excellent studies of Samuel Stouffer¹⁰³, and Samuel Stouffer and Jackson Toby¹⁰⁴, on conflict of norms (particularistic and universalistic norms), and also from Alfred Winslow Jones' study of attitudes towards corporate property rights (Life, Liberty, and Property).¹⁰⁵

The presentation of the indicators of values in the questionnaire used in the present study also bears a certain similarity to the construction of Kluckhohn's and Strodtbeck's schedule for the cross-cultural measurement of value orientations. They explain their methodological choice as follows:

Religious Education Association, 1962).

¹⁰¹ This method is explained by Bernard Berelson in "Content Analysis", in the Handbook of Social Psychology (Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954). Sorokin uses this method in his Social and Cultural Dynamics.

¹⁰² Op. cit., pp. S-83-S-87.

¹⁰³ Op. cit.

¹⁰⁴ "Role-conflict and personality", 56 American Journal of Sociology 1951, 395 – 406.

¹⁰⁵ Life, Liberty and Property (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1941)

Ideally, it would be best if one were able to test directly at the high level of abstraction at which value orientations are conceptualized. This is not possible. Since the value orientations are in large part implicit, hence seldom consciously verbalized, no systematic direct testing of them can be made ... But if the barriers of language differences are to be hurdled in order that a uniform method for cross-cultural testing can be achieved, neither the situations which are described nor the alternatives of solving the problems they pose can be highly specific and particularized ... our attempt to solve this complex problem was to seek out situations which were universal in type even though somewhat variable in actual content, and then hold constant the alternatives of solution of the problem.¹⁰⁶

Considerations similar to those just transcribed lead, in the present study, to presenting the respondents with specific situations in order to infer from their answers conclusions about their value orientations.

Making this choice meant sacrificing other possible methodological avenues of research which might also have been fruitful, such as the following:

McClelland reports differences in scores of n Achievement (need for achievement), n Affiliation and n Power in various countries and in various periods, concluding that there are certain definite - although not always simple- relations between achievement values and economic development. The methods that he used primarily were content analysis of children's stories, the application of questionnaires in order to trace the origins of "n Achievement in parental values and attitudes and the effects of n Achievement in adolescent boys on their occupational interests and performance under certain conditions".¹⁰⁷ The score of n achievement is the "count of the number of achievement related ideas in stories written under normal testing conditions".¹⁰⁸

Charles Morris in his cross-cultural study Varieties of Human Value also measures basic values of

¹⁰⁶ Op. cit., p. 93.

¹⁰⁷ David C. McClelland, The Achieving Society, (New York: Van Nostrand, 1961), p. 58.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 43. He defines achievement related ideas operationally as those thoughts "of doing well with respect to some standard of good performance, of being blocked in the attempt to achieve, of trying various means of achieving, and of reacting with joy or sadness to the results of one's efforts" (p. 43). The "need for achievement" thus defined seems logically derived from the anthropocentric major premise stated in chapter 2.

individuals. presenting the respondents with thirteen complex paragraphs about desirable ways to live: the respondent ranks these paragraphs according to his liking or disliking of the way to live described in each paragraph. Each paragraph contains several statements, and the results have been factor-analyzed.¹⁰⁹

F. Banfield, in his The Moral Basis of a Backward Society attempts a description of Southern Italian values leading to economic stagnation. He uses mainly his personal observation and illustrative interviews in order to substantiate his hypothesis that "amoral familism" in one of the basic value bottlenecks to development in that area. He considers that interest in short-run gain for the sole benefit of the individual or for his nuclear family, plus other negative moral qualities, characterize the people whom he studied.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹ (University Of Chicago Press, 1956).

¹¹⁰ Edward Banfield, The Moral Basis of a Backward Society.

The Aggregates of Cases Studied

Since Latin America is too diverse a cultural area for any reasonable sampling (even for exploratory purposes) with the limited resources available for this study, the empirical study is concerned not with Latin America as a whole but focuses on Argentina, as a result of the fact that the author knows more that country than any other Latin American society.

On the other hand, no attempt is made to study a sample of the whole populations of the United States and Argentina with our limited resources.

It was considered that a sample of university students would involve the following advantages for a cross-cultural study of values:

1. The university populations of the United States and Argentina are highly comparable because they consist of equivalent age groups, of persons engaged in a similar type of intellectual work, aiming for similar career goals, and partaking of a common Western university tradition.
2. The sampling becomes easier not only because the target population is much smaller, but also because it is divided into sub-groups (particular universities, departments, careers, regions, etc.) whose characteristics are known and comparable, facilitating the control of the variations which can result from these differences.
3. The application of the questionnaires becomes easier because it is possible to send them to professors at the universities that have been chosen, The professors in turn can distribute them among the students in class in order that they be filled out in the classroom. This procedure offers another advantage: the students can be controlled in order to prevent them from consulting with others about their answers to the questionnaire, and to avoid their rereading the questionnaire and changing some of their answers.
4. The cooperation of the respondents is much easier to obtain in this population (it has been called a "captive population") than in others, as a result of the authority relationship of professor-students in school situation; the intellectual sophistication of university students permits them to answer a self-administered

questionnaire, and permits them to understand not only the harmlessness of answering it but also its worth.

5. The bias in the selection of the respondents is minimized by having all the students in the class answer the questionnaire. Indeed, in this way one avoids the bias of selection by the researcher, by the teachers, or by the students themselves (self-selection), or who will answer the questionnaire and who will not.

6. The political and cultural leaders of both countries are recruited from their respective university students' populations, and consequently knowing the attitudes of this population has strategic value for policy purposes.

TABLE 3. -- Composition of the samples from each university

University attended	Per cent males	Per cent graduate students *	Per cent reporting high religious involvement	Total no. of cases
Emory University.....	48	4	26	(46)
Mississippi State University.....	81	0	44	(63)
The University of Texas.....	53	1	40	(72)
Rutgers University.....	98	98	16	(45)
Queens College.....	44	0	15	(62)
Fordham University.....	47	0	57	(123)
University of California - Los Angeles.....	17	10	23	(30)
National University of Buenos Aires **		0	21	(180)
Catholic University of Buenos Aires.....	36	0	44	(50)
National University of Tucumán	35	0	23	(127)
Catholic University of Tucumán.	42	0	35	(43)
Catholic Institute in Santiago del Estero	20	0	44	(25)
National University of Córdoba..	35	0	15	(26)
Catholic University of Córdoba..	47	0	60	(15)

* Argentine students enter professional schools (Law School, Medical School, etc.) immediately after high school, and they are considered undergraduates until they obtain a professional degree.

** The sex of respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires was not reported.

TABLE 4. -- Religious orientation by university attended.

University attended	Religious orientation						Total	Total no.
	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Irrelig.	Other	No answer		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	No.
Emory University	87	2	9	2	0	0	100	(46)
Mississippi State University	76	11	3	8	2	0	100	(63)
The University of Texas	83	12	1	3	0	0	100	(72)
Rutgers University.....	22	27	36	13	2	0	100	(45)
Queens College	11	8	73	3	2	3	100	(62)
Fordham University.....	1	98	0	0	1	1	100	(123)
University of California - Los Angeles	43	20	20	13	10	0		
National University of Buenos Aires	1	46	12	33	4	5	100	(180)
Catholic University of Buenos Aires	00	100	0	0	0	0	100	(50)
National University of Tucumán	1	82	1	15	0	1	100	(127)
Catholic University of Tucumán	0	93	0	2	5	0	100	(43)
National University of Córdoba	4	92	0	4	0	0	100	(26)
Catholic University of Córdoba	0	100	0	0	0	0	100	(15)

TABLE 5. -- Political orientation by university attended (Argentine sample).*

Political orientation	University attended						
	National University of Buenos Aires	Catholic University of Buenos Aires	National University of Tucumán	Catholic University of Tucumán	Catholic University of Santiago del Estero	National University of Córdoba	Catholic University of Córdoba
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Conservatives	4	20	5	7	8	4	13
People's Radicals	5	4	10	7	12	38	13
Intransigent Radicals	7	8	12	14	4	8	0
Socialists	40	0	13	5	8	23	0
"Justicialistas" (Peronists)....	3	2	2	9	20	0	0
Communists	6	0	4	0	0	0	0
Christians Democrats.....	3	34	17	28	36	19	47
"None" or "non existent" in our country or non existent yet.....	17	12	17	5	0	4	0
Other political party.....	3	6	2	2	4	4	20
No answer	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
Total respondents	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(No. cases)	(180)	(50)	(127)	(43)	(25)	(26)	(15)

* No association between political orientation and value orientations was predicted for the American sample.

Brief Description of the Samples

The American group

The study included 447 American university students from the following universities:

1. Emory University. This is a private university affiliated with the Methodist Church. It is located in the South of the United States in a large town (Atlanta, the capital of Georgia). In the fall of 1958 it had 3,946 students (2,875 men and 1,161 women). The school has an honor system.

Forty six respondents (10 per cent of the American group studied) study at Emory University. Five of them are freshmen; seven sophomore; sixteen junior; fifteen senior and two graduates. Four of them are psychology majors. Twenty-four of them are sociology majors. Six of them major in Humanities (Education, History, English, Languages, etc.) and four of them major in engineering or pure sciences. Twenty-four of them are females and twenty-two are males. Twenty-six per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

2. Mississippi State University. This university is also Southern, but it is state-controlled and it is located in a smaller town. The total enrollment was 4,884 in the fall of 1958, most of whom are men (4,514 as compared with 370 women), The school has no honor system.

Sixty-three of the respondents in this study (14 per cent of the American sample) attend Mississippi State University. Twenty-three of them major in the Humanities, ten of them major in engineering or pure science, and twelve of them major in profit-oriented disciplines (economics, business, accounting, public relations, etc.). Five of them are freshmen, nineteen sophomore, twenty-four juniors, and eleven seniors. Fifty-one of them are males and twelve of them are females. Forty-four per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

3. University of Texas. This university, located in Austin, in the American SouthWest, is also coeducational and state-controlled. It is larger than Emory University or Mississippi State University. Indeed, its enrollment in the fall of 1958 was 19,225, of whom 13,984 were males and 5,241 were females. The school does not have an honor system.

Seventy-two respondents in the present study (16 per cent of the American sample) attend the University of Texas. Forty-one of them major in profit-oriented disciplines, eighteen of them in the humanities, five of them in sociology and four of them in psychology. Seven of them are sophomores, forty of them are juniors and twenty-four of them are seniors. Thirty-four are females and thirty-eight are males. Forty per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

4. Rutgers- The State University. This state controlled university has almost as large an enrollment as the University of Texas. Indeed, 15,348 students, (11,247 males and 4,061 females) were enrolled in this university in the fall of 1958. It is located in the East of the United States. The school of Law is located in Newark, New Jersey, very near New York City. It has an honor system.

Forty-five of the respondents in the present study attend the School of Law at Rutgers University, thirty-two of them in the first year, and ten in the second year. All but one of them are males. Sixteen per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most

satisfaction in life

5. Queens College. This is a college of liberal arts, coeducational, under municipal control, located in the East of the United States in the city of New York. Its enrollment for the fall of 1958 was 9,596 (4,534 males and 5,062 females), It does not have an honor system.

Sixty-two of the respondents in the present study (that is, 14 per cent of the total American sample) attend Queens College. They major in various areas (eight in psychology, five in sociology, five in art, twenty-seven in Humanities, one in biological sciences, six in engineering and pure sciences, and seven in profit oriented disciplines).

Thirty-five are females and twenty-seven are males. Thirty of them are sophomores, nineteen are juniors and thirteen are seniors. Fifteen per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

6. Fordham University. This university is also located in New York City. It is controlled by the Society of Jesus, of the Roman Catholic Church. Its enrollment for the fall of 1958 was 10,265, of whom 6,634 were males and 3,631 females. The school does not have an honor system.

The American sample includes 123 students from Fordham University, most of them in their sophomore or junior year; 53 per cent are females. Most of them major in sociology, in the humanities and in biological sciences. Fifty-seven per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

7. University of California- Los Angeles. This is a state university, located in Los Angeles, California, with enrollment of 16,448 (10,631 men and 5,857 women) in the fall of 1958. It does not have an honor system.

Thirty respondents attend this university. Most of them are juniors or seniors, and art majors. Twenty-five of them are females. Twenty-three per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

The Argentine Group

The study includes 469 Argentine students, from the following universities:

1. Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires. This is state university located in the city of Buenos Aires, large metropolis where almost a third of the total population of the country lives. The students attending this university were 58,684 according to the October 1958 university census. K. H. Silvert and F. Bonilla report that it was estimated that by 1961 the university population had risen to 70,000.¹¹¹ In 1958 only 25,3 per cent of the students were females. The mean age of the students was 20 years old. Only 2,2 per cent was born in villages of less than 2,000 inhabitants. Thirteen percent of the students are married. Eighty-two per cent of the students report that they do not consult with the teachers about their doubts, and 60 per cent report that they do not consult with the assistants in the courses either. Sixty-four per cent of the students work to support themselves while studying. In one third of the cases the work is not related with their area of study. Only 1 per cent of the students are scholarship holders. Ninety per cent of the students live with their family, be it with their parents (72 percent), spouse (13 per cent) or other relatives: 1,6 per cent live alone, 5,6 per cent live in a boardinghouse, and 1,7 per cent with friends.

The parents of 2,3 per cent of the students in Buenos Aires University did not receive any formal education; 41 per cent of them attended elementary school; 20 per cent of them attended school but did not finish; 15 per cent finished high school; 6 per cent attended university and 15 per cent are university graduates. The 5,4 per cent of the fathers and the 8,3 per cent of the grandfathers of the students were workers.

Fifty three per cent of the students in the University of Buenos Aires have Argentine fathers; 13 per cent have Spanish parents; 11 per cent have Italian parents; the rest have Polish parents (4,8 per cent), Russian parents (3,9 per cent), German parents (1,4 per cent), parents from other European countries (5,4

¹¹¹ "Education and the Social Meaning of Developments: A Preliminary Statement" (N.York, American Univ. Field Staff).

per cent) and from Latin American countries (4,5 per cent).¹¹²

The present study includes 180 respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires. However, their responses were used only for the overall comparison, because they did not arrive early enough to use them in most of the analysis. This group is formed by sociology majors (25 per cent), psychology majors (48 per cent) and art majors (22 per cent). Eighty-three per cent of the students are in their first year, seven per cent in their second year and 3 per cent in their third year.

¹¹² "Censo Universitario" (Octubre 1958)-Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires.

Forty per cent of the respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires identify themselves with the Socialist party; 6, 6 per cent with the Radical Intransigent party; 6,1 per cent with the Communist party; 5 per cent with the Radicals of the People; 4,4 per cent with the Conservatives; 2,8 with the "Justicialista" party (neo-peronist); and 2,8 with the Christian Democrats. Twenty-one per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

2. Universidad Católica Argentina. This is an university affiliated with the Catholic Church, and also located in the city of Buenos Aires. This university has existed only for a few years, as a result of the fact that before 1958 private universities could not award degrees which would enable their holders to exercise the corresponding profession.

Fifty of the respondents considered in this study attend the Catholic University of Buenos Aires. All of them are sociology majors. Fifty per cent of them are in their first year and 48 per cent are in their second year. Thirty-four per cent of them are Christian Democrats; 20 per cent conservatives; 8 per cent Radical Intransigents; 4 per cent People's Radicals; and 2 per cent are "Justicialistas" (neo-peronists). Forty-four per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

The socio-economic status of the respondents from the Catholic University of Buenos Aires is higher than that of respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires.

3. Universidad Nacional de Tucumán. This is a state university located in Tucumán, a town of around 200,000 inhabitants, which is the most important economic and cultural center of the North of Argentina. The national university of Tucumán has traditionally been the cultural center for the whole North of Argentina, and some of its schools are located in towns in other Northern provinces.

The Argentine sample includes 127 respondents from the National University of Tucumán, majoring in psychology (21 per cent), Humanities (35 per cent) biological sciences (32 per cent) and Law

(8 per cent). Nine per cent of them are in their first year; 58 per cent in their second year; 17 per cent in their third year; and 2 per cent in their fourth year. Seventeen per cent of them are Christian Democrats; 13 per cent of them Socialists; 12 per cent of them Radicals Intransigents; 10 per cent of them People's Radicals; and 5 per cent of them Conservatives. Twenty-three per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

4. Instituto Universitario Santo Tomás de Aquino. (Catholic University of Tucumán). This is a branch of the Catholic University of Córdoba, located in the town of Tucumán. This is a relatively new university, affiliated to the Catholic Church.

Forty-three of the Argentine respondents attend the Catholic University of Tucumán. Fifty-eight per cent of them major in Humanities and 40 per cent of them major in profit oriented disciplines. Ninety per cent of them are in their first year and 5 per cent in their second year. Twenty-eight per cent of them are Christian Democrats; 14 per cent of them Intransigent Radicals; 9 per cent "Justicialistas"; 7 per cent People's Radicals and 7 per cent Conservatives. Thirty-five per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

The socio-economic status of respondents from the Catholic university of Tucumán is not significantly higher or lower than that of respondents from the National University of Tucumán. The socio-economic status of respondents from both Tucumán's universities appears to be lower than the socio-economic status in any of the two universities from Buenos Aires (the National and the Catholic).

5. Instituto Universitario San José This Institute is affiliated to the Catholic University of Tucumán, and it is located in the capital of the province of Santiago del Estero, a small town where the impersonality of modern industrial life is practically unknown.

The Argentine group studied includes 25 respondents from the San José Institute. Twenty-eight of that major in profit oriented disciplines; 20 per cent in engineering and pure sciences; 40 per cent in Humanities and 12 per cent in sociology. All of them are in their second year. Nine of them are Christian

Democrats, 5 "Justicialistas"; 3 People's Radicals; 2 Socialists and 2 Conservatives. Forty-four per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

6. Universidad Nacional de Córdoba. This is a state university located in Córdoba, a town of around one million inhabitants, It was originally founded by a Roman Catholic Bishop, but it was later (in 1917) the center of the "Reforma Universitaria" a movement of break with tradition, including clerical tradition, which obtained the admission of the students to participation in the government of the universities.

The Argentine sample includes 26 respondents attending the National University of Córdoba

Forty-six per cent major in law; 27 per cent in the Humanities; and 27 per cent in psychology. Ten of them are Conservatives, six Socialists and 5 Christian Democrats. Fifteen per cent of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

7. Universidad Católica de Córdoba. This university also located in the city of Córdoba is affiliated to the Catholic Church and of recent creation.

Only 15 respondents attend the Catholic university of Córdoba, 8 of them major in profit oriented disciplines and 7 in social work. They are either second, third or fourth year students. Seven of them are Christian Democrats, 2 People's Radicals and 2 Conservatives. Nine of them indicate religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life.

Respondents from the Catholic University of Córdoba are of lower socio-economic status than respondents from the National University of Córdoba.

Cultural backgrounds

Argentina and the United States both have been incorporated in the Western Christian Civilization by European colonization and immigration; both have a similar federal Constitution (the Argentine Constitution is largely based on the American); and both are relatively young countries.

However, Argentine has inherited from Spain its religion (Roman Catholic), its language, and many elements of its culture and values, which contrast sharply with North American Anglo-Saxon and Protestant tradition. On the other hand, the United States has reached a more advanced stage of economic, scientific, and organizational development than has Argentina.

The atmosphere of an Argentine university is obviously different from that of a university in the United States. Argentine students participate in the government of their universities. They have a third of the vote for the election of rector and deans of the universities, and they participate in the decisions of the University Board. The participation of the students in the government of the universities takes place through the students' associations. These associations, far from being primarily concerned with problems related to the learning process in the university, are primarily organized along ideological and political lines. The two main university students' organizations in Argentina are: (1) the "Argentine University Federation" (FUA) which in the political field tends toward the extreme left, and in the ideological field opposes some traditional ideologies, especially those of a Catholic tradition; (2) the other large university students' organization is called "Humanistic", and in the political and ideological field is close to the orientation of the European Christian Democracy. The FUA was, until recently, the most powerful student organization, but now the "Humanistic" movement seems as strong as (if not stronger than) the FUA.

Until 1958 no private universities could flourish in Argentina, because they were not legally entitled to award university degrees which would enable their holders to exercise their professions. Only state universities could award such degrees. In 1958 President Frondizi sent to Congress a proposed law making it possible for private universities to grant degrees with similar legal value as those given by state universities. The FUA felt that this was an act which could benefit only the Catholic Church, since it was considered the only non-state institution which was in a condition to create universities immediately in Argentina. Consequently the FUA initiated a strong nation-wide campaign opposing private universities, claiming that they would lower the professional standards and that they would result in a privilege for the

Catholic Church, which according to them was the only institution benefited.

The "Humanists," for their part, engaged in a strong campaign in support of private universities. President Frondizi's brother himself, then Rector of Buenos Aires University, headed a column of FUA students in the streets of Buenos Aires protesting against the project for giving equal rights to private universities. This problem concentrated the attention of the nation for several weeks, and even some members of Congress who until then had been unconditional supporters of Frondizi's projects, opposed this one. Nevertheless, the project was approved, and as a result the Catholic universities have grown with an extraordinary speed in a few years.

This situation of ideological and political cleavage and struggle in the university, as well as the students' participation in the government of state universities, and the change introduced by the newly legalized private universities, give to the Argentine university student a very different outlook from that of the American university student, who is mainly engaged in learning, without exhausting his energies in ideological and political struggles.

The system of university teaching in Argentina is also quite different from the American. Students do not pass through college in Argentina. Much of what Americans learn in college is taught in high school in Argentina. After high school the student enters directly into the professional school of his choice, and normally once having made this choice he cannot choose which courses to take, because all courses given are required. The university courses are specialized for the particular career chosen, and do not aim to add to the general knowledge of the student.

Argentine students display a high feeling of solidarity, and a relatively low level of strife through competition. Grades are not based on the mean of the grades of all the students. There is no honor system in the schools.

No fees are charged for studying in state Universities in Argentina, but at the same time there are very few scholarships (only 1 per cent of the students in the National University of Buenos Aires are

scholarship holders). The fees of the Catholic universities are not high, and they have many students holding scholarships.

Conclusion

The groups of respondents in both countries (United States and Argentina) include a rich variety of social characteristics which will be helpful in the analysis: (a) they come from various regions from both countries; (b) they attend various type of universities (state universities, Catholic universities, Methodist university; small and large universities); (c) they major in various areas; (d) they show a variety of political affiliations; (e) they include a wide variety of religious affiliation and involvement; (f) they include a large number of males and females; (g) they include first year students, second year, third year and fourth year students; (h) they include various socio-economic levels.

In the next chapter it will be shown how the problem of designing a questionnaire with situations common to these groups of students was faced.

CHAPTER IV

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The main body of the questionnaire used in the present study consists of indicators of the seven value-orientations defined in chapter II as logically derived from the application of the theocentric and the anthropocentric major premises to a set of common human problems: relations to men; to family; to friends; to peers; to fellowmen; to reciprocity, and to ideas. Thus the questionnaire is designed to assess the main core of value orientations around the theocentric and anthropocentric major premises (as described in chapter II), rather than the values included in the various descriptions of the American and Latin American value clusters reviewed in chapter I. Many items included in this questionnaire are devised to assess value orientations not explicitly mentioned in the description of chapter I (i.e. obligation to fellowstudents, fellowmen, fatherland, spouse, and the problem of reciprocity).

In this way, if the Argentine group consistently tends to accept the theocentric value orientations more than does the American group, and to accept the anthropocentric value orientations less than the American group, this finding could suggest that: (a) the dominant values in the Argentine group are more logically harmonious with the theocentric major premise than in the American group; (b) the dominant values in Latin American societies are more logically harmonious with the theocentric major premise (and less harmonious with the anthropocentric major premise) than the dominant values in American society, to the extent that the group of Argentine respondents is representative of Latin American societies, and to the extent that the group of American respondents is representative of American society; (c) the anthropocentric and the theocentric major premises are both the logical explanation of the value clusters described in chapter I, and the logical source of the value clusters described in chapter II; (d) a strain towards logical consistency explains why theocentric value orientations cluster with each other, and

anthropocentric value orientations cluster with each other.

This single evidence would be only suggestive of such conclusions, because it could happen that the results come by accident or as a consequence of other causes: for instance, it is possible the following explanation: the coincidence between the values measured by the questionnaire and the value-orientations considered to be logically derived from the theocentric and anthropocentric major premises, is a result only of the fact that the author who derived the value orientations is the same person who constructed the questionnaire, partly on the basis of his observations in the United States and Argentina, one may think that the author has simply stated be logically derived from the theocentric major premise the values which he observed in Argentina, and he described the values observed in the United States as value orientations logically derived from the anthropocentric major premise.

However, the data obtained through the use of the questionnaire of this study can provide suggestive evidence against the contention that the results would only show the degree to which the author perceived rightly or wrongly the dominant values in the United States and in Argentine. Indeed, the questionnaire also determines if the respondents belong to groups or categories which have been considered directly associated with the acceptance of determinate major premise and/or value orientations, just as belonging to the Argentine culture is considered directly associated with the theocentric major premise (as a consequence of the Catholic and pre-industrial tradition).

If respondents who belong to groups or categories defined as directly associated with the theocentric major premise and/or value orientation(s), do, in fact, answer the questionnaire by accepting all the theocentric value orientations more than others, this result would suggest that: (a) there is a strain toward consistency among the various value orientations insofar as they all tend to become theocentric or anthropocentric at the same time, according to the group or category of people to which the respondent belongs; (b) the way in which dominant value-orientations cluster in American culture or in Argentine culture is not simply an accident peculiar to these cultures, but obeys a more general tendency to clustering

in such ways; (c) the clustering would result from the individuals' implicit acceptance of the theocentric or anthropocentric major premises.

In this way, by attempting to assess empirically the seven value orientations logically derived from the theocentric and anthropocentric major premises, the present study attempts not only to fulfill its primary descriptive concern, but also to throw some light on the legitimacy of the conceptual assumptions on which the description is based.

Questionnaire Items used as Indicators for Each Value Orientation

The most general manifestation of the theocentric and anthropocentric value orientations assessed through the questionnaire of this study is the degree to which individuals accept desirable behavior as a matter of moral obligation and submission to supra-human norms. Indeed, a tendency to deny that one should act rightly because one is morally obliged to do so derives from the anthropocentric major premise; instead one is led to claim that one acts rightly because one spontaneously wishes to do so. This attitude was described in relation to American people -contrasting them with non democratic societies- by the Tocqueville, as follows:

When the world was managed by a few rich and powerful individuals, these persons loved to entertain a lofty idea of the duties of man ... they were incessantly talking of the beauties of virtue ... In the United States hardly anybody talks of the beauty of virtue, but they maintain that virtue is useful and prove it every day. The American moralists do not profess that men ought to sacrifice themselves for their fellow creatures because it is noble to make such sacrifices, but they boldly aver that such sacrifices are as necessary to him who imposes them upon himself as to him for whose sake they are made ... They therefore do not deny that every man may follow his own interest, but they endeavor to prove that it is the interest of every man to be virtuous.¹¹³

However, each of the seven value orientations has special characteristics, and the items will be grouped below according to the value orientation which they are intended to assess.

¹¹³ Op. Cit., II, 129-130

The respondents had to express the extent of their agreement or disagreement with the statement contained in each item. In order to avoid some well-known methodological problems the items were constructed in such a way that agreement with some of them is the indicator of a theocentric value orientation, and agreement with others is the indicator of an anthropocentric value orientation. Agreement with items marked with an asterisk (*) is an indicator of a theocentric value orientation. Agreement with other items indicates an anthropocentric value orientation.

In order to avoid difficulties in the interpretation of the answers the items refer as much as possible to specific situations common to American and Argentine university students.

Relation of man to his family

The questionnaire items used to assess this value orientation are intended to determine to what extent the respondents emphasize the value of all-out commitment to one's family as a matter of principle (theocentric answers), or rather emphasize the needs for instrumental adaptation to environmental demands for achievement and occupational advancement (anthropocentric answers).

Loyalty to family is a supreme expression of dependence upon supra-human principles, because it is the unconditional acceptance of supra-human norms for the sake of the value of the norms themselves (ascribed loyalties), although it is known that this rigidity often involves serious obstacles to instrumental achievement. The value of the practical achievements that one may hinder by such rigidities is considered insignificant compared with the value of commitment to sacred objects, from a theocentric point of view. The norms' mandates are intrinsically morally binding and cannot be limited by instrumental considerations.

The following items are intended to show to what extent living with parents (as a manifestation of love and unlimited loyalty towards them) with the dependence that this implies, is considered more important than the actor's needs for independence and occupational advancement.

Item 20*: If your parents want you to live with them as long as you are unmarried, and you are about 22 years old, you would feel guilty if you left their home of your own free will.

Item 21: If you are offered a very good job in another state, there is nothing wrong in accepting it, although it requires you to leave your parental home.

Item 23: In general, it is better for a boy about 22 years old not to go on living in his parents' home, even if unmarried.

The answers to these items will reflect not only an individual choice but a general societal trend, since in American society it is common that children of around 22 years old seek to live independently from their parents, and geographical mobility as a means for occupational advancement is a common practice. Although the answers to these questions will reflect also structural differences between the American and Argentine societies (as will answers to any question in a cross cultural study) these structural differences in themselves can be considered the expression of the differences in values. This process can be clarified by showing how, in the Spanish-American community of Atrisco, geographically although not culturally based in the United States, family reasons rather than achievement reasons underlie geographical mobility, as reported by F. Kluckhohn:

In the earlier study of Atrisco, family dissension, chiefly that between eldest and younger brothers, was shown to be the main cause of emigration. Almost never did a man leave the village primarily to better himself economically or to take a job which appealed to him more than the one he had at home.¹¹⁴

Item 22 explicitly states the dilemma between obligations of commitment to parents and achievement goals.

Item 22: To do well in your job and build your own future is more important than your obligations to your parents.

The unconditionality of the moral obligation to commit oneself as a matter of principle, and the emphasis placed on intentions in a theocentric orientation, is expressed in item 24.

Item 24*: We are morally obliged to love our parents even if they have treated us badly.

The dilemma between rigid loyalty to sacred persons (theocentric orientation) on the one hand and

¹¹⁴ Op. Cit., pp. 198-199.

instrumental achievement on the other, is expressed in the alternatives of either following or not following parents' advice, and traditional family norms, in important areas of one's life. The first alternative leads to traditionalism and implies the consideration of the acceptance of parental authority as a matter of moral obligation, rather than just one guide to conduct with which one has to compromise in the same way that one compromises with other demands of the environment, accepting it only in so far as it seems instrumentally appropriate of the actor's achievement goal. The following items are intended to determine how the respondents solve this dilemma.

Item 71*: Generally you ought to bring up your children in the same way your parents brought you up.

Item 72*: You ought to live the way your family did, even if most of the people in your country live differently.

Item 73*: Generally you ought to follow your parent's advice about your choice of career and job.

Item 76: A person who makes up his own mind about everything is better than someone who always follows his parents' or friends' advice.

Item 77*: You ought to consult your parents before deciding whether to marry the person you love.

From an instrumental point of view such diffuse attachments have a negative influence as has been expressed by Parsons, in speaking of the universalistic-achievement pattern:

The segregation from the fusions involved in diffuseness either of generalized status ascriptions or of affective attachments, seems to be essential to the mobility of personnel and facilities and the allocation of rewards by achievements, which this pattern requires.¹¹⁵

Absolute principles require unconditional commitment to family, without fear for the possible discontinuation of reciprocity. The following item is especially related to this aspect:

Item 63*: You have the right to ask the person who is, or is going to be, your wife (or husband) to share everything with you, even innermost desires and secrets.

If one is obliged to commit oneself to family as a matter of principle and moral obligation, the fact that a member of one's family may not reciprocate appropriately does not justify one's withdrawal of love from him. This is indicated especially by items 78 and 79.

¹¹⁵ The Social System, p. 190.

Item 78: If parents do not provide a happy childhood for their children, they are not entitled to expect their children to love them.

Item 79: If a wife does not do all that is necessary for her husband to lead a reasonably comfortable and happy life, she is not entitled to expect him to go on loving her. (In the questionnaire form for females the item states: "If a husband...").

In relations among relatives some degree of commitment could be indicated in the answers to the following items.

Item 60*: (You are offered a job in another part of the country. Before deciding whether to accept:) You would consult other relatives.

Relation of man to his friends

Here again the respondent has to choose between emphasizing the moral obligation of diffuse and deep attachment to his friends, and the needs for occupational advancement and instrumental goal-achievement. According to the theocentric orientation it is more valuable to help others achieve, than to achieve more than others. The following items indicate the respondent's position in relation to this orientation:

Item 12*: (A student in your University is cheating in an examination and a classmate reports him to the teacher) If the two students were close friends, you would disapprove of the action of one reporting the other.

Item 16*: (If a close friend has great difficulties in a course) The successful student is morally obliged to offer help to this close friend.

Item 17*: You would feel guilty if you did not offer help and your close friend failed the course.

Item 19*: A man's obligations towards his friends are at least as important as his obligations towards such things as his studies, career, or job.

The respondent's position in relation to the obligation to identify himself with his friends, so as to be alter-and-himself, rather than just himself, is determined through the following item:

Item 18*: A close friend should be concerned about the personal problems and future of his friend almost to the same extent as he is concerned about his own.

In relation to unconditionally of loyalty and concern for a friend we have:

Item 62*: If a close friend of yours falls into bad habits, and is no longer friendly with you, you would still feel obliged to be concerned about him.

The distinction between item 16 (recognition of moral obligation) and item 17 (feeling of guilt) also serves to determine the theocentric or anthropocentric orientation of the respondent. Indeed, according to a theocentric orientation the actor feels morally obliged to commit himself, but not to ensure results; he will not feel guilty even if he fails, provided that he considers that his orientation or intentions are good. In relation to Latin Americans Gillin expresses this as follows:

If he fails, after having made a "good try", he is not torn by feelings of guilt, conscience, of inadequacy, which play a large part in the psychological aftereffects of failure in North American culture.¹¹⁶

Feelings of guilt variate according to moods and psychological states, while once one has accepted a moral obligation as a matter of principle, the actor's behavior in relation to it will be seen systematically as a matter of moral obligation.

¹¹⁶ Op. Cit., p. 47

Relation of Man to his Peers

Once a person has recognized the sacredness of a norm, the norm is to be applied to everyone - be he a friend or just a peer-. The theocentric orientation would lead to one's applying similar obligations to peers as to friends, and the norms limiting such obligations (if any), should also apply in a similar way to friends and peers. The anthropocentric orientation does not consider commitment as a matter of principle, which has to be applied to everyone, but only to those to whom it seems practical to apply (because of varying considerations of liking, of friendship, of convenience, etc.). Consequently the feelings of obligations towards peers and towards friends will be different of each other, since one considers that he owes much more to friends than to peers, as a result of the special cooperative associations which friendship implies.

For the university students group studied in this research the most appropriate peer-group to consider in the questionnaire is the community of fellowstudents.

In order to determine to what extent the obligation towards peers is seen as more important than the obligation towards the instrumental norms for competition, the following situation was presented to the respondents:

A student in your University is cheating in an examination and a classmate reports him to the teacher. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

Item 7*: You would disapprove of the action of the student who reports the cheater.

Item 8: A student has the right to report a classmate who is cheating.

Item 9: You would disapprove more of the student who cheats than of the one who reports him.

The above items also permit us to see if the obligations toward ordinary fellowstudents are seen as similar to the obligations toward friends (comparing with answers to item 12).

In order to determine to what extent helping fellowstudents is seen as a matter of moral obligation two items have been included:

Item 14*: The successful student is morally obliged to offer help to his classmate who is in difficulty.

Item 15*: You would feel guilt, if you did not offer such help and he failed the course.

These two items also permit us to compare to what extent the obligations toward ordinary fellowstudents are seen as similar to the obligations toward friends.

The distinction between feelings of moral obligation and feelings of guilt has the same functions indicated above with regard to the similar distinction in the relation to friends.

Relation of man to his fellowmen

The theocentric orientation toward fellowmen stresses the fact that moral norms are matters of principle, and thus they determine obligations towards every fellowman (except those who are "anti-sacred" or evil). This relation can be illustrated by the fact that the villagers from Atrisco felt it was their duty to give protections to Florence Kluckhohn, even though she was an outsider, as she reports:

Some villagers took umbrage at the attentions a Spanish-American from Railtown was drunkenly trying to shower on me ... Certain members of the community took action. He was upbraided, and he so took it to heart that the next evening he fully apologized as he has been instructed to do.¹¹⁷

The feelings of moral obligation toward fellowmen is assessed through the following items:

Item 26*: You are morally obliged to do something to help these people in need (people very poor, undernourished, illiterate or living under very poor health conditions, in your state).

Item 28*: You sometimes feel guilty because you are not doing enough to help these people.

The reasons for distinguishing feelings of moral obligation from feelings of guilt has been explained in reference to similar distinctions made when considering the value orientations towards friendship and towards peers.

The theocentric orientation towards fellowmen also leads one to consider the attitude of someone offering his friendship to the actor as valuable, and stresses the moral obligation of the actor to reciprocate. This orientation even stresses the obligation to be friends to everyone or anyone, as some Argentine respondents in the present study comment:

Student 722 says that he would never refuse (even in an hypothetical situation) to be a friend of

¹¹⁷ Op. Cit., pp. 233-234.

anyone.

Student 523 says that he believes that one ought to offer friendship not only to those who have offered friendship to us but to everyone around us.

Student 600 says: "I believe that if someone sincerely wishes to be our friend we ought not to refuse".

Student 627 says: "If among students one wishes to be friends with another, the other ought to accept his friendship and try to understand him, helping him and making him participate in his activities".

Student 743 says: "I believe that when a person wishes to be a friend of another, the other has to reciprocate, and not only this, but furthermore we have to try to be fiends of everyone and to b the ones who try to develop such union...".

Item 49 is used as an indicator in relation to the feeling of moral obligations to reciprocate.

Item 49*: Peter is morally obliged to reciprocate.¹¹⁸

In item 65 the duty of altruism in general is contrasted with the importance of being capable (instrumental excellence):

Item 65: A capable person motivated for his own gain is more useful to society than an altruistic but less capable one.

Unilateral involvement and reciprocity

The theocentric solution of the problem of unilateral love, concern, loyalty, friendship, and involvement in general, is solved in favor of persevering in love, concern, loyalty, etc. Indeed, giving love, friendship, loyalty, etc. per se is not only valuable, but it is the most desirable aspect of love, friendship or loyalty, because it is a matter of principle involving submission to the super-empirical power from Whom justification derives. Receiving love, friendship, loyalty, becoming popular, etc., is the most important aspect from an anthropocentric view-point, because these are practical empirical results from the view-point of the receiver.

Consequently, from a theocentric view-point giving love, friendship and loyalty unilaterally brings fulfillment to the one who gives, without any serious dangers of being exploited. Indeed, even if alter coes derive benefit without reciprocating, the actor does not consider himself cheated, exploited or

¹¹⁸ Item 49 refers to Situation G, transcribed in page 104.

dependent, because what he gives he gives for the benefit of alter. Sheer submission to superior norms through "giving" oneself is the maximum fulfillment or accomplishment that a man can reach. Results, such as being able to obtain reciprocity, add practically nothing to the fulfillment resulting from sheer "giving".

From the anthropocentric point of view unilaterally giving love, friendship or loyalty is not only wasted effort, but it also involves a danger of becoming dependent and being exploited, because he who gives (love, friendship or loyalty) unilaterally will be striving after instrumentally valuable reciprocity and will be ready to submit himself to alter's caprices in order to gain his good will; on top of all that, his failure to achieve reciprocity will make him feel inadequate and his pride will be hurt.

Since, from a theocentric view-point, the person unilaterally giving (love, friendship or loyalty) is considered to be fulfilling supra-human norms, his hopes and demands are respected and reciprocated. From the anthropocentric view-point the person unilaterally involved is considered a nuisance who insists in obtaining reciprocity, eliciting only feelings of contempt and pity.

From a theocentric view-point the actor is concerned to reciprocate after receiving (love, friendship or loyalty). From an anthropocentric view-point the actor is concerned with obtaining reciprocity before after gives. Consequently he is supposed to be cautious not to "give" unless he has some security of being reciprocated at the same time. He is supposed not to give himself intensely, thus anticipating possible misperceptions (of alter's readiness to "give") or withdrawal of reciprocity. This caution can result in the following characterization of an anthropocentric "giving-receiving" (love, friendship and loyalty) relationship: the parties are engaged in a joint enterprise in which A knows that B will not "give" unless he sees A involved in the same process of "giving", but "giving" conditional to B's "giving". If alter sees that ego does not "give" (love, friendship, etc.) he will not "give", thus avoiding falling into unilateral dependence, exploitation, etc.. If alter sees that ego gives unconditionally he will not

"give" because the desire to acquire ego's reciprocity will no longer motivate him to "give" (he no longer needs to overcome ego's caution).

In order to assess the attitudes towards the problem of unilateral involvement and reciprocity it was considered best to present the respondents with two specific situation -a student caring unilaterally for a youth of the opposite sex, and a student unilaterally offering friendship to another student-. In relation to such situations the respondent is asked to evaluate two descriptions of the position of both parties, as follows

SITUATION F - John is a student. He cares for Mary but Mary does not care for him. With only this information, two other students were trying to describe John's situation. Here is what each said:

Student 1: (1) John's basic concern is to have Mary care for him in return. (2) John will become dependent on Mary. (3) As a result John is liable to exploitation by Mary. (4) John will resent his dependence. (5) John's pride will be hurt. (6) John will try to hold back his feelings or withdraw from the relationship. (7) If he does not withdraw, he will become a nuisance. (8) Mary will try to discourage his persistence.

Student 2: (1) John's basic concern is for Mary's problems and needs. (2) John will not become dependent on Mary's caprices. (3) John will not be liable to exploitation by Mary. (4) John will be dependant only in the sense that he will do things that he considers good for Mary. (5) If Mary does not care for him in return John will not consider his pride hurt. (6) John will not withhold his feelings. (7) Mary will not consider John a nuisance. (8) On the contrary, Mary may feel obliged to care for John in return.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the followings statements:

Item 37: Student 1 describes better than Student 2 what usually happens in such cases.

Item 38: If a girl was the one who cared and the boy did not care for her, the situation would be closer to that described by Student 1 than to that described by Student 2.

Item 39: Usually when someone has cared for you without your caring for her, the situation was closer to that described by Student 1 than to that described by Student 2. (If this has never happened to you, base your answer upon what you would expect to happen).

Item 40: Usually when you have cared for someone without her caring for you, the situation was closer to that described by Student 1 than to that described by Student 2. (If this has never happened to you, base your answer upon what you would expect to happen).

Item 41: You would no care for somebody who did not care for you.

Item 42*: Mary is morally obliged to care for John in return.

SITUATION B - John is a student. He wants to be a friend of Peter, who does not like him. With only this information, two other students were trying to describe John's situation. Here is what each said.

Student 1: (1) John's basic concern is to have Peter like him in return. (2) John will become dependent on Peter. (3) As a result John is liable to exploitation by Peter. (4) John will resent his dependence. (5) John's pride will be hurt. (6) John will try to hold back his feelings or withdraw from the relation ship. (7) If he does not withdraw, he will become a nuisance. (8) Peter will try to discourage his persistence.

Student 2: (1) John's basic concern is for Peter's problems and needs. (2) John will not become dependant on Peter's caprices. (3) John will not be liable to exploitation by Peter. (4) John will be

dependant only in the sense that he will do things that he considers good for Peter. (5) If Peter does not reciprocate John will not consider his pride hurt. (6) John will not hold back his feelings. (7) Peter will not consider John a nuisance. (8) On the contrary, Peer may feel obliged to reciprocate.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the followings statements:

Item 45: Student 1 describes better than Student 2 what usually happens in such cases.

Item 46: Usually when somebody has taken the initiative in trying to be your friend the situation was closer to that described by Student 1 than to that described by Student 2. (If this has never happened to you, base your answer upon what you would expect to happen).

Item 47: Usually when you have taken the initiative in trying to be someone else's friend the situation was closer to that described by Student 1 than to that described by Student 2. ((If this has never happened to you, base your answer upon what you would expect to happen).

Item 48: You would not want to be friends with somebody who did not want to be your friend.

Item 49*: Peter is morally obliged to reciprocate.

By stating what usually happens in such cases, and what has actually happened to them in such cases, the respondents are reporting actual behavior, from which once can infer the theocentric of anthropocentric value orientation towards unilateral involvement and reciprocity in the respondents' environment and reciprocity in the respondents' environment and in their own values. If the respondent agrees with Student 1's interpretation of the situations he is indicating that the is used to looking at these situations from an anthropocentric view-point. If the respondent agrees with Student 2's interpretations he is indicating that he is used to looking at these situations from a theocentric view-point.

These items have the advantage that the students are not directly reporting on the existing norms or basic values. In no place is it said that unilateral involvement is full accomplishment, or that one should be careful not to become involved. Instead, the respondents report on feelings and situations derived from the value orientation: a high evaluation of unilaterally giving (love, friendship, loyalty or concern) will necessarily contract the tendency to consider that the person unilaterally involved is a nuisance, that his pride is hurt, that he is basically interested in reaching reciprocity, etc..

The items related to unilateral desire for friendship were expected to be better indicators than those referring to the boy-girl relationship, because the involvement in the later case has a sexual element, which requires reciprocity.

Relation of man to other men

All of the above items are indicators of the theocentric or anthropocentric solutions to the problem of the relation of men to another men.

Relation of men to ideas

The theocentric value orientation towards ideas emphasizes the absolute value of the ideas which are "right" and the duty to reject those which are "wrong", without any compromise. The anthropocentric value orientations towards ideas emphasizes the relativity of the value of ideas, making value depend upon variations in the empirical world, and the criterion of experience; rigid positions towards ideas are rejected, emphasizing the value of open-mindedness and relativism.

A set of three items refers to ideas about family life:

SITUATION H - In a conversation at school another student attacks a conception of family life which you accept (with specific reference to marital responsibilities, infidelity, children's duties towards their parents, polygamy, etc.). To what extent would you agree with each of the following statements?

Item 51*: You would feel morally obliged to take a strong stand, trying to give your reasons.

Item 52: You would feel that family life is a matter of preferences and opinions, and there are no right or wrong answers to such questions.

Item 53: You would feel that you are right but that you are not morally obliged to argue or try to convince others of your viewpoints.

One item refers to the ideas about basic human rights.

Item 54*: (In another conversation what is being attacked is your conception of basic human rights -e.g., political, religious, or economic freedom-) You would feel morally obliged to take a strong stand, trying to give your reasons.

One item refers to religious ideas:

Item 55*: (In another conversation what is being attacked is your own religion or your ideas about religion) You would feel morally obliged to take a strong stand, trying to give your reasons.

One item refers to moral standards in general:

Item 67: You are not entitled to apply your own moral standards to other people's behavior.

Other items

1. Relation of man to his fatherland

A theocentric orientation towards the fatherland would lead a person to feel morally obliged to defend it with his life if necessary. The anthropocentric orientation would lead one to consider the fatherland as one more object in life, not necessarily a sacred object.

The following item serves as indicator of the orientation towards the fatherland:

Item 80*: Dying in defense of one's country is worthwhile.

2. Relation of man to enemies

Since from a theocentric view-point the imperatives to love, to be loyal, to be concerned and to offer friendship are matters of principle, one cannot refuse to associate with or help a person, unless that person is seen as an enemy who does not deserve the actor's commitment. For this reason a theocentric orientation may be associated with low faith in people, in order to limit the actor's feeling of obligation to commit himself. This will be explained in some detail below, in the section dealing with "boomerang" items. Faith in people has been defined by Morris Rosenberg as follows:

In this study, faith in people will be defined as the individual's degree of confidence in the trustworthiness, honesty, goodness, generosity and brotherliness of the mass of men.¹¹⁹

Two items are used to assess this specific orientation:

Item 68*: Most people cannot be trusted.

Item 69*: Usually when you and another student were angry with each other, it was mainly his fault.

3. Intentions and performance

The theocentric major premise basically emphasizes the value of intentions. The anthropocentric major premise basically emphasizes the value of results. Max Weber expresses this distinction very

¹¹⁹ "Occupational Values and Occupational Choice" (Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation,

clearly:

A man who believes in an ethic of responsibility ... will say: these results are ascribed to my action. The believer in an ethic of ultimate ends feels "responsible" only for seeing it that the flame of pure intentions is not quenched.¹²⁰

The item which is a most direct indicator of the theocentric and anthropocentric major premises themselves in the present study is item 70.

Item 70*: It is the intention and not the results that makes an action good.

There is another item which refers to the distinction between internal dispositions and actual performances, as follows:

Item 66*: A man who loves his children but beats them when he is drunk is better than a man who never pays much attention to them.

Types of Relationships Between Questionnaire

Items and Value Orientations

Some items seem to bear a more direct and unequivocal relationship to the value orientations than others. The items have been classified into four types: direct, indirect, "boomerang" and ambiguous.

Direct items are those which fulfill two requirements: (a) they are indicators of an attitude which is central to a given value orientation; (b) an answer to these items cannot be interpreted as an indicator of two value orientations of different direction (one theocentric and one anthropocentric).

Columbia University, Sociology Dep.), p. 79.

¹²⁰ Gerth and Mills, p. 121.

"Boomerang" items¹²¹

Three items are called "boomerang" because, instead of indicating a value orientation directly, they are indicators of the reactions against such value orientation. In other words, the presence of such reaction is considered to be an indicator of that value orientation, notwithstanding the fact of the apparent contradiction:

Item 66*: A man who loves his children but beats them when he is drunk is better than a man who never pays much attention to them.

Item 68*: Most people cannot be trusted.

Item 69*: Usually when you and another student were angry with each other, it was mainly his fault.

Indeed, it is one thing to declare the beauties of altruism and of a theocentric emphasis, and a quite different matter to make the necessary effort to carry these values into practice with all the difficulties of everyday life. Theocentric orientations in Argentine society demand an all-out committed orientation towards all persons. However, such norms can be fulfilled in practice only by a society of unselfish individuals. Consequently there is an adaptive¹²² need for considering that one is obliged to commit oneself only in the cases in which such commitment is beneficial for the actor.

However, the possible alternative means for satisfying such an adaptive need are limited by the theocentric value orientation in the group. In order to feel justified in terms of the theocentric orientation towards people, and at the same time to circumscribe one's commitment to these persons whose association will enhance one's self-interest, the most expeditious means apparently is through rationalizing

¹²¹ The Webster New World Dictionary defines "boomerang" as "something that goes contrary to the expectation of the person using or doing it and results in his disadvantage or harm". In mass communications research, when propaganda produces an effect contrary to that intended by the communicators, this phenomenon is called a boomerang effect (B. Berelson, "Communications and Public Opinion" in W. Schramm, Mass Communications, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1960; R. K. Merton, Op. Cit., pp. 517-524). In the present study we speak of "boomerang items" referring to items which are indicators of attitudes which are contrary to the values which originate such attitudes.

¹²² The adaptive functional problem has been characterized by T. Parsons and N. J. Smelser as the problem of meeting situational exigencies by adjusting to or transforming the

one's attitude towards others as having originated in their anti-sacredness (hostility or untrustworthiness). Another adaptive means would be to extenuate the actor's culpability for deficient behavior by claiming that his intentions are good.

Parsons refers to a similar situation in speaking of what Max Weber called the moral 'irrationality' of the situation of human life:

The conceptual scheme developed in this volume ... tends to confirm his view [Max Weber's] that in terms of any pattern-consistent value-orientation system there are bound to be situations and circumstances which make complete realization of the expectations developed, when that valued system is internalized and institutionalized, impossible ... The "optimum" situation for human adjustment, if indeed such an optimum can be defined at all, does not lie at the pole of maximum institutionalization of a rigorously consistent value-system.

There is always a complex variety of mechanisms in the social system which mitigate the severity of these frustrations and conflicts.¹²³

Parsons illustrates this phenomenon by referring to "discrepancies between effort and reward".¹²⁴

However, what is being considered in the present study is rather the phenomenon of discrepancy between general principles and specific norms and behavior; something similar to this situation is considered by Parsons later, when speaking about "The Adaptive Transformation of a Revolutionary Movement". He states:

Since the revolutionary (or religious) belief system always to an important degree contains utopian elements, there must, in general, be a process of "concession" to the development of "adaptive structures". Exactly what these will be, in what order and through what processes, will vary a great deal, as a function of the content of the ideology, and of the degree to which it is utopian. Even where that degree is not extreme, however, the tendency is strongly, because the dominant motivational pattern of a revolutionary movement is compulsive, for its leaders to be oriented to "principles" and thus to be reluctant to make the "normal" concessions to the exigencies of an operating social system, which are always necessary.¹²⁵

The theocentric orientations as they appear in this study (especially in the Argentine group studied) are no longer the manifestation of a revolutionary movement, but they are partly the institutionalized inheritance of a revolutionary movement (Christianity) which emphasized the value of

environment.

¹²³ The Social System, pp 370 – 371.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

love for fellowmen in the same way as one loves oneself. This is related to what Parsons states as follows:

A revolutionary movement must pay the price of success. It cannot both have the cake of the motivational advantages of revolt, and eat it by being the focus of institutionalization of an orthodoxy too. In sum it ceases to be a revolutionary movement.¹²⁶

Since (in the case under study) the satisfaction of the adaptive need involves a contradiction with the dominant theocentric value orientations, this tension creates a conflict and strain that can be solved by means of a rationalization. Indeed, the actor can claim that the people to whom he does not commit himself are enemies of what is sacred (friendship, trust, dignity, etc.).

In this way new norms are created, norms contradicting the theocentric orientation, although it is claimed that they are based on the same theocentric orientations. These norms are clear indicators of the existence of the theocentric orientation because if it were not for the need to justify such anti-theocentric view-point, no obligation to commit oneself to people is admitted as a principle. Consequently, no special justification is necessary in order to exclude someone from the circle of one's associates. Such exclusion can be simply accounted by the actor's indifference or wish to do so. People are not classified into friends and enemies (in the same way as ideas are not classified into "right" and "wrong"). Such a classification would hinder rather than help the anthropocentric pragmatic goals: one can associate with one person when it seems advantageous to do so, and one can withdraw from the association when it is appropriate to do so. Association and separation can be adapted to the demands of instrumental achievement and occupational advancement. Since ego does not offer all-out commitment to alter, and since he assumes that alter is not going to offer all-out commitment to him, the requirements or conditions for a persona to be accepted as an associate and to be trusted are few, and are related mainly to his performance record rather than to searching into his good or bad intentions or his private life.

The strains resulting from the adaptive process, and the need for rationalization in order to solve

¹²⁵ Ibid, p. 526.

¹²⁶ Ibid. P. 529.

such strains has been explained by Parsons as follows:

No revolutionary movement can reconstruct society according to the values formulated in its ideology without restriction ... it often leaves certain unresolved strains ... One of these is concerned with the tensions involved in maintaining the ideology intact, including its utopian elements, and yet making the indispensable concessions to the exigencies of operating as a society.¹²⁷

Speaking about deviant behavior Parsons refers to "the relevance or the mechanism of rationalization to coping with the attendant strain on the cognitive level":

Rationalization is an adjunct and instrument of repression in that cognitively it denies the existence of a conflict and attempts to present a consistent picture in accord with approved normative standards of proper motivational orientation. There are many possible "devices" to which rationalization may resort in order to make the actor's behavior and attitudes plausible and acceptable, such as "extenuating circumstances", the imputation of exaggerated deviance to alters and the like, but they have in common an element of cognitive distortion of what, in terms of the cognitive culture which is predominantly institutionalized, is the appropriate and adequate explanation and justification of action.¹²⁸

This "imputation of exaggerated deviance to alters" can be interpreted in the light of what Parsons says when speaking about the "compulsive conformist":

The compulsive conformist does not face the same problems of overtly breaking with the institutionalized value system ... Certain features of the dynamics of group prejudice seem to fit here. Vis-à-vis the members of and outgroup, our major value-patterns call for an attitude of universalistic evaluation and treatment and tolerance for their own achievement-goals and needs ... Anti-Semitism ... from the point of view of the Gentile group ... constitutes deviant behavior since the Jew is by the main-value pattern entitled to the same universalistically tolerant behavior as any fellow Gentile. Here there is a strong pressure to "rationalize" his special treatment by such allegations as that he "does not compete fairly", and that he cannot be counted upon to be honest or loyal. Discrimination against him is thereby subsumed under the universalistic value system. So long as this type of legitimation is accepted and mutually reinforced within the Gentile group, or a sub-collectivity within it, we can have a reinforced pattern of deviant behavior without any individual having to accept the normal price of deviance in the form of an overt break with his institutionalized role and the risk of negative sanctions. Indeed, if the process goes far enough it is the person who conforms with the main value-pattern who is subject to negative sanctions.¹²⁹

The need to stigmatize Jews (as unfair, dishonest or disloyal) is a result of the fact that in attempting to exclude Jews from fair competition and equal position in society, the Gentiles have to justify

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 529-530.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 266-267.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 289-290.

that attempt in face of the universalistic value pattern that they otherwise accept. Consequently, the norm stigmatizing Jews, although contradicting the universalistic pattern is a clear indicator of the existence (and acceptance) of such pattern, because if that pattern were not present, Jews could be excluded from free competition and equal opportunities without the need to invent a reason to justify it. Similarly, once the theocentric orientation imposing the duty of commitment to people as sacred entities has been accepted, the exclusion of some people from the actor's commitment has to be legitimized by stigmatizing them as hostile or untrustworthy. Consequently the need to stigmatize the out-group as hostile or untrustworthy (low faith in people) may be a clear indicator of the theocentric norm of commitment to people in general. One of the differences between stigmatization to escape universalistic-achievement norms, and stigmatization to escape theocentric norms lies in the fact that in the first case emphasis is placed on the undesirable performance of the stigmatized person in the instrumental achievement complex, while in the second case emphasis is placed on the low moral quality of the person.

The "appeal to extenuating circumstances" can be illustrated with what Clyde Kluckhohn says in speaking of the relation between values and cathexis:

Since value always involves affect, cathexis and value are inevitable somehow interrelated. Sometimes the relationship is that the value is little more than a rationalization for a cathexis. A probable example is the widespread conception among the working class that regular sexual intercourse is necessary for health -at least the health of the male-. In other cases, cathexis in the strict sense and value in the strict sense pull against each other. Disvalued activities are cathected. People are strongly attracted to adulterous relationships.¹³⁰

The rationalization legitimating cathexis is a way of releasing the strain created by the conflict between value and cathexis. In the present study there is one item which serves as an indicator of an attenuating circumstance -good intentions- for the behavioral release of an impulse contradicting the theocentric value orientation -getting drunk and beating children-.

Item 66*: A man who loves his children but beats them when he is drunk is better than a man who never pays much attention to them.

¹³⁰ Parsons et al, Towards a General Theory of Action, p. 399.

This item is an indicator of the dominance of a theocentric value orientation, in so far as it is an attempt to legitimize in terms of theocentric orientation a violation of it. For this reason it is called "boomerang".

As suggested by Parsons the legitimation of such deviations from the dominant value orientations has to be "accepted and mutually reinforced within" the group, in order that the deviant individuals do not have "to accept the normal price of deviance in the form of an overt break with his institutionalized role and the risk of negative sanctions".¹³¹ Among the groups considered in this study (age group, sex category, religious group, etc.), the national group seems the only one which reached such acceptance and mutual reinforcement of the legitimacy -in theocentric terms- of the indicated deviations from theocentric orientation. Apparently in this case reaching such acceptance and mutual reinforcement of a clear deviance from theocentrism is more an adaptive need of a whole society (Argentine society in this study) rather than of a particular category of people within a society. Besides, the acceptance and mutual reinforcement within a whole nationality group has monopolistic and durable qualities which permit individuals not to see the otherwise clear contradiction between the theocentric orientation and the deviance which is legitimized in terms of the theocentric orientation.

For this reason the three items called "boomerang" have been considered as good indicators of theocentrism or anthropocentrism of value orientation only in the case of comparison between two cultures (the American and the Argentine). Indeed, in the case of comparison between two other categories of people the clearly deviant nature of the legitimation of violations makes it unlikely that individuals having truly internalized the theocentric major premise will fail to see the contradiction. If they see the contradiction and they still accept the deviant norm, one can doubt the intensity of their commitment to the theocentric value orientation.

Consequently, normally "boomerang" items will be considered in this study only when

¹³¹ Parsons, The Social System, p. 290.

comparisons between nationality groups are made.

Indirect items

SITUATION A - A student in your University is cheating in an examination and a classmate reports him to the teacher. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

Item 7*: You would disapprove of the action of the student who reports the cheaters.

Item 8: A student has the right to report a classmate who is cheating.

Item 9: You would disapprove more of the student who cheats than of the one who reports him.

Item 10: The teachers would disapprove more of the student who cheats than of the one reporting him.

Item 11: We are more unfair to our fellow students when we cheat in an examination than when we report cheaters.

Item 12*: If the two students were close friends, you would disapprove of the action of one reporting the other.

These six items are called indirect because, instead of indicating directly a theocentric value orientation, they are indicator of an exaggerated manifestation of such a value orientation in the sphere of orientation towards peers (fellowstudents in this case). The exaggerated type of conformity to the theocentric orientation in only one sphere (risking the neglect of theocentric orientations in other spheres) can be considered similar to the type of deviance called "ritualism" or "over-conformity" by Merton.¹³² However, in the present case the "deviance", although not completely harmonious with the basic dominant values in society (theocentric orientations) is nevertheless accepted by the society as a whole.

Merton's characterization of "ritualism" can help us to understand these indirect manifestations of theocentric orientations. Merton states:

Ritualism refers to a pattern of response in which culturally defined aspirations are abandoned while "one continues to abide almost compulsively by institutional norms".

.....
In this way, it was suggested, the acute status-anxiety in a society which emphasizes the achievement-motif may induce the deviant behavior of 'over-conformity' and 'over-compliance'. For example, such over-compliance may be found among 'bureaucratic virtuosos', some of whom may "over-conform precisely because they are subject to guilt engendered by previous nonconformity with the rules".

.....
Peter M. Blau ... suggests that ... "ritualism results not so much from overidentification with rules and strong habituation to established practices as from lack of security in important

¹³² Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1959), pp. 149-52 and 184-187.

social relationships in the organization". It is, in short, when the structure of the situation does not allow the status-anxiety over the capacity to measure up to institutionalized expectations that individuals in these organizations respond with over-compliance.¹³³

Probably these considerations are relevant for the characterization of the attitudes expressed the indirect items. Indeed, exaggerating the compliance with the theocentric orientation in one's relations to fellowstudents may be simply an expression of the individual's actual alienation from the basic spirit of the theocentric value orientation, and his attempt to "make-up" for that failure by exaggerating compliance (according to the theocentric orientation towards peers). Such exaggerated compliance may be taken as an index of one's insecurity resulting from failure to fulfill the obligations of the theocentric orientations. The failure to fulfill such theocentric obligations has been largely rationalized (as indicated by the "boomerang" items), but nevertheless it is likely to cause anxiety as a result of the fact that there is always some awareness of the contradictions.

The insecurity about the actual content of the norms and one's own adequacy to interpret them as a cause of over-conformity is explained by Merton in the following terms:

It is often been said, and this is probably part of the truth, that the convert becomes overly-zealous in his conformity to the norms of the group because he considers himself to be on trial and wishes to ensure his acceptance ... Apart from this matter of motivation, the convert may also be peculiarly conformist for want of having had first-hand knowledge of the nuances of allowable and patterned departures from the norms of the group which he has lately joined ... In the absence of close familiarity with the norms of his newfound group, he has no alternative but to make the official norms his compelling guide to behavior. Very often, as everybody knows, the new convert -whether of a religious, political, or "social" persuasion- becomes a prig, narrowly engrossed in the satisfaction of acting in conformity with the rules.¹³⁴

As in the case of the norms indicated by the "boomerang" items, the exaggerated manifestation of theocentrism is likely to take place only when, within a nationality group, there is acceptance and mutual reinforcement of the desirability and legitimacy of such manifestation of theocentric orientation. Indeed, since it is a rather clear exaggeration (and consequently "deviation") which departs from the spirit of the theocentric orientation, it is unlikely that groups or categories of people having less extensive (in spheres

¹³³ Ibid., pp. 184-185.

of life and in time) and less intensive influence than society as a whole, can afford to build the common conviction that such exaggeration is a legitimate extension of the theocentric orientation. On the other hand, these other groups of people may choose in-group loyalties rather than loyalty to peers as the area in which to exaggerate the conformity with theocentric orientations.

The orientation indicated by agreement with items 7 or 12, and disagreement with items 8, 9, 10 and 11, is considered an exaggeration by attempting to over-conform with the theocentric orientation because it is actually instituting a protection to behavior conflicting with the theocentric orientation (cheating, leading to injustices in gradings).

Consequently, normally "indirect" items will be considered in this study only when comparisons between nationality groups are made.

The phenomena explained above (as indicated by the indirect items) can be illustrated by a very common occurrence among Argentine young men. A young man may be a drunkard, a gambler, a lazy parasite, or a heavy burden for his family and teachers, but if he is nice to his peers ("un buen muchacho", "un buen tipo"), young people may say: "Yes, he likes to gamble, he likes to drink liquors, he does not study and he does not work, but... he is a good fellow" ("un buen muchacho", "un buen tipo", "un buen compañero"). In this way, through emphasizing and exaggerating their loyalty to peers, Argentine young people sometimes avoid the guilt (and discredit) which would otherwise result from their failure to fulfill obligations towards their family, their ideas (especially their religious ideas), and their fellowmen (especially the underprivileged, whose sufferings could be reduced if the "buenos tipos" were sober and responsible workers).

The above considerations are hypotheses which need to be fully tested in future studies, as in the case of the considerations made in relation to boomerang items.

¹³⁴ Ibid., p. 352.

Ambiguous items

Agreement with these items may be interpreted as an indicator of two contradictory value orientations (one theocentric and one anthropocentric) depending on which aspect of the item the respondent is considering in answering it. There is no a priori criterion for determining which is the correct interpretation for each case. Although the ambiguity of these items was suspected before the collection of the data, they were included in the questionnaire because it was thought that one of the interpretations (by the respondent) was more likely than another. However, the actual response to these items has shown that they are more ambiguous than was tolerable. Indeed, they do not correlate consistently with the bulk of items, which are clear indicators of the value orientations, and which correlate consistently with each other.

For this reason the following ambiguous items have been excluded almost completely from the foregoing analysis of the data:

Item 6: You would disapprove of the action of the student who is cheating.

Agreement with this item may be interpreted as an indicator of the emphasis placed on respect for moral laws of justice and honesty, and in the sense it would be in harmony with the theocentric conception of human value. Agreement with the same item can also be interpreted as placing a high value on organizational norms forbidding cheating, and in this way it may be considered to harmonize with the anthropocentric conception of human value.

SITUATION K - While traveling on a train, you meet a congenial person of your own age and sex. After an hour's conversation:

Item 56: You would consider inviting him to your home.

Item 57: You might discuss your family and friends with him.

Item 58: You might discuss your personal problems with him.

Agreement with these items may be interpreted as an indicator of the respondent's need for partial commitments and superficial interpersonal relationships as a result of a basic detached instrumental orientation in his life; in this way it would harmonize with the anthropocentric major premise. But

agreement with them may also be interpreted as an expression of concern for people, and in this sense it harmonizes with the theocentric major premise.

Item 67: You are not entitled to apply your own moral standards to other people's behavior.

Agreement with this item may be an expression of the belief that only God can judge the moral conduct of our fellowmen, and this is perfectly harmonious with a theocentric conception of human value. On the other hand agreement with this item may be an expression of the belief in the relativity of moral standards, in harmony with the anthropocentric major premise.

Item 75: A person who makes up his own mind about everything is better than someone who always takes an expert's word.

Agreement with this item may be an expression of concern for asserting the actor's independence, and in this way it would be harmonious with the anthropocentric major premise. On the other hand, agreement with the item could mean a rejection of the expert's instrumental orientation conflicting with the traditional concern for the "sacred", and in this way it would find some harmony with the theocentric major premise.

In relation to the following items, although the author thought they might not to be ambiguous, he finally decided that they are ambiguous, after inspecting the results of this survey.

Item 41: You would not care for somebody who did not care for you.

Item 48: You would not want to be friends with somebody who did not want to be your friend.¹³⁵

These items may be interpreted on the one hand as a refusal to "give" love or friendship without being reciprocated, as if the essential element of "giving" would be the expectation of "receiving". Agreement with such items can be interpreted on the other hand as a manifestation of one's desire not to demand from others a love or friendship that they are not willing to give. For individuals who agree, having in mind the first consideration, agreement would imply harmony with the anthropocentric major

¹³⁵ Items 41 and 48 refer to Situations F and G (See pp. 103 - 105); they were included in the questionnaire as indicators of the value orientation towards reciprocity.

premise. For individuals who agree, having the second type of consideration in mind, agreement would imply harmony with the theocentric major premise. As a matter of fact, Argentine respondents, in commenting on this situation, often expressed the thought that they would never make demands from others, while Americans often expressed the thought that they would never accept such demands made by others.

Item 42¹³⁶: John is morally obliged to care for Mary in return.

Agreement with this item is impossible to interpret clearly. It logically seems to harmonize with the theocentric major premise, but since it deals with a love relationship functionally leading to marriage, it seems that there is no real theocentric reason for agreeing with the item. On the contrary, persons taking seriously and realistically matters of moral obligations would tend to disagree with this item, the disagreement being in this case harmonious with the theocentric major premise.

There are other items (53, 60, 73, 78 and 79) whose ambiguity was not clearly detected before the analysis of the data. Their behavior will be analyzed when considering how the American and the Argentine groups differ from each other in their value orientations.

Indices of theocentric-anthropocentric orientation

In order to have summary measures for each value orientation, the items listed above as indicator of each of them were combined into indices of theocentrism-anthropocentrism.

The index for the value orientation on the relation of man to his family contains the items listed above under that heading, except for item 60 (habit to consult relatives before accepting a job) which was considered more an indicator of the structure of the family than of the theocentric or anthropocentric value

¹³⁶ Item 42 refers to Situation F (See pp. 103 – 104); it was included in the questionnaire as an indicator of the value orientation towards reciprocity.

orientation.

The indices for the other value orientations (on the relation of man to friends, peers, fellowmen, unilateral involvement, and ideas) result from combining all the questionnaire items listed above under the corresponding headings.

The index for the value orientation on the relation of man to other men is formed with all the items used for constructing the indices for the spheres of orientation towards family, friends, peers, fellowmen, and unilateral involvement. Another index was constructed combining all the items listed above, except for those characterizes as "ambiguous". Finally, an index was constructed by combining all the items listed above, except for those characterized as indirect, boomerang or ambiguous.

The indices were computed in the following way:

1. The answers to each item were ranked from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric).
2. The answers to each item were given value according to the following scale:

	<u>Group A</u>	<u>Group B</u>
	Items for which agreement indicates a theocentric orientation. They were indicated with an (*) above.	Items for which agreement indicates an anthropocentric orientation.
- Strongly agree	1	5
- Agree	2	4
- Uncertain	3	3
- Disagree	4	2
- Strongly disagree	5	1

"No answer" is given a value of 3 (the same as for "uncertain") in every case.

3. For each individual the mean of the answers to the items included in a given index was considered his index score going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric).

PART II

SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND VALUE ORIENTATIONS

Introduction

It has been pointed out that the association between an individual's social status (belonging to a group or category of people) and a value orientation (theocentric or anthropocentric) can be direct or indirect. Insofar as the association is direct, the present study merely describes the value orientation ascribed to certain statuses in the groups which have been studied. Insofar as the association is indirect, the present study attempts to show the effects of a strain towards consistency between value orientations which are directly associated with the respondent's position in society, and other value orientations.

If one status (A) of an actor is associated with an anthropocentric value orientation, and another status (B) is associated with a theocentric value orientation, it is assumed here that there is a strain towards consistency in the status-set, which stimulates the individual to abandon one of the statuses (A, or B), if this can be done without much difficulty. The new status, replacing the abandoned one, would be associated with a value orientation (theocentric or anthropocentric) harmonious with the value orientations associated with the remaining status. Furthermore, it is assumed, a person is not likely to enter into statuses associated with value orientations opposite (in the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension) to those with which his previous statuses are associated.

These ideas have been expressed by Merton in the following terms:

The components of status-sets are not combined at random. A process of self-selection – both social and psychological- operates to reduce the prospects of random assortments of statuses. Values internalized by people in prior dominant statuses are such as to make it less likely (than would be the case in the absence of these values) that they will be motivated to enter statuses with values incompatible with their own ... As a result of this process of self-selection of successive statuses, the status-set at any one time is more nearly integrated than it would otherwise be. In terms of the value-orientation already developed, people reject certain statuses which they could achieve, because they find them repugnant, and select other prospective statuses, because they find them congenial ... By the same mechanism, it becomes possible for statuses which are "neutral" to one another to turn up with considerable frequency in the same status-sets. By "neutral" is meant only that the values and obligations of the respective statuses are such that they are not likely to enter into conflict.¹

¹ Ibid., p. 383.

Consequently, one can expect that any two statuses (X and T) which are associated with a given value orientation (Y) are likely to be associated with each other, as a consequence of their common association with Y. However, the process of self-selection does not always take place with the plasticity described by Merton. Indeed, in the above quoted considerations he was explicitly referring to "sequences of what Linton called achieved (or more generally, what may be called acquired)" statuses: statuses into which individuals move by virtue of their own achievement rather than those in which they have been placed by virtue of fortunate or unfortunate birth, (which would be ascribed statuses)".¹ However, although in a slower process, the same considerations could be applied to ascribed statuses. Indeed, a group will usually favour statuses associated with the dominant value orientations of the group. And to that extent, statuses "neutral" to each other (in so far as they are not associated with conflicting value orientations). Consequently, the set of statuses that a group may ascribe to an individual is likely to show internal value congruence.

In other words, the value orientations which the individual is expected to internalize as a result of one of his ascribed statuses are not likely to conflict with the value orientations which he is expected to internalize as a result of other of his ascribed statuses. For instance, considering a family group, if the family is characterized by high religious involvement it is likely that the parents will bring up the child in their same faith, that they will educate him in parochial schools, that they will prepare him for careers giving him opportunity to be helpful to others, that they will make him identify himself with their political choice (probably a conservative party); that they will arrange for him to have friends of his same religion, and to belong to religious associations of their own confession. The value consistency among ascribed statuses may be considered a result of the value consistency in the group which ascribes the statuses. Some ascribed statuses cannot be changed (sex, age, etc.) to bring them into line with others.

¹ Ibid., pp. 382 – 383.

Whatever the mechanisms are which operate to produce value consistency in the status set, many instances in the present section will show that such consistency does emerge. For example in Catholic schools there is a higher proportion of respondents who are Catholic, Christian Democrats, and who report high religious involvement and having best friends of the same religion as their own, than in non-Catholic schools. Among respondents planning to enter teaching or social work there is a higher proportion of females than for other career orientations.

Once the association between a determinate status (X) and a given type (theocentric or anthropocentric) of value orientation (Y) has been established one may elaborate¹ the relationship, to find out whether by holding another status (T) constant in the sample, the relationship between X and Y is reduced or eliminated. If X and T are both associated with Y in the same way, one would conclude that they are likely to "turn up with considerable frequency in the same status-sets". However, since this mechanism associating T and X through Y does not operate "with full automatic efficiency", as Merton observes², in the status-sets of many individuals T does not accompany X. By holding status T constant, we can determine to what extent status X by itself is associated with value orientation Y. Since T and X are associated with each other through Y, one would presume that in the individual cases in which T and X are not associated with each other, one of them would fail to be associated with value orientation Y. Consequently, it would not be surprising that by this sheer fact, the association between X and Y would be reduced by holding T constant.

This pattern can be illustrated with an example in which X and T occur in a known sequence: the feminine sex role (X) is associated with high religious involvement (T) and theocentric value orientations (Y). If for a group of cases, the relationship between feminine sex (X) and theocentric value orientations

¹ The term "elaboration" is used with the meaning with which Paul F. Lazarsfeld uses it in Evidence and Inference in Social Research (Publication No. A-276 of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University); Herbert Hyman uses it with similar meaning in Survey Design and Analysis, pp. 275-329.

² Op. cit., p. 383.

(Y) is tested holding religious involvement (T) constant, one would have four statistical groups resulting from combining high and low religious involvement with female and male sex. The deviant cases of females for whom the association between female role and theocentric value orientation was not strong enough to lend them to high religious involvement have value orientations closer to those of the conformist males, who show strong association between their male roles and their expected anthropocentric value orientations. In this way, by holding religiosity constant, we are comparing "deviant" females with "conformist" males, and "deviant" males (high religiosity) with "conformist"

females (high religiosity).¹

In an attempt to distinguish developmental sequences from spurious relationships, Hyman states:

To hold education or any other background factor constant is to imply that it alone may directly determine behavior ... Background factors never directly cause behavior; they cause attitudes; and attitudes in turn determine behavior.

.....
The explanation of a phenomenon can be in terms of independent variables that have complexity, either historically or in configurational terms. To test the explanatory power of such factors means to test them at whatever level of complexity is involved. Otherwise the test is simply not what it purports to be. However, once such an explanation is demonstrated, then the analyst may wish to understand it better. He may wish to refine the complexity –to analyze it- to separate the configuration into its components –to trace out the emergence of the factor- so as to understand the way in which the explanation works. This latter purpose should not be confused with that earlier part of the analysis that involved the empirical test of the explanation. For this latter purpose, the procedures of control of other factors constitute the empirical means by which the analyst observes what component parts of the totality are crucial to its effectiveness.²

These few sentences clearly lead to the following conclusion: An independent variable may be associated with a dependent variable not alone, but acting either jointly with other variables, or through other variables, or as a result of the action of other variables. Such intervention of a third variable does not make the original relationship between independent and dependent variables less interesting, but, on

¹ Not being identified with the value orientation (Y) associated with their status, the need for consistency in deviant females do not stimulate them to join other statuses associated with value orientation (Y). An individual attending a Catholic university but not identified with the theocentric value orientations generally associated with attending such university is under less stimulus to become Democristian or high in religiosity, than another individual attending the same university and who identifies with the theocentric value orientations generally associated with that attendance. In this way, the fact that holding religiosity (T) constant, association between type of university attended (X) and value orientations (Y) is reduced, does not necessarily mean that such association does not exist, or that such association is insignificant, but it only means that T and Y are associated with each other through the mediation of X, and consequently in the cases in which the association between T and X fails to be present, there is a presumption that T and/or X are not associated with Y.

The way of artificially reducing or eliminating the association between T and X is by holding one of them constant, while studying the association between the other and Y. By doing so, we are not only reducing the association between X and Y. In a sense of it can be said that we are holding X constant, in so far as individuals in the + X group who are not + T are likely to be deviants, otherwise they would be + T as well.

² Op. cit., p. 263.

the contrary, it serves to help one understand the original relationship better. In this way, as Hyman observes:

Spuriousness applies to situations where a variable other than the apparent explanation was found to have produced the observed effect, providing the other variable is not an intrinsic part of the developmental sequence which produced the apparent explanation.¹

The paragraphs quoted from Hyman refer to an explanatory analysis in which the purpose is to establish a causal nexus between an independent and a dependent variable. In the present study, the aim is to find associations between the variables without necessarily reaching conclusions about the causal direction dominating in any given association. The reason for this emphasis is that the main concern of this study is the exploration and description of the strain towards consistency among value orientations and the associations between value orientations and specific statuses. Test variables will be held constant in some cases in order to clarify the way in which value orientations are related to various statuses rather than in order to determine causal relationships.

1

CHAPTER V

THE RELIGIOUS FACTOR

Expected results

Within the groups studied only Christian religious groups are represented to any significant extent. There is an important group of Jews but they seldom report themselves as identifies with the Jewish religion.

Christianity emphasizes man's dependence upon God (or superior beings) and sacred norms emanating from Him, emphasizing the fact that the universe has its basis and center in God. Atheism and religious indifference are more likely to be linked to a conception of man as standing by himself without dependence upon supra-human principles. This means that the theocentric major premise is emphasized more by Christianity than by atheism or religious indifference.

Consequently one would expect that both in the American and in the Argentine groups studied, the respondents who are under stronger influence of religion will show more theocentric value orientations than other. The individuals' position in relation to the religious factor can be broken down into several aspects:

1. Degree of personal involvement with a given religious faith. This aspect of personal exposure to the religious factor is close to what Lenski calls the individual's involvement in the "associational" aspect of his socio-religious group.¹ Religious involvement can be defined here as the importance that the individual's religious beliefs have for his life, and the extent of the individual's commitment to his religion. Lenski measures "associational" involvement mainly on the basis of the frequency of the individual's attendance at religious services. Such a measurement was not used for the analysis in the present study

¹ Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor, (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1963),

because the relationship between a religious involvement and a determinate frequency of church attendance is different for different religious groups. Indeed, for a given average level of religious involvement, Catholics should attend religious services more often than Protestants or Jews, because the Catholic Church prescribes at least weekly attendance at Mass. Consequently, Lenski's conclusion that Catholics show a greater associational involvement than Protestants or Jews because more Catholics attend church services at least once a week¹, does not necessarily mean that Catholics take their religion more seriously than Protestants or Jews.

The item used to determine the degree of personal religious involvement in the present study was taken from R. Goldsen *et al.* What College Students Think²

What three things or activities in your life do you expect to give you the most satisfaction?

Please write a 1 in the space preceding the most important; a 2 in the space preceding the next most important; and a 3 in the space preceding the third most important.

Rank

pp. 22-23.

¹ Ibid., pp. 36-40.

² (Princeton, Van Nostrand, 1960). This item is considered by Goldsen *et al* a particularly sensitive indicator of religious involvement. Indeed, they state: "Some students told us that they counted on religion to give them an important sense of satisfaction in their lives.

"Perhaps the most acute aspect of the 'religiousness' expressed by the students was this feeling of commitment, the expectation that religious beliefs and religious activities would play an important role in one's total life picture ... The comparatively few students (17 per cent) who selected 'religious beliefs or activities' at all, could be viewed, we felt, as having given expression to this sort of over-all feeling of commitment to religious feelings and beliefs" (p. 156).

Goldsen *et al* also report that in a study of general population conducted by The Catholic Digest, 16 per cent of the respondents selected "religious beliefs or activities" among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life (p. 156, foot-note 5).

Compared with these findings, our respondents show an unusually high level of religious involvement. Indeed, in the American sample, 38 per cent select religious beliefs or activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life. In the Argentine sample, 32 per cent select religious beliefs or activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life. This exceptionally high proportion of respondents with high religious involvement results partly from the high percent of respondents from Catholic universities include in our samples (34 per cent in the American sample, and 46 per cent in the Argentine sample).

three

- Your career or occupation
- Family relationship
- Leisure-time recreational activities
- Religious beliefs or activities
- Participation as a citizen in the affairs of your community
- Participation in activities directed towards national or international betterment

Individuals who check religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life will be referred to as having high religious involvement. Other individuals will be referred to as having low religious involvement. Within the group with high religious involvement, those checking religious beliefs and activities in the first place, second place, and third place, will be referred to as having "highest", "next-to-highest" and "medium" religious involvement respectively.

2. The type of religious group with which the individual is identifies. This is close to what Lenski calls religious orientations. He refers to them in the following way:

To properly assess the influence of religious commitments, it is also necessary to study the influence of different religious orientations. In the religious tradition of the Western world, various types of religious orientations have competed with one another, each emphasizing a different facet of the Judaic-Christian heritage.

.....
In the present study it did not prove practical to investigate the influence of all the many orientations found in the rich and complex Judaic-Christian tradition. Rather, we limited our investigation to two orientations which seemed most likely to be related to the problem at hand. These are doctrinal orthodoxy and devotionalism.

By doctrinal orthodoxy we refer to that orientation which stresses intellectual assent to prescribed doctrines. Those who are orthodox, therefore, are those who accept the prescribed doctrines of their church; the heterodox are those who deviate from these intellectual norms to a greater or lesser degree.

By devotionalism we mean that orientation which emphasizes the importance of private, or personal, communion with God. The term "pietism" might have been used with equal propriety, but since it carries certain evaluative overtones, it seemed wiser to use the less familiar term ... Devotionalism is a more active, behavioral type of religious orientation, especially when compared with doctrinal orthodoxy, which is an extremely passive, intellectual orientation.¹

In the present study instead of using the distinction between doctrinal orthodoxy and devotionalism, the distinction between identification with the Catholic group and with other religious groups will be used. This distinction is related to the distinction used by Lenski only to the extent that the

Catholic tradition stresses intellectual assent to prescribes doctrines, and Protestant groups stress the importance of private, or personal, communion with God. Even to this limited extent, the difference between Catholic and Protestant traditions in only one of emphasis and degree.

For the sake of the present study it will be assumed that the orientations of the Catholic traditions and the Protestant traditions as a whole differ from each other in the following ways described by Parsons:

The Reformation may be seen, from on pint of view, as process of the extension of this principle of autonomy ... The essential point may be stated as the religious "enfranchisement" of the individual, often put as his coming to stand in a direct relation to God. The Catholic Church ... has kept him under a strict tutelage by a set of mechanisms of which the sacraments were the core.²

Speaking about the Reformation he says:

The essential point is that the individual dependence on the human mediation of the church and its priesthood through the sacraments was eliminated and, as a human being he had, under God, to rely on his own independent responsibility ... In this situation the very uncertainties of the individual's relation to God, an uncertainty driven to its extreme by the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination, could, through its definition of the situation for religious interests, produce a powerful impetus to the acceptance of individual responsibility.

.....
The counterpart of eliminating the sacramental mediation of the secular priesthood was eliminating also the special virtues of the religious.

.....
The religious status of secular callings was extended from that of a principle of basic nondiscrimination to one of their endowment with positive instrumental significance.

.....
Ascetic Protestantism ... Thought at least equally insistent on the divine origins of norms and values for life, tended to cut off this reliance on authority and place sharper emphasis on the individual's responsibility for positive action, not just by his faith to be receptive to God's grace, but to get out and work in the building of the Kingdom. This precisely excluded any special valuation of devotional exercises and put the primary moral emphasis on secular activities.³
(Italics mine).

Speaking about the upgrading of general levels of responsibility that accompanies the evolution of Reformed Christianity Parsons states:

Responsibility has a double aspect. The first is responsibility of the individual in that he

¹ Op. cit., pp 24 – 25.

² Talcott Parsons: "Christianity and Modern Industrial Society" in Studies in Sociology 1, (Buenos Aires, Omeba, 1961), p. 31.

³ Ibid., pp. 32 – 35.

cannot rely on a dependent relation to others, or to some authority, to absolve him of responsibility –this is the aspect we have been referring to as his autonomy in the specific sense in which the term has been used in this essay. The other aspect is responsibility for and to, responsibility for results and to other persons and to collectivities.¹ (Italics mine).

In the same essay Parsons states, speaking about Ascetic Protestants:

Clearly this is the branch which had the most direct positive influence on the complex of orientations of value which later proved to be of importance to modern industrialism.²

In these few statements Parsons clearly states how the branches of Protestantism which have been important for modern industrialism have led to a secularization where the responsibility of men for the empirical results of his actions is emphasized more than his dependence upon receptivity of God's grace. This is close to what has been defined above as the anthropocentric major premise. He also characterizes the Catholic tradition as placing a greater emphasis upon reliance on authority and receptivity to God's grace. This is close to what has been defined above as the theocentric major premise.³

Consequently, Catholics were expected to show more theocentric orientations than Protestants.

The Jewish group shows a very low degree of religious involvement. For this reason this group is expected to show more anthropocentric orientations than Catholics or Protestants, independently of the intrinsic content of orthodox Jewish doctrine.

3. Extent to which an individual's closest associates belong to the same religious group as himself.

This is called "communal involvement" by Lenski, who defines it in the following way:

¹ Ibid., p. 49.

² Ibid., p. 41.

³ Such description coincides with Lenski's findings reported as follows: "doctrinal orthodoxy proved more frequent among Catholics than among Protestants. Sixty-two per cent of Catholics respondents took an orthodox stance on all items, compared with only 38 per cent of the negro Protestants and 32 per cent of the White Protestants". Op cit., p. 57.

Goldsen et al report: "The Catholics are most agreed than Protestants and Jews on the necessity for a religious or ethical belief system to be based on absolute and traditional values" (Op. cit., p. 164).

Communal involvement has been measured in terms of the degree to which the primary relations of an individual (i.e. his relations with friends and relatives) are limited to persons of his own group.¹

Lenski uses as an indicator of high communal involvement the fact that one is "married to someone of the same socio-religious group", and who also reports that "all or nearly all of their close friends and relatives" are of the same group. In the present study most of the respondents are unmarried, and consequently the spouse's religion identification could not be used as an indicator of communal involvement. On the other hand, instead of asking about the religion of all their close friends and relatives, in the present study students were asked only about the religion of their two best friends. Indeed, sometimes, the religious identification of relatives has little significant for the actor. The fact that one of the actor's two best friends belong to a different socio-religious group from the actor is much more important and significant for communal involvement, than the fact than any other close friend or relative may belong to a different socio-eco-religious group than the respondent. Consequently, respondents who report both their best friends belonging to the same religious denomination as themselves will be referred to as having high communal involvement with their religious group, or showing high reference group

¹ Ibid., p. 23.

homogeneity. Individuals who report one or both best friends not belonging to the same denomination as themselves will be referred to as reporting low communal involvement with their religious group, or showing low reference group homogeneity.

Since high communal involvement with one's religious group or reference group homogeneity is associated to the acceptance of the theocentric major premise, it is expected that it will also be associated with the acceptance of the theocentric value orientations towards men, family relationships, friendship, peers, fellowmen, unilateral involvement and ideas.

4. Indirect institutional influence of the religious factor: Individuals who grow up and live in a society in which a particular religious orientation (Catholicism or Protestantism in the present study) has traditionally dominated are likely to accept the value orientations associated with that particular religious orientation. This tendency exists even for those individuals who are not personally identified with the traditional religious orientation of their society or group (e.g.: Protestants or Atheists in Argentine, or Catholics in United States)

This macroscopic and indirect influence of the religious factor has been pointed out by Parsons when he associates the value orientation of Latin countries with the "emphasis away from the secular instrumental complex" characterizing "Catholic Christianity".¹

The indirect influence of the religious orientation factor is possibly one of the main factors leading Latin American cultures to show more theocentric value orientation than American culture. Such factor may help to explain why in the present study the Argentine group consistently shows, as expected, more theocentric value orientations than the American group.

The fact that once the influence of a religious or ideological movement contributes to shape the social organization and way of life in a culture, it influences individuals independently of their personal

1

non-identification with the original religious or ideological movement, is expressed in the following way by Max Weber:

The Puritan wanted to work in a calling; we are forced to do so. For when asceticism was carried out of monastic cells into everyday life, and began to dominate worldly morality, it did its part in building the tremendous cosmos of the modern economic order. This order is now bound to the technical and economic conditions of machine production which to-day determine the lives of all the individuals who are born into this mechanism, not only those directly concerned with economic acquisition, with irresistible force. In Baxter's view the care for external good should only lie on the shoulders of the "saint like a light cloak, which can be thrown aside at any moment". But fate decreed that the cloak should become an iron cage.¹

The importance of the existing system of legitimacy even for those who are trying to destroy it has been described as the fact that individuals are caught by the same ideology that they are attempting to destroy.

5. Type of university attended. A relatively more direct type of exposure to the religious factor through secular institutions is attendance at universities which are affiliated with a particular religious denomination. Students attending such universities are presumed to be more exposed to the influence of that particular religious group than students attending universities without religious identification. This factor could be considered partly an extension of communal religious involvement, in so far as it would involve the tendency of individuals attending such universities to surround themselves with social objects (university, teachers, students) of their own religious group.

It is expected that individuals attending universities affiliated to a determinate church will tend to show more theocentric value orientations than individuals attending other universities. It is expected that individuals attending universities affiliates with the Catholic Church will tend to show more theocentric value orientations than individuals attending universities affiliated with Protestant churches, as a result of the association of Protestant and Catholic traditions with the anthropocentric and theocentric orientations, as explained above.

The Findings²

Religious involvement and value orientations

The level of religious involvement is similar for both groups (American and Argentine) of students studied, as shown in table 6.

TABLE 6. – Religious involvement of American and Argentine respondents.

Rank of religious beliefs and activities among the things from which respondents expect most satisfaction in life	American group	Argentine group
	Percent	Percent
First (high rel. inv.)	11	10
Second (next to high rel inv.)	13	9
Third (medium rel. inv.)	12	12
Not included in first three choices (low rel. inv.)	62	66
Total no. of cases	(441)	(289)

Although the Argentine group shows more theocentric orientations than the American group (as will be shown below) it shows no higher religious involvement than the American group. It will be shown that although high religious involvement is a social characteristic associated with theocentrism of value orientations, belonging to the American or Argentine cultures is more strongly associated to the anthropocentric or theocentric value orientations than low or high religious involvement are.

¹ The Protestant Ethic ..., p. 181.

² The questionnaires filled out in the National University of Buenos Aires arrived too late to be included in most of the analysis which follows. Unless express mention is made to them they will not be included when reference is made to the Argentine group.

In both the American and the Argentine groups respondents of highest religious involvement show greater theocentrism in all value orientations, than do respondents with low religious involvement, as shown in table 7.¹ In both the American and in the Argentine groups, respondents with next-to-highest religious involvement show more theocentrism in value orientations than do respondents with low religious involvement, except for the orientation towards peers among Argentines, as shown in table 7.² In both national groups respondent with medium religious involvement show more theocentrism in their value orientations than do respondents with low religious involvement, except for the orientation towards reciprocity, as shown in table 7.

The orientations in which the association between high religious involvement and theocentrism appears strongest are the orientation towards family relationships, towards ideas and towards fellowmen, followed by the

¹ Forty-three items were defined above as "direct" items. The group of highest religious involvement scored more theocentric than the group of low religious involvement in 40 of the 43 items in the American group, and in 36 of the 43 items in the Argentine group.

² The group of next-to-highest religious involvement scored more theocentric than the group of low religious involvement for 37 of the 43 items in the American group, and for 38 of the 43 direct items in the Argentine group.

TABLE 7. – Theocentrism in value orientation by religious involvement (+ signs indicate that respondents with higher religious involvement scored more theocentric than those with lower religious involvement. – signs indicate that the opposite was the case).

Value orientations	Average difference in theocentrism mean scores*, comparing: the group with low religious involvement with:		
	Highest rel. inv.	Next-to-highest rel. inv.	Medium rel. inv.
	American group		
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+35	+30	+32
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+29	+04	+09
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u> (fellowstudents)	+62	+01	+20
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+33	+15	+03
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+35	+25	.00
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+48	+41	+26
Relation of man to <u>other men</u>			
Total no. of cases	(441)		

* This average is obtained as follows: (a) For each item the mean of the answers of one group (which goes from 1 to 5) is subtracted from the mean of the answers in the other group. (b) If the group with higher religious involvement score more theocentric than the other, the difference is given a + sign. Otherwise it is given a – sign. (c) The differences corresponding to the items indicators of a given value orientation are added and divided by the number of items.

TABLE 7. -- Continued

Value orientations	Average difference in theocentrism mean scores, comparing: the group with low religious involvement with:		
	Highest rel. inv.	Next-to-highest rel. inv.	Medium rel. inv.
	<u>Argentine group</u>		
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .35	+ .29	+ .42
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .27	+ .29	+ .14
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u> (fellowstudents)	+ .24	- .08	+ .12
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .42	+ .42	- .17
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .01	+ .30	+ .24
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .49	+ .48	
Relation of man to <u>other men</u>			
Total no. of cases	(289)		

orientation towards friendship relationships. The recognition of one's duties towards fellowstudents is less directly associated to religious involvement than the recognition of other obligations. The items indicating the orientation towards reciprocity are only indirectly associated to religious involvement, because instead of referring to what would be done, they indicate how the respondent perceives what in fact occurs in cases of unilateral involvement.

The association between religious involvement and value orientations is strikingly consistent. It is high among Catholics and among Protestants¹; in Catholic and non-Catholic universities²; among males and among females³; among the high and the low socio-economic status respondents⁴; among respondents forming a group with their friends, belonging to different groups to which their friends belong, or not forming any group with their friends⁵; among respondents belonging to the same religious group as their two best friends, or among other respondents⁶; among Christian Democrats, Radicals or Leftists.⁷

¹ Except for the orientation towards peers among Catholics.

² Except for the orientation towards peers in Fordham university (Catholic university in the American group).

³ Except for the orientation towards reciprocity, among Argentine females.

⁴ Except for the orientation towards peers among low socio-economic status Americans, and the orientation towards reciprocity among low socio-economic status Argentines.

⁵ Except for the orientation towards fellowmen among American respondents belonging to different groups to which their friends belong, and the orientation towards peers among Argentine respondents forming a group with their friends; and the orientation towards reciprocity among Argentines belonging to different groups to which their friends belong or not forming any group with them.

⁶ This was computed only for Americans.

⁷ Except for the orientations towards peers and reciprocity among Christian Democrats; the orientation towards friends among Radicals; and the orientation towards ideas among Leftists.

TABLE 8. – Theocentrism in value orientations by religious involvement, holding political orientation constant. (Argentine sample only).

Value Orientations	Average difference in theocentrism mean scores (mean theocentrism scores of respondents with high religious involvement minus mean theocentrism scores of respondents with low religious involvement)		
	Christian Democrats	Radicals	Leftists
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .08	+ .17	+ .19
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .15	- .10	+ .31
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	- .45	+ .42	+ .40
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .12	+ .22	+ .63
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	- .16	+ .09	+ .17
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .35	+ .34	- .52
Total no. of cases:			
Low rel. inv.	(33)	(43)	(37)
High rel. inv.	(40)	(17)	(7)
Total	(73)	(60)	(44)

However, as shown in Table 8, the association between religious involvement and value orientations is not as strong among Christian Democrats as it is among Radicals or Leftists, in Argentine. This and other findings which will be reported later in this chapter and next chapter led to the formulation of the following proposition, in order to explain them: The more strongly a given status of a person is associated with certain value orientations, the less strong will be the association between the value orientations and other statuses.

The above proposition was considered necessary to explain why (as will be shown later) within the group with high religious involvement the association between value orientations and religious affiliations, type of university attended, sex roles, and cohesion with one's friends, is weaker than within the group with low religious involvement.

The idea stated in this proposition is not new in Sociology. In voting studies it was found that propaganda for registration¹ or varying social roles of men and women² have less effect upon the political behavior of those with high political interest than among those showing low political interest.

It seems that if a status of a person is strongly associated with certain orientation in values, such orientation is likely to become fixed as a consequence of such strong association. If individuals have taken a strong position to start with (be it in relation to the anthropocentrism-theocentrism dilemma of value orientation, or in relation to political orientation and behavior), no much room is left for variability deriving from other statuses.

Unless two statuses always (or never) appear together in status-sets, the strong association of a value orientation with one of them (A) will be negatively correlated with the strong association between that value orientation and the other status (B). The reason is that to the extent that the value orientation is associated to a variable (status A) behaving independently from status (B), the behavior of that value

¹ H. Gosnell, Getting Out the Vote. An Experiment in the Stimulation of Voting. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927).

² P. Lazarsfeld, B. Berelson, and H. Gaudet, The People's Choice (New York: Columbia

orientation cannot be fully dependent upon status (B). Since the phenomenon of cross-cutting status-sets is fairly strong in the United States and Argentina, the postulates stated above seem applicable to the group of students object of this study.

The proposition stated above refers especially to status-variables, one of whose poles (e.g.: high religious involvement or high political interest) is more strongly associated with the corresponding values, than the other pole is. Such variables specify the relationships between the value orientations and other statuses. The pole status not strongly associated to the corresponding value orientation can be considered a condition permitting the strong association between the value orientations and other statuses. This type of conditions have been explained by Lazarsfeld in the following terms:

In cases of the type PA we usually call the test variable t a "condition". General examples easily come to mind, although in practice they are fairly rare and are a great joy to the research man when they are found. For example, the propaganda effect of a film is greater among the less-educated than among highly educated people. The depression had worse effects on authoritarian families than on other types.

Three general remarks can be made about this type of finding or reasoning: (a) It corresponds to the usual stimulus-disposition-response sequence, with x being the stimulus and the antecedent t being the disposition. (b) The whole type might best be called one of specification. One of the two partials will necessarily be larger than the original relationship. We specify, so to speak, the circumstances under which the original relationship holds true more strongly. (c) Usually we will go on from there and ask why the relationship is stronger on one side of the test dichotomy.¹ (Italics mine).

However, it will be shown below that in some cases neither of the partials is larger than the original relationship. The reason for this is that the t factor (e.g. religious involvement) is also related to the independent variable (e.g. religious affiliation or sex) in a way expressed by the type of elaboration called "interpretation".

In the M type of analysis, on the other hand, our main interest is to see whether, after the introduction of a test factor, the partial relationships between the variables with which we started are smaller, on the average, than the original relationship.

.....
In interpretation, the test factor lies between x and y in time, or, in other words, it follows after x . This is what we mean when we say that the interpretative factor provides a "link" between

University Press, 1948), pp. 48 – 49.

¹ Evidence and Inference ..., pp. 120 – 121.

x and y.¹

It seems contradictory that a test factor t will serve at the same time as a link interpreting the relation between x and y, and as a conditions specifying the association between x and y. Indeed, in the latter case (MI type) t should antecede x, while in the first case (PA type) t should come after x in time. However, as Hyman states "in actual practice it is rare to find pure P or M types".² For instance, as will be shown below, high religious involvement can be considered partly as an antecedent and partly as a consequence of attending a Catholic university. Consequently, holding religious involvement constant will be seen to have two effects upon the association between value orientations and type of university attended: (a) The two partial relations will be smaller than the original relation (MI type of elaboration). (b) One of the partial relations (within the group with low religious involvement) will be smaller than the other (PI type of elaboration).

It will be shown below that by holding religious involvement constant the association between value orientations and various statuses is reduced, but the reduction is usually greater within the group with high religious involvement than within the group with low religious involvement.

Value Orientations and Friends' Religion

Within the American sample (441 respondents), 52 per cent reported having the same religion as their two best fiends. Within the Argentine group (289 respondents) 79 per cent reported that their two best friends were Catholics. American respondents who report having the same religion as their best friends are considered as having high communal involvement with their religious group. Argentine respondents³ who report that their two best fiends are Catholic will be considered also as having high

¹ Op. cit., pp. 285 – 286.

² Op. cit., p. 284.

³ Even Argentine respondents who are not Catholic.

communal involvement with their religious group, since only 2 per cent of Argentine report a religious affiliation other than Catholic.

Both in the American and in the Argentine group respondents with high communal involvement score more theocentric for all value orientations, as is shown in Table 8.

As in the case of association between religious involvement and value orientation, the association between communal involvement and value orientation is strongest for the value orientation towards family and ideas (although it is relatively weak for the value orientation towards fellowstudents). One might think that the theocentric orientation of those with high communal involvement can be explained by their greater religious involvement. Indeed, one would expect that individuals with high religious involvement would tend to make friends of their own religion, and individuals with friends practicing the same religion as themselves would tend to reach a higher religious involvement. Forty-six per cent of American reporting high communal involvement also report high religious involvement, while only 30 per cent of Americans reporting low communal involvement report high religious involvement.

TABLE 9. – Theocentrism in value orientations by "communal involvement".

Value Orientations	Average difference in theocentrism mean scores (mean theocentrism scores of respondents with high "communal" involvement minus mean theocentrism scores of respondents with low "communal" involvement)	
	American sample	Argentine sample
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .24	+ .29
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .03	+ .13
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .06	+ .05
Relation of man to his <u>fellows</u>	+ .05	+ .01
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .16	+ .19
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .20	+ .15
Total no. of cases:		
High comm. inv.	(229)	(228)
Low comm. inv.	(198)	(35)
Total	(427)	(263)

Among Argentine respondents, 36 per cent of those reporting that their two best friends are Catholic, report high religious involvement; while only 22 per cent of those with low communal involvement report high religious involvement.

If the differential in religiosity would wholly account for the differences in value orientations between those with high communal involvement and those with low communal involvement, the differences would disappear by holding religious involvement constant. However, even holding religious involvement constant respondents with high communal involvement score more theocentric than those with low communal involvement, except for the orientations towards reciprocity and towards fellowmen within the group of low religious involvement, as is shown in table 10.

TABLE 10. – Theocentrism in value orientations by "communal involvement", holding religious involvement constant. (American sample only)¹.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism mean scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents with high "communal" involvement, minus mean theocentrism scores of respondents with low "communal involvement")	
	High Religious Involvement	Low Religious Involvement
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .24	+ .16
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .06	+ .02
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .01	+ .14
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .11	- .03
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .12	- .05
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .09	+ .16
Total no. of cases:		
High comm. inv.	(106)	(124)
Low comm. inv.	(59)	(139)
Total	(165)	(263)

¹ The Argentine sample is not included because only 35 Argentine respondents report low "communal involvement".

Religious Faith and Value Orientations

Comparisons of groups with different religious affiliation were made only for the American sample, as a result of the fact that only 2 per cent of the Argentine sample report religious affiliation other than Catholic.

As expected, for 31 of the 43 items used in the test Catholics score more theocentric than Protestants. For 37 of the 43 items Catholics score more theocentric than Jews.

The association between Catholic faith and theocentrism of value orientation is strongest in the orientations towards family relationships and towards ideas. This may be explained by the fact that the Catholic faith in the United States is more directly associated to such value orientations than to others, as a result of the particular emphasis placed by the Catholic Church on the humble acceptance of the unity of its doctrine, and the duty of unconditional devotion to one's own family.

In the orientations towards peers and towards fellowmen Protestants score more theocentric than Catholics, but the differences are smaller than for the orientations towards family relationships and towards ideas (Table 11). In the orientations towards friendship relationships and towards reciprocity Catholics score only slightly more theocentric than Protestants (Table 11). Catholics score more theocentric than Jews in all the value orientations considered (Table 11).

TABLE 11. – Theocentrism in value orientations by religious affiliation. (American sample only).

Value Orientations	Average difference in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Catholics respondents, minus mean theocentrism scores of Protestants or Jewish respondents)	
	Protestants and Catholics	Jews and Catholics
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .28	+ .33
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .01	+ .10
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	- .10	+ .18
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	- .17	+ .14
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .01	+ .16
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .39	+ .64
Total no. of cases:		
Protestants	(179)	
Catholics	(160)	(160)
Jews		(75)
Total		(414)

In order to clarify the difference between Protestants and Catholics religious involvement was held constant. The gap between Catholics and Protestants is larger within the group with low religious involvement than within the group with high religious involvement (Table 12). Indeed, (a) for all value orientations¹ Catholics score more theocentric (relatively to Protestants) among respondents with low religious involvement than among respondents with high religious involvement; (b) the sum of the differences with low religious involvement is larger among respondents with low religious involvement than among respondents with high religious involvement.

The above finding may be explained with the proposition stated above: The more strongly a given status of a person is associated with certain value orientations, the less strong will be the association between the value orientations and other statuses. Indeed, high religious involvement is strongly associated to theocentrism of value orientations, thus reducing the possible association between theocentrism of value orientations and religious affiliation. The difference found among respondents with low religious involvement would reflect the traditional ethos of the religious groups to which the respondents belong (Protestant or Catholic) rather than the

¹ This finding also shows the strain towards consistency among value orientations, since all of them tend to variate simultaneously in the same direction.

TABLE 12. – Theocentrism in value orientations for Protestants and Catholics, holding religious involvement constant. (American sample).¹

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism mean scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Catholic respondents, minus mean theocentrism scores of Protestants respondents)	
	High Religious Involvement	Low Religious Involvement
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .25	+ .33
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	- .05	+ .01
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	- .28	+ .07
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u> <u>Unilateral involvement and</u> <u>reciprocity</u>	- .22	- .20
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .32	+ .42
Total no. of cases:		
Protestants	(68)	(111)
Catholics	(95)	(65)
Total	(163)	(176)

¹ Jews are not included in this comparison because only 3 of the 75 Jews in the American sample, report high religious involvement.

respondents' personal involvement.¹

To conclude, the fact that Protestants scored more theocentric than Catholics in the orientations towards peers and towards fellowmen makes it impossible to generalize from our data that Catholics show more theocentrism of value orientations than Protestants. However, the fact that the differences in theocentrism between Catholics and Protestants are smaller for the orientations towards peers and towards fellowmen, then for other orientations (towards family and ideas) for which Catholics score more theocentric than Protestants may suggest that as a whole belonging to the Catholic group is associated to theocentrism in value orientations. This suggestion is stronger if one considers that among respondents with low religious involvement Protestants score more theocentric than Catholics only in the orientation towards fellowmen.

¹ Common sense would lead to think that if Catholic tradition leads to theocentrism of value orientation more than Protestant tradition, Catholics should score more theocentric than Protestants especially among respondents with high religious involvement. Indeed, one would assume that respondents with high religious involvement have strongly internalized their religious faiths and can best reflect their differences. However, here it is assumed that the differences lie mainly in the traditions derived in secular life from these religious groups (Protestant and Catholic) and that at present high religious involvement in any of both groups leads to theocentrism of value orientations. Consequently, in order to determine the differences between the Protestants and the Catholic influences, it is necessary to consider Protestants and Catholics who are not high in religious involvement (and therefore theocentric in value orientations) to start with.

Respondent without a religion

Eighteen American respondents reported that they have no religion, or that they are agnostics or atheists.¹

It was considered that respondents without a religion would tend to deny that the value of man and of his actions depends upon his conformity with supra-human norms (theocentric manor premise). Consequently, it was expected that respondents without a religion would show less theocentric value orientations than Protestants, Catholics or Jews. Indeed, this was the case, as Table 13 shows.

The association between irreligion and anthropocentrism in value orientations is very strong and consistent: it is strongest in the value orientations towards ideas, probably as a result of the skepticism often associated with atheism and irreligion in general.

The association between irreligion and anthropocentrism appears weakest in the value orientation towards reciprocity (Jews score more anthropocentric than irreligious respondents in this orientation). This may be explained as a result of the fact that the image of the desirability of unilateral involvement depends more upon the type of treatment given in a society to a person unilaterally involved, than upon the ideas or

¹ The following analysis is limited to the American sample, because in the original Argentine sample only 7 respondents reported not having a religion.

TABLE 13. – Theocentrism in value orientations for irreligious respondents, compared with Protestant, Catholic and Jewish respondents.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores Protestant, Catholic or Jewish respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of irreligious respondents)		
	Comparing <u>irreligious</u> respondents with:		
	<u>Protestants</u>	<u>Catholics</u>	<u>Jews</u>
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .34	.+ .68	+ .35
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .47	+ .48	+ .38
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .54	+ .34	+ .26
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .46	+ .30	+ .16
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .09	+ .11	- .12
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .92	+1.30	+ .66
Total no. of cases:			
Protestants	(179)		
Catholics		(160)	
Jews			(75)
Irreligious respondents	(18)	(18)	(18)

values of a particular individual or group in a society. Indeed, if in the United States the dominant values of the society lead to consider that a person unilaterally involved is a nuisance, treating him as such, person who is (or is going to be) unilaterally involved in the United States will tend to see his (actual or potential) situation as one involving desprestige, humiliation, indignity and dependence for him. In this way, even persons whose values would not lead them to define the situation of unilateral involvement as being undesirable, are forced by the social definition of the situation, to define it in this way.¹

Type of University Attended and Value Orientations

As expected, in both the American and the Argentine samples respondents attending Catholic universities score more theocentric than respondents attending other universities, as shown in Table 14.

Combining the corresponding items for each value orientation, we find that in the American sample, respondents from Fordham University score more theocentric than respondents from other universities, in the following way: (a) Fordham students score more theocentric than students attending the University of California (Los Angeles) and Queens College, for all value orientations; (b) Fordham students score more theocentric than students attending Rutgers University, except for the orientation towards reciprocity; (c) Fordham students score more theocentric than students attending the University of Texas, except for the orientation towards fellowmen; (d) Fordham students score more theocentric than

¹ If person A unilaterally cares for person B, who has contempt for unilateral involvement, person B will tend to be harsh with person A. When A feels that he is being a nuisance and that he is looked upon as a weak person striving to obtain reciprocity, he might end up believing that this is true, and he may act as if this was true. After this experience, when person C shows unilateral involvement, person A might be harsh to him.

The way in which American respondents are convinced (irrespective of their religious identification) that unilateral involvement is an undesirable situation, has some similitude with the way in which the definition of the situation of inferiority of Negroes by the dominant values in the South of the United States, leads to a real situation of slow cultural and economic development of Negroes, and also leads to convince Whites (and sometimes to convince Negroes) that the initial definition of Negroes' inferiority was correct. See R. H. Merton, *op. cit.*, chapter XI ("The Self-fulfilling Prophecy").

students attending Mississippi State University, except for the orientations towards peers and towards fellowmen; (e) Fordham students score more theocentric than Emory students for the orientations towards family relationships and towards ideas, but Emory students score more theocentric than Fordham students for the value orientation towards peers and towards reciprocity (see Table 14).

The latter finding is perhaps the most interesting in Table 14. Indeed, Fordham University and Emory University are the two only church affiliated universities in the American sample. The fact that Emory University is the only one in relation to which Fordham's lead in theocentrism is not consistent, suggest that theocentrism in value orientations is associated to the fact that an university is associated with a church, independently of the denomination of the church.

However, Table 14 shows that the differences in theocentrism between both universities (Fordham and Emory) appears much larger for the value orientations in which Fordham score more theocentric (family and ideas) than for the value orientations for which Emory score more theocentric (peers and reciprocity). This finding, and the fact that for 32 of the 43 items used in the test Fordham respondents score more theocentric than Emory respondents, suggest that, on the whole, the university affiliated to the Catholic Church (Fordham) shows more theocentrism in value orientations than the university affiliated to the Methodist church (Emory).

On the other hand, the comparison between Fordham and Emory cannot be taken as conclusive. Fordham is located in New York, the great metropolis of the East of the United States, while Emory is located in Atlanta, a relatively smaller town, in the South of the United States.¹

In both Emory university and Fordham university most respondents major in Sociology or the Humanities, but 18 per cent of Fordham respondents, as compared to 9 per cent of Emory respondents,

¹ Probably Fordham respondents failure to lead in theocentrism for the orientations towards peers (Emory and Mississippi), fellowmen (Emory, Mississippi and Texas) and reciprocity (Emory), is a result of the pre-industrial and traditionalistic characteristic of southern society (these characteristics do not lead to theocentric orientation towards ideas because this a strongly universalistic orientation).

major in the biological sciences. Twenty-six per cent of Emory respondents and 57 per cent of Fordham respondents show high religious involvement.

TABLE 14. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by university attended

Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Fordham respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of other respondents).						
Comparing Fordham respondents with respondents from:						
Value Orientations	Univ. of California	Queens College	Rutgers University	Texas Univ.	Mississippi Univ.	Emory University
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .69	+ .42	+ .45	+ .39	+ .27	+ .59
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .29	+ .20	+ .18	+ .12	+ .12	.00
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .08	+ .11	+ .22	+ .03	- .01	- .22
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .15	+ .06	+ .08	- .14	- .11	.00
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .17	+ .18	- .10	+ .06	+ .03	- .07
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .35	+ .61	+ .97	+ .53	+ .40	+ .75
Total no. of cases:						
Fordham	(123)	(123)	(123)	(123)	(123)	(123)
Other Univ.	(30)	(62)	(45)	(72)	(63)	(46)

In the Argentine sample, where we have three Catholic Universities and three state universities, it was thought that comparing by one Catholic university and one non-Catholic university in the same town, one would avoid the danger of taking the differences between two town or regions to be differences between types of universities. Consequently, the Catholic University of Tucumán and the National University of Tucumán were compared with each other; and the Catholic University of Buenos Aires and the national University of Buenos Aires were compared with each other.¹

It was found that for 34 of the 43 items used in the test, respondents from the Catholic University of Tucumán scored more theocentric than respondents from the National University of Tucumán. The respondents from the Catholic University of Tucumán showed more theocentrism than respondents from the National University of Tucumán, except for the value orientation towards reciprocity (Table 15).

It was found that for 32 of the items used in the test respondents from the Catholic University of Buenos Aires scored more theocentric than respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires, while only for 7 items respondents from the Catholic University of Buenos Aires scored less theocentric than respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires. The

¹ The Catholic University of Córdoba was not compared to the National University of Córdoba, because the sample includes only 41 respondents from Córdoba.

TABLE 15. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by university attended. (Argentine sample).

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents from Catholic universities, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents attending state universities in the same town)	
	Town of:	
	Buenos Aires	Tucumán
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .47	+ .33
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .17	+ .22
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	- .06	+ .58
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .12	+ .33
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .22	- .15
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .79	+ .20
Total no. of cases:		
Catholic University	(50)	(43)
State University	(180)	(127)

respondents from the Catholic University of Buenos Aires showed more theocentrism than respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires, except for the orientation towards peers (Table 15)

The proportion of respondents with high religious involvement is greater in Catholic universities than in other universities. One might think that the differences in value orientations between respondents from one or the other type of university can be accounted for by their differences in religious involvement. However, even holding religious involvement constant, the answers of respondents from Catholic universities are closer to the theocentric pole than the answers of other respondents¹, except for the orientation towards reciprocity, as shown in Table 16.

It was expected that the association between type of university attended and value orientation would be stronger within the group with high religious involvement, according to the empirical generalization stated above: "The more strongly a given status of a person is associated with certain value orientations, the less strong will be the association between the value orientations and other statuses". Assuming that high religious involvement is strongly associated to theocentrism in value orientations, it was expected that the association between type of university attended and value orientations could not be as strong among respondents with low religious involvement. Indeed, it was found that within the group of low religious involvement respondents from Catholic universities score less theocentric than respondents from other universities for 14 of the 43 items used in the test, while within the group with high religious involvement respondents from Catholic universities score less theocentric than others for 19 of the 43 items considered.

However, Table 16 shows that, on the whole the association between type of university attended

¹ Since in Argentina we have represented three Catholic universities in the same towns where the state universities represented are located, the following comparisons will be limited to the Argentine sample. In the following comparisons respondents from Catholic universities will include those attending the Catholic universities of Tucumán (including the Instituto San José, of Santiago del Estero), Córdoba and Buenos Aires. Respondents from non Catholic universities will include those attending the National universities of Tucumán and Córdoba.

and value orientations is almost as consistent and strong for the group with low religious involvement as it is for the group with high religious involvement. This exception to the empirical generalization stated above may be partly explained as a result of the fact that the association between type of university attended and theocentrism in value orientations is fairly strong. For this reason, even respondents with high religious involvement are led in non Catholic universities to accept anthropocentric orientations towards people and towards ideas to a greater extent than do respondents with high religious involvement attending Catholic universities.

The type of geographical environment where the respondents grew up was not considered a possible explanation for the differences in value orientations

TABLE 16. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by type of university attended, holding religious involvement constant. (Argentine sample).

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents from Catholic universities, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents from state universities)	
	Among respondents with:	
	High religious involvement	Low religious involvement
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .07	+ .17
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .34	+ .10
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .28	+ .34
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .27	+ .32
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	- .18	- .01
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .38	+ .32
Total no. of cases:		
Catholic University	(60)	(76)
State University	(33)	(120)

between respondents from Catholic and other universities. Indeed, the groups of respondents which show greater theocentrism according to their ecological backgrounds are not especially highly represented in Catholic universities. Nevertheless, it was considered interesting to determine whether the association between type of university attended and value orientations increases or decreases according to the ecological background of the respondents.

It was found that within the group of highest theocentrism according to its ecological background (that is, those who grew up in rural areas) the association between type of university (Catholic or other) and value orientations is smaller than within the other ecological groups. If one considers that rural background is more strongly associated with value orientations (along with anthropocentrism-theocentrism dimension) than are other types of ecological background, one may explain this finding as another application of the empirical generalization stating that: "the more strongly a given status of a person is associated with certain value orientations, the less strong will be the association between the value orientation and other statuses" . (See Table 17).

TABLE 17. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by type of university attended, holding ecological background constant. (Argentine sample).

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents from Catholic universities, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents from state universities)			
	Considering respondents who grew up in:			
	Rural Areas	Small Towns	Medium size Towns	Large Towns
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	-.07	+.30	+.20	+.27
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+.24	+.20	+.02	+.28
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	-.22	+.20	+.58	+.32
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	.00	+.46	+.42	+.37
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+.58	+.02	+.10	-.16
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+.28	-.14	+.46	+.43
Total no. of cases:				
Catholic University	(7)	(17)	(31)	(71)
State University	(9)	(18)	(41)	(73)

CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL FACTORS

There are other elements in the position of a person in society, besides the religious factor, which are likely to show association with theocentrism or anthropocentrism in value orientations. In the following pages, an explanation will be offered of why various social, economic and political positions of the actor were considered to be association with certain theocentric or anthropocentric value orientations; and it will be shown, furthermore, with which value orientations they appear associated, according to the data collected in the present study.

Female and Male Roles, and Value Orientations

Both in Argentina and in the United States the female role is associated with values emphasizing dependence, love and devotion, while, the male role is associated with value orientations emphasizing instrumental achievement. Such difference is stated by Parsons as follows:

With all the variability of sex role from society to society, it can be said to be universally true that the adult masculine role is less implicated with detailed child care than the feminine, and is more implicated with prestige and responsibility in the wider society beyond the narrow kinship circle.

.....
A man is "worthy" to enjoy an erotic love relationship only in so far as he lives up to the general value-pattern for the masculine role in the society, as he attains requisite levels of competence, responsibility, etc.. Similarly a woman must accept her familiar role, her attachment to a fully masculine man not a mother figure, and the responsibility of socializing her children in terms of the general value system, as a condition of being loved ...¹

In other words, Parsons observes the emphasis placed on the woman's devotion to her family and dependence upon man, and the emphasis placed on the man's competence and responsibility for instrumentally relating the family with the environment (adaptive functional problem of the family).

Consequently it seems that the female role is directly associated with the theocentric orientation towards the family, while male role is directly associated with the anthropocentric major premise (emphasis on independence and instrumental achievement).

Thus it is expected that differences in sex roles will be associated with value-orientations (especially the orientation towards family relationship): female role with the theocentric pole, and male role with the anthropocentric pole.

The Findings

As expected, for 32 of the 43 items used for the comparison females tend to score more theocentric than males, among American respondents. Among Argentine respondents, for 26 of the 43 items used females tend to answer more theocentric than males.

Both among American and among Argentine females show more theocentric value orientation than do males (Table 18). However, among American respondents males score more theocentric than females in the orientation towards peers. Among Argentine respondents, males score slightly more theocentric than females in the orientation towards family relationships. This exception may be explained as a result of the fact that women in Argentina still enjoy much less independence than women in the United States or males in Argentina. As a consequence, women attending Argentine universities tend to do so reaction against their traditional dependent position.

One might think that the differences in value orientations between females and males can be explained by the higher religious involvement characteristic of females. Indeed, among females 55 per cent report high religious involvement, while among males only 25 per cent report high religious involvement, in the Argentine sample. However, even holding religious involvement constant females answer more theocentric than males (Table 19). However, religious involvement specifies the association

¹ The Social System, pp. 222, 224.

between sex roles and value orientations. Indeed: (a) within the group of low religious involvement the association is

TABLE 18. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by sex.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism mean scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of female respondents, minus mean theocentrism scores of male respondents)	
	American sample	Argentine sample
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .17	-.01
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .32	+ .03
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	-.05	+ .35
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .19	+ .09
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .06	+ .27
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .07	+ .12
Total no. of cases:		
Females	(160)	(161)
Males	(246)	(81)
Total	(406)	(242)

TABLE 19. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by sex, holding religious involvement constant. (Argentine sample only).

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism mean scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of female respondents, minus mean theocentrism scores of male respondents)	
	High Religious Involvement	Low Religious Involvement
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	-.34	-.01
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+.05	+.05
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+.06	+.33
Relation of man to his <u>fellows</u> <u>Unilateral involvement and</u> <u>reciprocity</u>	+.27	+.16
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	-.11	+.21
Total no. of cases:		
Females	(66)	(120)
Males	(26)	(75)
Total	(92)	(195)

stronger than in the total sample; (b) within the group with high religious involvement the association (between sex roles and value orientations) is weaker than in the total sample. This finding may be considered another application of the proposition formulated above, which states: The more strongly a given status of a person is associated with certain value orientations, the less strong will be the association between the value orientation and other statuses. In the same way as the varying social roles of men and women have least influence in political behavior among those who express most interest in the coming elections¹, the varying social roles of male and female respondents have least influence upon the value orientations of respondents who show highest religious involvement.

Age and Value Orientations

Most of the university students in the present study are in their late 'teens or early twenties. It is assumed that the younger students in this group are still under the effects of structural dependency upon family, teachers, et., more than are the older, and they still consider themselves dependent upon sacred authorities (God, ministers, parents) whom they were taught to respect. In this sense Child observes:

Dependent behavior is taken here as essentially synonymous with Murray's (1938) term "succorance". It refers to behavior which seems to have as its goals the obtaining of nurturance from other people, or which clearly indicates that reliance upon the help of others is the individual's dominant method of striving for his goals. Two major aspects of socialization may be distinguished here. First, dependent behavior (as distinguished from the mere fact of helplessness) seems itself to be largely an acquired mode of responding, a mode of responding which is everywhere expected in the infant and the very young child. The extent to which the individual child becomes dependent, the objects of his dependence, and so forth, are presumably a result of interaction with his social environment and hence in part a function of socialization variables during infancy and early childhood. Second, the older child and adult are everywhere expected to be less dependent than the young child.²

Parsons, who speaks about dependency as one of the "classical attributes of the infant"¹ states that "the independence necessary to an autonomous achievement orientation, the capacity for affective

¹ Lazarsfeld et al, The People's Choice, pp. 48 - 49.

² Irving L. Child, "Socialization", Handbook of Social Psychology (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1959), v. II, p. 672.

neutrality, for universalism and for functional specificity independent of the direct gratification interests of childhood" "are admittedly value-patterns of particular significance in the adult role-system of our own society".²

Consequently, within the group of students who are preparing themselves for full adult roles the older are likely to be compelled more strongly than the younger to make radical moves and efforts to assert their own independence, rebellion, originality, courage, etc.. It may be that among adults the reverse is the case. Indeed, the older are likely to attach more importance to authority and

¹ The Social System, p. 215.

² Ibid., p. 219

obedience than the younger are. They are possessors of the authority that age gives, and it is in their interest to have it respected. Nor do they feel any longer the need to demonstrate independence through radical acts, and they show less spirit of juvenile adventure and rebellion.

Consequently, within the age group considered in the present study, it was expected that younger respondents should show more theocentric value orientations than older respondents.

The Findings

The samples were divided into three groups, in order to test the association between age and value orientations.

1. Respondents born before 1941. It will be considered that these respondents are 22 years old or older.
2. Respondents born in 1941. It will be considered that they are 21 years old.
3. Respondents born after 1941. It will be considered that they are 20 years old or younger.

As expected, in both countries respondents 20 years old or younger show more theocentric value orientations than respondents 21 years old, except for the orientations towards peers in the American sample, and the orientations towards family and towards reciprocity in the Argentine sample. As expected, respondents 22 years old or older answered less theocentric than respondents 21 years old, except for the orientation towards reciprocity among Americans, and the orientations towards fellowstudents, friends and fellowmen among Argentines, as shown in table 20.

The association between young age and theocentrism is strongest for the value orientation towards ideas. Indeed, in both national samples, whether one compares 21 years old respondents with younger respondents or with older respondents, the younger consistently show more theocentrism in the value orientation towards ideas than do the older.

The association between young age and theocentrism in the value orientation towards family relationships is fairly strong. Indeed, in the American sample, whether one compares 21 years old

respondents with younger or older respondents, the young show a much more theocentric value orientation towards family relationships than the old (Table 20). In the Argentine sample comparing 21 years old respondents with older respondents, the young show a much more theocentric value orientation towards family relationships than do the old. However, comparing 21 years old respondents with younger respondents, there is practically no difference between the old and the young. Probably the reason for the finding is that the most important change of attitude towards the family does not occur in the period from 17 to 21 years, but after the 21st. year, among Argentines. On the other hand, this finding may be partly the result of the fact

TABLE 20. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by age.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism mean scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of older respondents are subtracted from mean theocentrism scores of younger respondents)	
	Comparing 21 years old respondents with older respondents	Comparing 21 years old with younger respondents
American sample		
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+.19	+.07
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+.11	+.08
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+.08	-.02
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+.11	+.06
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	-.02	+.06
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+.18	+.04
Total no. of cases:		
21 years old	(103)	(103)
Older	(159)	
Younger		(169)
Total		(431)

TABLE 20. – Continued.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism mean scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of older respondents are subtracted from mean theocentrism scores of younger respondents)	
	Comparing 21 years old respondents with older respondents	Comparing 21 years old with younger respondents
<u>Argentine sample</u>		
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+.22	.00
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	-.13	+.13
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	-.18	+.19
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	-.02	+.16
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+.29	-.05
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+.25	+.04
Total no. of cases:		
21 years old	(24)	(24)
Older	(127)	
Younger		(132)
Total		(283)

in comparing those born in 1941 with those born after 1941 one compares persons with one, two or three years difference, while in comparing those born in 1941 with those born before 1941 one compares persons representing several years of difference in age.

Apparently the strongest association between young age and theocentrism is the value orientations towards ideas and towards family relationships. This should not surprise us, since the type of submission imposed upon the child mainly emphasizes his submission to family authority, affection and loyalty, the submission to the authority of the teacher, and to the unquestionable truth of the ideas received from his parents.

The association between young age and theocentrism in the value orientation towards friendship is shown to be fairly strong among Americans, whether one compares 21 years old respondents with younger or with older respondents, and it is also fairly strong among Argentines when one compares respondents 21 years old with younger students. However, if one compares 21 years old respondents with older respondents, the older appear more theocentric than the younger, among Argentines. The reason for this exception may be the fact that in Argentina loyalty in friendship is strongly emphasized in the adult

culture, probably even more so than among children.¹

The association between young age and theocentrism in the value orientation towards fellowmen appears a fairly strong among Americans, whether one compares 21 years old respondents with younger or older respondents. Among Argentines the association is strong only when comparing 21 years old respondents with younger respondents. When comparing 21 years old respondents with older respondents, the older tend to answer in a slightly more theocentric way than do the younger. This might be partly explained by the fact that respondents from Catholic universities are more represented in the older group (54 per cent) than in the younger group (48 per cent). The questions remains, why should the influence of Catholic universities affect the orientation towards friendship more than other orientations?

Young age is not consistently associated with the theocentric value orientations towards peers and towards reciprocity.

It can be concluded that the data show a fairly strong association between young age and theocentrism in most areas, but especially in those areas which children are taught to accept more unconditionally, that is, loyalty to family and loyalty to ideas. The plausibility of this interpretation is increased when one

¹ Young people are still too idealistic to be strongly attracted by the adaptive and pragmatic advantages involve in a particularistic emphasis on friendship, while loyalty to friends is an important source of reciprocal favors in

observes that respondents from Catholic universities are more represented in the older group than in the younger group, in both countries. One would expect that if age in itself has no association to theocentrism or anthropocentrism of value orientations, the older would score more theocentric than the younger, as result of the fact that a greater proportion of the older come from Catholic universities (which have been found to score more theocentric than other universities). Consequently, it seems that the measure of the association between young age and theocentrism that we obtained is conservative.

Rural and Urban Backgrounds, and

Value Orientations

The sheer absolute size of a community has great importance for the community's social structure and values. This has been expressed by Merton as follows:

Groups or organizations of the same relative size will function differently depending upon their absolute size, ... For example, communities which have the same relative racial composition -say, with then per cent Negro and the rest white- will have sociologically different situations, depending on whether the absolute size of the community is a hundred or a hundred thousand.

.....
The concepts of absolute and relative size have been distilled from the following passage in Simmel's Sociology, and have been given a somewhat different denotation. "The structural differences among groups, that are produced by mere numerical differences, become even more evident in the roles played by certain prominent and effective members. It is obvious that a given number of such members has a different significance in a large group than in a small one. As the group changes quantitatively, the effectiveness of these members also changes. But it must be noted that this effectiveness is modified even if the number of outstanding members rises or falls in exact proportion to that of the whole group. The role of one millionaire who lives in a city of then thousand middle-class people, and the general physiognomy which that city receives from his presence, are totally different from the significance which fifty millionaires, or, rather, each of them, have for a city of 50,000 population -in spite of the fact that the numerical relation between the millionaire and his fellow citizens, which alone (it would seem) should determine that significance, has remained unchanged".¹

The problem of community size has been matter of concern to social psychologists when they characterized mass phenomena. Brown observes:

F. H. Allport (1924) and K. Young (1930) are among those who have seen that it is

¹ Op. cit., p. 313 and n. 50.

important to distinguish collectivities involving face-to-face interaction from co-acting collectivities in which individuals are placed shoulder-to-shoulder. This difference is, of course, greatly dependent on collectivity size. Miller and Dollard (1941) have expressed a belief that size is an important factor in collective behavior. Larger collectivities make better models for identification. Even such writers as Martin (1920), Freud (1922), and Strecker (1940), who equate crowd mentality with an individual psychological state like paranoia, recognize that the paranoid and the crowd have arrived at their common ground through the operation of different mechanisms. All of the specific mechanisms suggested for the crowd are related to size.¹

Riesman finds that the conditions "responsible for other-direction are affecting increasing numbers of people in the metropolitan centers of the advanced" industrial countries"². He adds that "the other-directed types are to be found among the young, in the larger cities...".³

Traditionally numerically small communities have been associated with an emphasis on interpersonal solidarity rather than organization and achievement. Durkheim observes that the increase of the division of labour in society progresses more rapidly when more individuals are in enough contact to be able to act and react upon each other. He calls such rapprochement and the active relations resulting from it moral density.⁴ Durkheim considers that the social volume (total number of members) has the same influence over division of labour as has density.⁵ He explains this as a result of the following facts: (a) in order that a function can divide itself into two exactly complementary fractions, as the nature of division of labour demands, it is indispensable that both parties keep in constant communication during the time of dissociation⁶; (b) the more similar to each other functions are, the more they have points of contact, and the more they are in danger of coming into conflict.⁷ Similar professions combat each other the more the more similar they are.⁸ Thus the increase in the absolute size of a community leads to a type

¹ Roger W. Brown, "Mass Phenomena", Handbook of Social Psychology, v. II, p. 834.

² D. Riesman, N. Glazer and R. Denney, The Lonely Crowd (Garden City, New York, Doubleday, 1953), p. 35.

³ Ibid., p. 36.

⁴ Emile Durkheim, De la division du travail social (Paris, F. Alcan, 1893), pp. 237 - 238.

⁵ Ibid., p. 240.

⁶ Ibid., p. 260.

⁷ Ibid., p. 250.

⁸ Ibid., p. 253.

of society where cohesion derives from division of labor rather than from community of beliefs and feelings.¹ The impersonality of the first type of society can be contrasted with the personal solidarity characterizing the latter, which is described by Redfield, speaking about the folk type of society:

Such a society is small, isolated, nonliterate, and homogeneous, with a strong sense of group solidarity. The ways of living are conventionalized into that coherent system which we call "a culture". Behavior is traditional, spontaneous, uncritical, and personal; ... Kinship, its relationships and institutions, are the type categories of experience and the familial group is the unit of action. The sacred prevails over the secular; the economy is one of status rather than of the market.²

It seems that large urban centers are associated with a tendency to impersonality in a world of division of labour basically oriented to the optimization of instrumental achievement. To the contrary, rural centers appear to be associated with a tendency to interpersonal solidarity and emphasis on sacred loyalties, rather than on secular achievement.

Consequently, it was expected that respondents who grew up in rural areas would tend to show more theocentric value orientations than respondents who grew up in urban centers.

The Findings

The data bear out the expectations stated above, as shown in Table 21.

¹ Ibid., p. 262.

² Robert Redfield, "The Folk Society", The American Journal of Sociology, 52 (January, 1947), p. 294.

Respondents who grew up in rural areas score more theocentric than those who grew up in towns of less than 20,000 people, except in the United States for the value orientations towards friendship, towards reciprocity and towards ideas (Table 21.)

In both countries respondents who grew up in rural areas score more theocentric than those who grew up in towns of more 20,000 people and less than 200,000 people, except in Argentine for the value orientation towards reciprocity (Table 21).

In both countries respondents who grew up in rural areas score more theocentric than those who grew up in towns of more 200,000, except for the orientations towards reciprocity and towards ideas.

It would seem that the association between rural background and theocentrism is stronger for the value orientations towards friendship, family, fellowmen and peers, than for the value orientations towards reciprocity and towards ideas, and it is especially strong in the orientation towards family relationships. This is not surprising since rural communities are more likely than others to develop the *Gemeinschaft* type of interpersonal relationships, which manifest themselves especially in solidarity with the in-group, rather than in reciprocity to strangers or in rigid commitment to ideologies.

TABLE 21. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by ecological background.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism mean scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents with rural background minus mean theocentrism scores of other respondents)		
	Towns of less than 20,000 people	Towns of more than 20,000 and less than 200,000 people	Larger towns
American sample			
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .04	+ .19	+ .09
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	- .37	+ .26	+ .14
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .02	+ .40	+ .21
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .09	+ .31	+ .20
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	- .12	+ .04	- .01
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	- .09	+ .16	- .05
Total no. of cases:			
Rural	(57)	(57)	(57)
Small town	(71)		
Medium town		(100)	
Larger town			(196)
Total	(424)		

TABLE 21. – Continued

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism mean scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents with rural background minus mean theocentrism scores of other respondents)		
	Towns of less than 20,000 people	Towns of more than 20,000 and less than 200,000 people	Larger towns
<u>Argentine sample</u>			
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+.28	+.10	+.29
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+.29	+.29	+.26
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+.58	+.58	+.33
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+.39	+.17	+.23
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+.03	-.28	-.04
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+.13	+.08	-.04
Total no. of cases:			
Rural	(16)	(16)	(16)
Small town	(35)		
Medium town		(74)	
Larger town			(146)
Total	271		

One might think that the higher theocentrism of value orientations shown by respondents with rural backgrounds may be due to the fact that respondents from Catholic universities are more represented in the group with rural background than in the other groups. However, the proportion of respondents attending Catholic universities is equal or lower in the group with rural background than it is in other groups.

It might be suggested that the theocentrism in value orientations in the group with rural background is associated with a high religious involvement. However, respondents with rural background do not show higher religious involvement than others, as shown in Table 22.

TABLE 22. -- Ecological background by religious involvement.

Ecological background	Proportion of respondents with high religious involvement. (% en each group)			
	American sample		Argentine sample	
	%	N	%	N
Rural	42	(23)	25	(4)
Towns of less than 20,000 people	46	(33)	34	(12)
Towns of more than 20,000 people and less than 200,000 people	30	(30)	36	(27)
Larger towns	38	(75)	29	(42)

Socio-economic Status and

Value Orientations

The lower classes have been found to have a greater tendency than the upper classes towards religious and political extremism, rigidity and dogmatism in their values. In this regards Lipset observes:

Many observers have called attention to a connection between low social status and fundamentalist or chiliastic religion. This suggests that extremist religion is a product of the same social forces that sustain authoritarian political attitudes. The liberal Protestant churches, on the other hand, have been predominantly middle class in membership. In the United States, this has created a dilemma for the liberal Protestant clergy, who have tended to be liberal in their politics as well as their religion and, hence, have often wanted to spread their social and religious gospel among the lower strata. But they have found that these classes want ministers who will preach of hell-fire and salvation rather than modern Protestant theology.

In the early period of the Socialist movement, Engels observed that early Christianity and the revolutionary workers' movement had "notable points of resemblance", particularly in their millennial appeals and lower-class base. Recently, Elmer Clark, a student of small sects in contemporary America, has noted that much sects, like early Christianity, "originate mainly among the religiously neglected poor". He writes ... "Premillenarianism is essentially a defense mechanism of the disinherited; despairing of obtaining substantial blessing through social processes, they turn on the world which has withheld its benefits and look to its destruction in a cosmic cataclysm which will exalt them and cast down the rich and powerful".

.....
The point here is that rigid fundamentalism and dogmatism are linked to the same underlying characteristics, attitudes, and predispositions which find another outlet in allegiance to extremist political movements ... Sven Rydenfelt ... concluded ... : "The Communists and the religious radicals, as for instance, the Pentecostal

sects, seem to be competing for the allegiance of the same groups".¹

Such a tendency in the values of the lower classes is associated with the theocentric major premise, in so far as it involves a rigid and dogmatic orientation towards a compensation derived from other-worldly values (religious extremism). On the other hand, it also might lead to an association with the anthropocentric major premise in so far as lower class groups may decide to find the means for their exaltation in this life and in this world, through drastic changes in society (political extremism).

In the present study it has been assumed that the otherworldly element of lower class extremism is stronger than the this-worldly element, if one considers respondents with similar political and religious identification. Indeed, it is considered that generally the lower classes have little hope of "obtaining substantial blessings through social processes"², and consequently they turn away from achievement goals and achievement expectations, and orient themselves to other-worldly and magical hopes, which seem closer to their reach. Consequently lower classes would tend to accept the theocentric major premise and value orientations more than upper classes. This expectation seems supported by Hyman's observations:

Achievement in any realm is dependent upon two factors; the possession of both the necessary ability and the motivation to reach the goal. Ability is of course limited by socially imposed barriers to training and lack of channels to given types of positions. However, ability may also be retarded by lack of individual striving to obtain whatever training in turn is instrumental to economic advancement.

Consequently if we find that both motivation to advance to high positions and to obtain the training which is instrumental in achieving such positions are reduced in the lower class individual we shall have established our hypothesis.

.....
It is clear that whatever measure of stratification is employed the lower groups emphasis college training much less.

.....
A variety of data suggest that the lower class individual holds values of such a nature as to reduce his striving towards those ends which would result in his moving up the class structure.

.....
Beliefs in Opportunity. This pattern of reduced personal aspirations and reduced appeal of valence of given occupations among the lower classes seems to derive from the perception of reality that the lower classes have. The goals of all individuals are governed to some extent by the

¹ Seymour M. Lipset, Political Man (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1963), pp. 97 - 100.

² Ibid.

appraisal of reality. Since a variety of data indicate that the poor are more aware of their lack of opportunity, presumably they would set their goals in the light of such beliefs.¹

McClelland also observes the lower classes' failure to orient themselves to instrumental achievement, expressing that working classes are normally low in n achievement.² McClelland also observes:

Social class is a much more important determinant of n achievement score than is ethnicity (or religion plus ethnicity).³

This lack of instrumental orientation to achievement suggests that low class status is associated with the acceptance of the theocentric major premise.

In the present study those American respondents whose father did not attend college are considered of lower class, and the other are considered of higher socio-economic status. Argentine respondents whose father finished high school are considered of higher class, and the rest are considered of lower class.

The Findings

Among both Americans and Argentines low socio-economic status is associated with theocentric orientation towards friendship and family relationships. However, contrary to what was expected, low socio-economic status is associated with anthropocentric value orientations toward unilateral involvement and towards ideas. In the areas of orientation towards fellowman and peers, low socio-economic status appears associated with the theocentric pole among American respondents and with the anthropocentric pole among Argentine respondents. As a whole low socio-economic status shows a stronger association with theocentric orientations among Americans, and a stronger association with anthropocentric

¹ Herbert H. Hyman: "The Value System of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification", in Class, Status and Power, R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, ed. (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1953), pp. 429 - 437.

² Op. cit., p. 235.

³ Op. cit., p. 363.

orientations among Argentine respondents (Table 23).

TABLE 23. – Theocentrism in value orientations by socio-economic status.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents with low socio-economic status minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents of high socio-economic status)	
	American sample	Argentine sample
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .04	+ .04
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .01	+ .08
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .10	- .14
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .04	- .17
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	- .01	- .07
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	- .01	- .12
Total no. of cases:		
Low socio-economic status	(236)	(162)
High socio-economic status	(205)	(125)

In the American sample, where low socio-economic status respondents answer more theocentric than high socio-economic status respondents, we find that respondents from Catholic universities and respondents with high religious involvement are more represented in the low socio-economic group than in the high socio-economic group (Tables 24 and 25).

In the Argentine sample, where the low socio-economic status respondents answer less theocentric than high socio-economic status respondents, we find that it is in the higher classes that respondents from Catholic universities and respondents of high religious involvement are more represented (Tables 24 and 25).

The above findings would indicate that the socio-economic group in which the proportion of respondents of high religious involvement, or of those enrolled in Catholic universities is higher, is the group that will show more theocentric value orientations, be it the high socio-economic status group (Argentine sample) or the low socio-economic status group (American sample). This would mean that the differences found between different socio-economic statuses is not associated with differences in socio-economic status, but rather with the proportion of respondents of high religious involvement or from Catholic universities included in each socio-economic group.

TABLE 24. -- Socio-economic status by type of university, in the Argentine sample.

Type of university attended	Socio-economic status	
	Low	High
Catholic universities	42	52
State universities	<u>58</u>	<u>48</u>
Total respondents	100	100
No. of cases	(162)	(123)

TABLE 25. -- Socio-economic status by religious involvement in the Argentine sample.

Religious involvement	Socio-economic status	
	Low	High
High religious involvement	28	38
Low religious involvement	<u>72</u>	<u>62</u>
Total respondents	100	100
No. of cases	(162)	(123)

Indeed, in both national samples, holding religious involvement constant, the differences in value orientations between respondents of high and low socio-economic status cease to be consistent (Tables 26 and 27).

In the American sample (in which low socio-economic status was found above to be associated with theocentric value orientations, except for the orientations towards reciprocity and towards ideas) we find that: (a) among respondents with high religious involvement, low socio-economic status is associated with the anthropocentric orientations towards peers, friends, reciprocity and fellowmen; (b) among respondents with low religious involvement, low socio-economic status is associated with the anthropocentric orientations towards family and ideas.

In the Argentine sample (in which low socio-economic status was found above to be associated with anthropocentric value orientations, except for the orientations towards friends and towards family relationships) we find that: (a) low socio-economic status is associated to the theocentric orientations towards family, friends and reciprocity among respondents with high religious involvement; (b) low socio-economic status is associated to the theocentric orientations towards family , ideas and fellowmen, among respondents with low

TABLE 26. – Theocentrism in value orientations by socio-economic status, holding religious involvement constant, in the American sample.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents of low socio-economic status minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents of high socio-economic status)	
	High religious involvement	Low religious involvement
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .06	- .07
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	- .08	+ .08
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	- .18	+ .46
Relation of man to his <u>fellows</u>	.00	+ .16
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	- .24	+ .04
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .05	- .13
Total no. of cases:		
Low socio-economic status	(100)	(131)
High socio-economic status	(66)	(139)

TABLE 27. – Theocentrism in value orientations by socio-economic status, holding religious involvement constant, in the Argentine sample.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents of low socio-economic status minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents of high socio-economic status)	
	High religious involvement	Low religious involvement
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .17	+ .03
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	- .10	.00
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	- .04	- .12
Relation of man to his <u>fellows</u>	+ .03	- .16
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	- .17	+ .01
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .10	- .14
Total no. of cases:		
Low socio-economic status	(45)	(104)
High socio-economic status	(47)	(64)

religious involvement.¹

These findings suggest that low socio-economic status leads to low religious involvement in Argentina and to high religious involvement in the United States, and that religious involvement is an intervening variable serving to interpret the relationship between socio-economic status and value orientations (theocentric or anthropocentric). Indeed, in Latin American countries the Catholic Church is increasingly worried by the working classes' alienation from the church, while in the United States Catholicism is strongest in the working classes.²

Only future studies with better sampling resources can determine to what extent the association between low socio-economic status and religious involvement (high among Argentine respondents; low among American respondents) is a peculiarity of our sample or is a characteristic of the American and Argentine university populations as a whole.

Meanwhile one can go further into the sampling composition to determine

¹ The analysis is not pursued further, because social class does not appear consistently related with the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension of value orientation.

² G. Lenski finds that the working classes are represented more among Catholics than among Jews or Protestants, and the middle classes are represented less among Catholics than among Jews or Protestants (respondents from Detroit). He also observes that the comparison of his findings with findings in previous surveys suggests (in Lenski's findings) "some overestimate of the proportion of Catholics in the middle class and some underestimate of their proportion in the working class, since in previous years the figure for middle-class Catholic families was usually closer to one third than two fifths". *Op. cit.*, p. 81.

if the difference in value orientations found in the different socio-economic strata of university students is associated with their political affiliation, especially in Argentina, where political affiliations strongly associated with religious involvement and with value orientations. Respondents in the extreme political left show low religious involvement and anthropocentric value orientations. Christian Democrats show high religious involvement and theocentric value orientations. However, the proportion of respondents identifying themselves with Left wing political parties is about the same in both socio-economic groups (high and low socio-economic status); and the proportion of respondents identifying themselves with the Christian Democrat party is also about the same in both socio-economic groups (Table 28).

Consequently, it would seem that the differences in value orientation between high and low socio-economic status groups would be explained by differentials in religious involvement rather than by differences in political affiliation. However, holding political affiliation constant, it results that political affiliation specifies the relationship between socio-economic status and value orientations. Indeed, if one considers the group identified with political parties on the Left, or the group identified with Christian Democrats, low socio-economic status appears associated with anthropocentrism of value orientations, except for the orientation towards ideas among Demochristians, and the

TABLE 28. – Political orientation by socio-economic status, in the Argentine sample.

Political Orientation	Socio-economic status	
	Low	High
Leftists parties	25	24
"Radical" parties	32	36
Christian Democrats	<u>42</u>	<u>40</u>
Total respondents	100	100
No. of cases	(99)	(78)

orientation towards family relationship and fellowmen among Leftists. If one considers the group identified with the Radical political parties, low socio-economic status appears associated with theocentrism of value orientations, except for the orientations towards friends and towards fellowmen (Table 29).

The above findings means that within groups high in theocentric value orientations (Christian Democrats) or high in anthropocentric value orientations (Leftists) low socio-economic status is associated with anthropocentrism in value orientations (Radicals) low socio-economic status is associated with theocentrism in value orientation.

Why does political identification specifies in this way the relationship between socio-economic status and value-orientations? It is hoped that future studies will explain this striking finding. Meanwhile one may explain it in the following way: Christian Democrats and Leftists are more concerned with social reform and social change than "Radicals" are. Respondents of high socio-economic status (even if they are Christian Democrats or Leftists) still have much of their affectivity and interests invested in the existing society, and they are reluctant to break sharply with traditional loyalties. When respondents of low socio-economic status accept the status quo (mainly represented by the traditional Radical parties) they tend to show high respect for traditional loyalties. But once they become advocates of reform and change (Leftist
or

TABLE 27. – Theocentrism in value orientations by socio-economic status, holding political orientations constant (Argentine sample).

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents of low socio-economic status minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents of high socio-economic status)		
	Political orientation:		
	Christian Democrat	Radical	Leftist
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	-.01	+.26	+.22
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	-.11	-.10	-.22
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	-.10	+.11	-.35
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	-.38	-.07	-.10
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	-.10	+.04	-.19
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+.12	+.16	-.25
Total no. of cases:			
Low SES	(42)	(32)	(25)
High SES	(31)	(28)	(19)

Christian Democrats), they tend to break sharply with traditions which are associated with the privileges from which they were formerly (and still are in most of the cases) excluded. On the other hand, their new status as university students makes this break with a tradition that they feel they have left behind, easier for them.

According to the explanation given, the finding reported above would be an application of Lipset's statement quoted above:

Rigid fundamentalism and dogmatism are linked to the same underlying characteristics, attitudes, and predispositions which find another outlet in allegiance to extremist political movements.¹

In other words, lower class respondents seem to fluctuate between rigid conformism to traditional dogmas and norms (respondents in the "Radical" parties), or sharp rejection of traditional norms (respondents in the Christian Democrat or Leftist parties).

¹ Political Man, p. 100.

Career Plans and

Value Orientations

The occupational choice of a person is closely associated with his values. As Morris Rosenberg states:

The college student who makes an occupational choice is projecting his vision into the long future. He knows that the freshest and most alert hours of his waking life will be spent at his work.¹

Rosenberg observes that "various occupations have certain technical or structural imperatives which permit the satisfaction of particular values"² He reports:

The members of our nationwide cross-section of college students were presented with a list of occupational values and were told to "consider to what extent a job or career would satisfy each of these requirements before you could consider it IDEAL".³

Rosenberg calls the attitude shown by students selection "opportunity to work with people rather than things" and "opportunity to be helpful to others" as requirements for an ideal job or career a "people-oriented" value complex. He calls the attitude shown by students selecting "chance to earn a good deal of money" and "give me social status and prestige" as requirements for an ideal job or career the "extrinsic-reward-oriented" value complex.⁴

Rosenberg ranks various types of occupational plans giving to each of them a weighted average score on "people-oriented" value complex, and a weighted average score on "extrinsic-reward-oriented" value complex.⁵ We combined both averages given by Rosenberg, by subtracting the weighted average score of "extrinsic-reward-oriented" value complex from the weighted average score on "people-oriented" value complex. It resulted that the two career orientations which most strongly combine an emphasis on the "people-oriented" value complex and a de-emphasis of the "extrinsic-reward-oriented" value complex,

¹ Occupations and Values, (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957), p. 10.

² Ibid., p. 17.

³ Ibid., p. 10.

⁴ Ibid., p. 11.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 18, 19.

are social work (4.00) and teaching (2.10), followed by medicine (1.54), social science (1.48) and government (.86).

Social work and teaching involve a special emphasis on being helpful to other people and a special disinterest for instrumental achievement, providing little opportunity for quick economic advancement. Rosenberg observes:

The relationship of the social worker, and teacher, to the people with whom they primarily deal, tends to be a helpful one; the relationship of the advertising-public relations, business, and sales-promotion occupational incumbents to the people with whom they deal, tends to be an exploitative one (in a value-neutral sense). In other words, members of the former group of occupations are chiefly oriented towards helping or improving others, members of the latter group are oriented either to getting something from others or toward getting others to behave in a manner which promotes the interests of the occupational incumbent.¹

¹ Occupational Values and Occupational Choice, (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dep. of Sociology, Columbia University), p. 85.

As a consequence of such considerations, it was decided to divide respondents into two groups: (a) those planning to enter teaching or social work. The type of values associated with their professional choices seem close to what has been defined in the present study as theocentric major premise and theocentric orientation towards man. Indeed, they attach little importance to achievement goals and instrumental considerations, while emphasizing the importance of devoting themselves to people; (b) those planning to enter medicine, business, the army, research, art, law, technical occupation, and other occupations.

There is a fairly large number of respondents planning to enter teaching or social work in the samples used for the present study. Indeed, 37 per cent of the American sample and 44 per cent in the Argentine sample plan to enter teaching or social work.

It was expected that respondents planning to enter teaching or social work would show more theocentric value orientations than respondents planning to enter medicine, business, army, art, law, technical occupations and other occupations.

The Findings

In the American sample, as expected, respondents who plan to enter teaching or social work show more theocentric value orientations than others, except for the orientation towards reciprocity (unilateral involvement), for which there is almost no difference between both groups (Table 28).

However, in the Argentine sample respondents planning to enter teaching or social work show less theocentrism than others in the value orientations towards friendship, family relationships and ideas, and they show more theocentrism than others in the value orientations towards peers, reciprocity and fellowmen (Table 28).

The findings in the Argentine sample may be explained by the fact that respondents from Catholic universities are less represented among those planning to enter teaching or social work (37 per cent of

them attend Catholic universities), than among those planning to enter other occupations (56 per cent of them attend Catholic universities).

Although among Argentine respondents, those planning to enter teaching or social work come in a much larger proportion from non-Catholic universities, than those planning to enter other occupations, nevertheless, the first group does not show less theocentrism in value orientations than the second group. This finding suggests that teaching and social work career plans are associated with theocentrism in value orientations even in the Argentine sample, to the extent that they balance the anthropocentric influence resulting from the fact that relatively few respondents planning to enter teaching or social work in our sample attend Catholic universities.

TABLE 28. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by career plans.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents planning to enter teaching of social work, minus the mean theocentrism scores of other respondents)	
	American sample	Argentine sample
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .15	-.03
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .10	-.06
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .10	+ .06
Relation of man to his <u>fellows</u>	+ .17	+ .15
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	.00	+ .04
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .05	-.05
Total no. of cases		
Respondents planning to enter teaching or social work	(164)	(127)
Other respondents	(241)	(159)

TABLE 29. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by career plans, holding type of university constant (Argentine sample).

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents planning to enter teaching of social work, minus the mean theocentrism scores of other respondents)	
	Type of university attended:	
	Catholic universities	State universities
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .18	-.04
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	-.05	+.04
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+.33	+.12
Relation of man to his <u>fellows</u>	+.10	+.12
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	-.03	+.19
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+.30	+.10
Total no. of cases		
Respondents planning to enter teaching or social work	(47)	(79)
Other career plans	(77)	(60)

In order to test this explanation, respondents planning to enter teaching or social work were compared with other respondents in the Argentine group, holding type of university constant. As expected, it resulted that both in the Catholic universities and in other universities respondents planning to enter teaching or social work showed more theocentrism in value orientation, except for the orientations towards friendship and reciprocity in Catholic universities, and the orientation towards family relationships in non-Catholic universities (Table 29).¹

Indoctrination in Modern Psychology and Value Orientations

A large sector of modern psychological study attempts a mechanical and biological explanation of the whole idea of sacredness, loyalty and altruistic orientation. Freud states in 1915:

We believe that civilization has been built up, under the pressure of the struggle for existence, by sacrifices in gratification of the primitive impulses, and that it is to a great extent forever being recreated, as each individual, successively joining the community, repeats the sacrifice of his instinctive pleasures for the common good. The sexual are amongst the most important of the instinctive forces thus utilized: they are in this way sublimated, that is to say, their energy is turned aside from its sexual goal and diverted toward other ends, no longer sexual and socially more valuable. But the structure thus built up is insecure, for the sexual impulses are with difficulty controlled; in each individual who takes up his part in the work of civilization there is a danger that a rebellion of the sexual impulses may occur, against this diversion of their energy.² (Italics mine).

The motivations and minds of persons have been described in terms of psycho-biological mechanisms, rather than in terms of heroism, noble feelings and high virtues. Berelson reports:

Less formal (and usually nonquantitative) studies of fictional materials to reconstruct the personality structure of the author have been based primarily on psychoanalytic categories. Assuming that the writer cannot fail to express deepest feelings in his art crayons, the analyst proceeds to uncover them by attention to allegedly revealing particulars in the fictional works themselves.

¹ Among respondents attending Catholic universities the association between teaching or social work career plans is stronger (although less consistent) than among respondents attending state universities.

² Sigmund Freud, A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis. (New York: Permabooks, 1953), p. 27.

The novels of Charlotte Brontë show evidence of an Oedipus theme; the chief concern of her sister Emily was with the emotional relations of children. Charlotte's novels, with their decrease of subjectivity and reduction of conflict, indicate a process of emotional integration which Emily did not achieve (Mc Curcy, 1947). The latent fascism of Knut Hamsun was betrayed by the authoritarianism of his novels, the acceptance of natural forces as unchangeable, the combination of brutality and sentimentalism, the motherly and housewifely role ascribed to women, the importance of the law of rhythm (Lowenthal, 1949). The novels of D. H. Lawrence reveal three stages of sexual development -Oedipal relations to his mother in the early novels, then homosexual relations, and finally the achievement of heterosexual relations (Mc Curdy, 1939). Dostoevsky's treatment of women in his novels reveals his oral character structure and his aggressiveness toward women (Kanzer, 1948). Charles Kingsley's Water Babies constitutes a renunciation of the psychological process of procreation and indicates his need for purification (Deutsch, 1947).¹

This trend towards depriving the motivation of people of sacred and heroic elements, emphasizing instead pathological phenomena and psycho-biological mechanisms, has been described by Sorokin in speaking about the shift from "Ideational" to "Sensate" art.

Another symptom of the nature of a culture mentality is found in the kind of heroes depicted by its literary works. In the first period -the Ideational- of painting, sculpture, music, and literature, the heroes were God Himself, other superhuman beings (the Madonna, the Holy Ghost, the apostles and saints), and a number of absolute values. In the Idealistic period, the personages were semi deified heroes: great knights and other incarnations of the positive values of empirical and semi empirical reality. After the fourteenth century their place is taken by the common run of people, by merchants, servants, peasants, polished courtiers, artisans, and what not; by rogues, criminals, prostitutes, failures, derelicts, and the wretched; by pathological types; by murderers, swindlers, exploiters, hypocrites, scoundrels, profligates, idiots, morons.

.....
 Any careful reader of present-day writing can but agree with the following statements: "from the seventeenth century on, most of the heroes of literature are either pathological or are on their way to becoming such..."

.....
 "The persons of the realistic novel and the theater of our times do not fare better than Shakespearean heroes. These are also maladies, vice, passion, virtue itself being, according to the materialistic doctrine, a mere consequence of a certain nervous situation ..." Psychology is reduced to pathology, and psychological anatomy replaces the ancient moral anatomy ... Each personage has his own "neurosis" his own ulcer; and each limps somewhat ... One can see at once where they come from: they escaped one fine night from the insane asylum (la cour des Miracles).¹

A popularized version of Freudian psychology emphasizes, along the same lines, the pathological and non-rational aspects of human motivation, deemphasizing the objectivity of the imperatives of moral

¹ "Content Analysis", in the Handbook of Social Psychology, v. I, p. 500.

obligation and virtues. This version is quite influential in modern psychology. Man becomes a bunch of mechanisms which can be manipulated by psychiatrists, social workers, planners, public relation and advertising techniques; he is no longer seen as a primarily morally responsible being deserving rewards or punishment according to his faults and merits.

The conception of man emphasized in the main stream of contemporary psychology appears in conflict with the theocentric major premise, which places the value of man and his actions in the spiritual purity of his intentions, oriented towards sacred objects. Consequently, it was expected that respondents who are highly expose to or indoctrinated by modern psychology, would tend to show less theocentric value orientations than others.

In order to determine the extent to which respondents were exposed to contemporary psychology they were asked:

Have you taken any course in psychology or engaged in extensive reading in psychology?

Respondents answering "yes" were considered highly exposed to psychology; respondents answering "no" were considered as having low exposure to contemporary psychology.

The Findings

As expected, both in the American and in the Argentine samples, the respondents with more exposure to academic psychology show less theocentric value orientations than the respondents with less exposure to academic psychology, except for the value orientation towards friendship among Americans, and the value orientation towards reciprocity among Argentines. The differences are especially strong in the value orientations towards family, towards ideas and towards fellowmen (Table 30).

However, holding constant the type of university attended, it was found: (a) among respondents attending a non-Catholic university high exposure to psychology is associated to theocentrism for all value

¹ Op. cit., vol. I, pp. 642 - 644.

orientations: (b) among respondents attending a Catholic university, high exposure to psychology is associated to anthropocentrism in value orientations, except for the orientation towards family relationships (Table 31). Thus one can say that "type of university" attended has a specifying function in relation to the association between exposure to psychology and value orientations: if the university is Catholic exposure to psychology is associated to theocentrism; if the university is not Catholic exposure to psychology is associated to anthropocentrism.

The above finding may be explained as follows: Studies in psychology are more closely associated with the ideology and ethics of the university attended, than other studies are. To study psychology in a Catholic university is to be doubly exposed to the theocentric influence of the university; indeed, one is exposed to this influence not only as an ordinary student, but one is exposing

TABLE 29. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by exposure to psychology, holding type of university attended constant (American sample).

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents least exposed to academic psychology, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents most exposed to academic psychology) Considering respondents attending:	
	Catholic University	Other University
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .13	+ .08
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	- .02	+ .03
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	- .02	+ .14
Relation of man to his <u>fellows</u>	- .65	+ .11
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	- .35	+ .14
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	- .10	+ .17
Total no. of cases		
Exposed to psychology	(70)	(192)
Non exposed	(53)	(91)

oneself precisely in a subject (psychology) in which the influence of the university is strongest.

Conversely, in non Catholic universities the teaching of psychology is more likely to follow the trend (explained above) of explaining empirically the ideas of sacredness, sanctity, heroism, virtue, altruism, etc., as psycho-biological mechanisms or as pathological phenomena.

The fact that in Catholic universities the type of psychology taught is influenced by the traditional Catholic philosophy, and relatively less influenced by modern Freudian psychology, should have been taken into account in the construction of our questionnaire. Indeed, in order to specify the independent influences of Freudian psychology and traditional Catholic psychology, it would have been necessary that the respondents specify if they are exposed to Freudian psychology or to other type of psychology.

However, even with the present construction of the questionnaire the findings are interesting in as far as they suggest a definitive relation between value orientations and studies of psychology.

Relationships among the Friends
of the Respondent, and
Value Orientations

The more harmonious the relationships among a person's close associates, the more they will provide psychological security for that person, making possible a type of social relationships close to what Toennies called Gemeinschaft, with high solidarity and consensus on certain sacred loyalties and values.

Homans observes:

At the level of the tribe, the village, the small group, at the level, that is, of a social unit (no matter what name we call it by) each of whose members can have some firsthand knowledge of each of the others, human society, for many millennia longer than written history, has been able to cohere.¹

On the contrary, whenever a person's associates are apart from each other, they are likely to make conflicting demands upon the person, emphasizing contradictory values and loyalties, leading the individual to insecurity and skepticism. Merton observes:

It is possible, for example, that when several membership groups exert diverse and conflicting pressures for self-appraisal, the individual tends to adopt other, non-membership groups as a frame of reference. In any event, there arises the large and imperfectly defined problem, previously alluded to, of searching out the processes of coming to terms with such conflicting pressures ... Thus, a study of political behavior found that individuals, under cross-pressure, were more likely to delay their final vote decision. And as the senior author goes to say: "But such delay is not the only possible reaction. Other alternatives range all the way from individual neurotic reactions, such as an inability to make any decision at all, to intellectual solutions which might lead to new movements ...".²

Having a cohesive group of friends would stimulate individuals to feel strongly about their loyalties, protecting them from insecurity, relativism and skepticism. Furthermore, an individual who feels strongly committed to his friends would judge it important to bring them together in order to share with each of them his other friends. For this reason, it seems that forming a group with one's friends is associated with the acceptance of the theocentric major premise, and of the theocentric value orientation

¹ George C. Homans, The Human Group, (New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1950), p. 454.

² Op. cit., p. 244 and note.

towards friendship.

Consequently, individuals forming a cohesive group with their friends are expected to show more theocentric value orientations than others.

In order to determine the degree of cohesion among the respondent and his friends, he was asked:

"How close are relationships among your 'friends'?

... We form a group.

... They are in different groups to which I belong.

... We don't form any group".

Respondents checking the first, second, or third alternatives, were considered as having high, medium or low cohesion with their friends, respectively.

The Findings

In the American sample, as expected, (1) respondents reporting high cohesion with friends show more theocentric value orientations than respondents with low primary group cohesion, except for the orientation towards peers; (2) respondents with high cohesion with friends show more theocentric orientation than respondents with medium cohesion, except for the orientation towards friendship (for which there is no difference); (3) respondents with medium cohesion with friends show more theocentric value orientations than respondents with low cohesion, except in their orientation towards fellowmen and orientation towards peers; (4) the four exceptions noticed involve only a small difference (.02) or no difference; (5) the association between high cohesion with friends and theocentrism is particularly strong in the value orientations towards family relationships and towards ideas (see Table 32).

In the Argentine sample, as expected: (1) respondents reporting high cohesion with friends show more theocentric value orientations than those reporting low cohesion with friends, except in the orientation towards peers; (2) respondents reporting high cohesion with friends show more theocentric value orientations than those reporting medium cohesion with friends, except for the orientations towards friendship, towards ideas and towards fellowmen; (3) respondents reporting medium cohesion with friends show more theocentric

TABLE 32. – Theocentrism in value orientations, and cohesion among friends.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents with higher cohesion with their friends, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents with lower cohesion with their friends)		
	Comparing respondents reporting:		
	High and low cohesion	High and medium cohesion	Medium and low cohesion
American sample			
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .25	-.04	+.21
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .16	.00	+.16
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	-.02	+.02	-.02
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .05	+.09	.00
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .02	+.02	+.02
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .05	+.09	.00
Total no. of cases:			
High cohesion	(150)	(150)	
Medium cohesion		(129)	(129)
Low cohesion	(151)		(151)

TABLE 32. – Continued.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents with higher cohesion with their friends, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents with lower cohesion with their friends)		
	Comparing respondents reporting:		
	High and low cohesion	High and medium cohesion	Medium and low cohesion
	Argentine sample		
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .12	+ .07	+ .04
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .09	- .02	+ .14
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	- .01	+ .04	- .05
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	.00	- .09	+ .10
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .34	+ .04	+ .34
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .16	- .16	+ .32
Total no. of cases:			
High cohesion	(87)	(87)	
Medium cohesion		(77)	(77)
Low cohesion	(117)		(117)

value orientations than those reporting low cohesion, except for the orientation towards peers; (4) the association between high cohesion with friends and theocentrism is particularly strong in the value orientations towards family relationships and towards reciprocity (see Table 32).

Considering both national samples, high cohesion with friends is most strongly associated to theocentrism in the value orientations towards family relationships, suggesting the importance of the relationships between the positions of a person in relation to his family and to his friends.

Considering both the American and the Argentine samples, one finds that the association between high cohesion with friends and theocentrism in value orientations is stronger when comparing respondents with low cohesion with respondents with high or with medium cohesion, than for the comparison between respondents of high and medium cohesion (Table 32). This suggests that the greatest difference in value orientations lies between respondents forming groups (one or several) with their friends, and respondents not forming any group with them.

Respondents with high religious involvement are found in greater proportion among those with high cohesion with their friends than among those with medium or low cohesion with their friends, although the difference is not large (Table 35).

In order to determine to what extent the more theocentric orientation of those with greatest cohesion with friends is associated with their greater religious involvement, the responses of groups with high, medium and low integration with their friends were compared with each other, holding religious involvement constant.

Even controlling for religious involvement, respondents with higher cohesion with friends show on the whole more theocentric value orientations than respondents with lower cohesion with their friends, as shown in Table 36. However, the differences do not appear as consistent as when the comparison was made without holding religious involvement constant, suggesting that the original differences in value orientations reported in Table 34 were partly associated with the difference in religious involvement

between groups differing in primary group cohesion.

Holding religious involvement constant in the Argentine sample, the association between high cohesion with friends and theocentrism of value orientations appears stronger in the group with low religious involvement than in the group with high religious involvement. This finding can be explained as another application of the empirical generalization which was stated above in the following terms: The more strongly a given status of a person is associated with certain value orientations, the less strong will be the association between

TABLE 35. – Proportion of respondents with high religious involvement, for different degrees of cohesion among friends.

Cohesion among friends	(% en each group)			
	American sample		Argentine sample	
	%	N	%	N
High cohesion (respondents from a group with their friends)	42	(63)	36	(31)
Medium cohesion (respondents belong to different groups to which their friends belong)	40	(51)	35	(27)
Low cohesion (respondent do not form any group with their friends)	34	(51)	27	(32)

TABLE 36. – Relationship between theocentrism in value orientations, and cohesion among friends, holding religious involvement constant.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents with higher cohesion with their friends, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents with lower cohesion with their friends)		
	Comparing respondents reporting:		
	High and medium cohesion	High and low cohesion	Medium and low cohesion
American sample - high religious involvement			
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+.05	+.15	+.17
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	-.02	+.19	+.14
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	-.03	-.04	-.02
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+.16	+.14	-.14
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+.03	+.26	+.08
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	-.01	.00	+.01
Total no. of cases:			
High cohesion	(63)	(63)	
Medium cohesion	(51)		(51)
Low cohesion		(50)	(50)

TABLE 36. – Continued.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents with higher cohesion with their friends, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents with lower cohesion with their friends)		
	Comparing respondents reporting:		
	High and medium cohesion	High and low cohesion	Medium and low cohesion
<u>American sample - low religious involvement</u>			
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .01	+ .21	+ .20
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .01	+ .16	+ .15
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .05	- .02	- .08
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	- .06	- .02	+ .02
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	- .03	- .06	- .01
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .01	+ .22	+ .21
Total no. of cases:			
High cohesion	(87)	(87)	
Medium cohesion	(78)		(78)
Low cohesion		(101)	(101)

TABLE 36. - Continued.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents with higher cohesion with their friends, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents with lower cohesion with their friends)		
	Comparing respondents reporting:		
	High and medium cohesion	High and low cohesion	Medium and low cohesion
<u>Argentine sample - high religious involvement</u>			
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .03	+ .17	+ .06
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	- .15	- .02	+ .11
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	- .16	- .52	- .37
Relation of man to his <u>fellows</u>	- .20	+ .10	+ .29
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .20	+ .56	+ .36
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	- .15	- .15	+ .35
Total no. of cases:			
High cohesion	(31)	(31)	
Medium cohesion	(27)		(27)
Low cohesion		(32)	(32)

TABLE 36. – Continued.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents with higher cohesion with their friends, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents with lower cohesion with their friends)		
	Comparing respondents reporting:		
	High and medium cohesion	High and low cohesion	Medium and low cohesion
<u>Argentine sample - low religious involvement</u>			
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .11	+ .09	+ .09
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .04	+ .12	+ .10
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	.00	+ .08	+ .08
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	- .11	- .13	- .02
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .01	+ .28	+ .27
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	- .14	+ .12	+ .27
Total no. of cases:			
High cohesion	(56)	(56)	
Medium cohesion	(50)		(50)
Low cohesion		(85)	(85)

the value orientation and other statuses. Indeed, among respondents with high religious involvement, the association between value orientations and other social characteristics (such as cohesion with friends) cannot be as strong as among respondents with low religious involvement.

This is a case of "specification" in which since the specifying variable (religious involvement) is associated with the independent variable (cohesion with friends), holding the specifying variable constant has a double effect: (a) both partial relations are smaller than the original relation between cohesion with friends and value orientations (religious involvement is an "interpretative factor" linking value orientations with cohesion with friends); (b) one of the partial relationships is larger (and the other smaller) than what the original relationship would be if one discounted the effect of religious involvement (religious involvement) specifies under which conditions the association is strongest).¹

However, holding religious involvement constant in the American sample, we find that the association between primary group cohesion and theocentrism in value orientations does not appear stronger within the group with low religious involvement. This throws doubts on the value of the

¹ The mixture of specification with interpretation leads to this modification of Lazarsfeld's assertion (referred to as specification) that "one of the two partials will necessarily be larger than the original relationship" ("Evidence and Inference ...", p. 120).

interpretation gives to the results obtained for the Argentine sample (Table 36).

However, if we look more closely at Table 36, we discover more similitudes than differences in the American and Argentine figures. Indeed, we see that in both the American and the Argentine samples: (a) the association between high cohesion with friends and theocentrism in the value orientations towards fellowmen and reciprocity is strongest among respondents with high religious involvement. The main differences between the American and the Argentine figures lies in the fact that the associations are stronger in the Argentine sample than in the American sample.

Why are the theocentric value orientations towards fellowmen and towards reciprocity more strongly associated with high primary group cohesion among respondents with high religious involvement than among respondent with low religious involvement? Probably this exception to the empirical generalization stated above may be explained as a result of the fact that respondents with high religious involvement tend to associate with people (of high religiosity) who emphasize the universalistic duties towards fellowmen¹ rather than particularistic norms confining loyalties to a special group of friends or peers, or to the family. The associates of respondents with low religious involvement would tend to emphasize more a particularistic type of loyalty.

¹ A person unilaterally involved can also be looked upon primarily as a fellowman.

If the above interpretation is correct, our findings would suggest that the particular content of the norms of the group of friends of the respondent determines to some extent the influence that religious involvement has over the association between cohesion with friends and theocentrism in value orientations, limiting the applicability of the empirical generalization stated above.

Political Identification and Value Orientations

In Argentine there is a deep cleavage among political parties. Identification with parties on the extreme left -Communist and Socialist- is associated with a contempt for supernatural sacredness, and an irritated impatience directed toward building a kingdom of men in this world, disregarding otherworldly principles. Belief in supernatural rewards tends to be considered by them as a misleading palliative. Although they accept certain sacred myths, they emphasize the myth of antisacredness.

At the other extreme, the Christian Democrats emphasize the importance of the spiritual heritage of Christianity, stressing the value of super-natural principles and beliefs. The Peronist party, since Perón (its founder and leader) broke with the Catholic Church has moved to a position close to that of Socialists or Communists, in relation with otherworldly goals. The Radical parties are traditionally liberal parties, which do not have a clearly militant this-worldly or otherworldly position.

The association between "otherworldliness" (or religious involvement) and political identification in France, the Netherlands and Germany, has been described by Lipset as follows:

In France, for example, 68 per cent of the practicing Catholics supported either the M.R.P. or the Independent party, both conservative, but 57 per cent of the non-practicing and 63 per cent of the "indifferent" Catholics supported either the Communists or the Socialists ... Among those with no religion 79 per cent supported the Marxist parties.

In the Netherlands information was available on church attendance for the three major religious groups, and here again, striking differences are evident in the voting choices of the different denominations. Fully 94 per cent of practicing Catholics supported the Catholic party, but only 52 per cent of those nonpracticing did, with 30 per cent of their choices going to the Socialists. Ninety per cent of the practicing Calvinists supported the Calvinist Antirevolutionary party, as compared with 63 per cent of the nonchurchgoing ... In West Germany Catholics and

Protestants are linked to direct political action through one religious party, the Christian Democrats. And there also, the more involved a man is in church activity, the more likely he is to back a religious party.¹

The Communists' and Socialists' concern with instrumental implementation of a kingdom of man in this world, and the contempt for otherworldly values, is in harmony with what was defined above as anthropocentric major premise. Consequently it was expected that they would tend to show more anthropocentric value orientations than other respondents. The Christian Democrats' concern for spiritual principles associates with an otherworldly religion is in harmony with the theocentric major premise. Consequently, it was expected that Christian Democrats would show more theocentric value orientations than others. Radicals would show value orientations not as theocentric as those of Christian Democrats, but neither as anthropocentric as Communists' or Socialists'.

The Findings

For each item used in the test, the means of the answers for each party were ranked from 1 (most theocentric) to 7 (most anthropocentric). The ranks for each party were added and divided by 43 (number of items used in the test), resulting in the following average ranks for each party (ranks go from 1 -most theocentric- to 7 -most anthropocentric-): (a) 4.9 for Socialists; (b) 4.8 for Communists; (c) 4.4 for "Justicialistas" (Peronists); (d) 3.9 for "Radicales Intransigentes"; (e) 3.6 for "Radicales del Pueblo"; and (f) 2.4 for Christian Democrats.

As expected, on the whole Argentine respondents identified with left wing parties answered more anthropocentric than others, and those identifies with the Christian Democrat party answered more theocentric than others.

¹ Political Man, pp. 257 - 259.

TABLE 37. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by political identification (Argentine sample).

	Mean ranks for each party, ranging from 1 -most theocentric- to 7 -most anthropocentric-						
Value Orientations	Conservatives	People's Radicals	Intransigent Radicals	Socialists	"Justicialistas"	Communists	Christian Democrats
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	3.6	3.0	3.2	5.0	4.3	6.7	1.8
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	5.6	2.7	5.0	4.8	3.8	2.5	3.8
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	1.0	4.5	5.7	6.0	7.0	3.7	2.5
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	3.0	5.0	3.6	5.2	5.2	4.1	2.7
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	4.6	4.4	5.3	2.9	3.3	5.4	2.1
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	2.0	4.0	4.5	5.2	6.8	5.1	5.4
Total no. of cases:	(40)	(42)	(28)	(28)	(16)	(4)	(72)

The mean ranks for each party, considering separately the items corresponding to each value orientation, are shown in Table 37.

In the orientation towards peers Conservatives rank most theocentric (1) followed by Christian Democrats (2.5) and Communists (3.7). The two extremes (Conservatives and Christian Democrats on the one side; and Communists on the other) answer in a similar way. This may be explained by the fact that emphasis upon loyalty to peers is relatively free from otherworldly connotations.

In the sphere of orientation towards friendship relationships, Communists answer most theocentric (2.5) followed by People's Radicals and Christian Democrats (3.0). Here again the scores of Communists and Christian Democrats are close to each other. Indeed, emphasis upon the value of friendship may not be seen as connected to any otherworldly loyalty.

For the sphere of orientation towards family relationships Christian Democrats score markedly more theocentric than all other respondents, probably as a result of the association between family obligations and the Catholic tradition in Argentina. This reason may also explain why Communists rank by far less theocentric than all other groups.

In the orientation towards reciprocity Christian Democrats rank more theocentric than all other political groups, followed by Socialists and Justicialists. Communists rank less theocentric.

In the orientation towards ideas Conservatives rank more theocentric (2.0) followed by the two radical groups. Justicialists (6.8), Christian Democrats (5.4), Socialists (5.2) and Communists (5.1) rank least theocentric. Probably the alleged "progressist" orientation of Left wing parties and Christian Democrats lead them to attempt to show an open-minded and tolerant attitude towards ideas, in contrast with Conservatives.

In the orientation towards fellowmen again Christian Democrats rank more theocentric than all other groups (2.75), this time followed by Conservatives (3.0) and Intransigent Radicals (3.6). Respondents in the extreme left rank closer to the anthropocentric pole because although they show high

commitment towards the underprivileged, they tend to agree with the following statement:

Item 65: A capable person motivated for his own gain is more useful to society than an altruistic but less capable one.

Respondents in the extreme left also tend to disagree more than others that if John wants to be a friend of Peter, this is obliged to reciprocate.

Indeed, the anthropocentric major premise leads to an attitude of contempt for good intentions, and an urgency for practical results.

The difference in value orientation found in the Argentine sample between Left, Radical and Christian Democrat political groups, cannot be explained by the socio-economic status of the members of such groups. Indeed,

TABLE 38. – Relationship between political orientations and socio-economic status (Argentine sample).

Socio-economic status	Political orientation		
	Leftist	"Radical"	Christian Democrat
	%	%	%
Low	57	53	58
High	<u>43</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>42</u>
Total responses	100	100	100
No. of cases	(44)	(60)	(73)

TABLE 39. – Relationship between political orientations and religious involvement (Argentine sample).

Religious Involvement	Political orientation		
	Leftist	"Radical"	Christian Democrat
	%	%	%
Low	16	28	55
High	<u>84</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>45</u>
Total responses	100	100	100
No. of cases	(44)	(60)	(73)

as shown in table 38, the groups which differ the most from each other (Left and Christian Democrats) have an almost equivalent socio-economic composition, and the Radicals have a socio-economic composition which is not very different from the other two groups.¹

One might think that the differences could be explained by the different religious involvement of the members of each political group, since indeed, members of the Leftist and Radical groups show lower religious involvement than Christian Democrats, and members of the Radical group show higher religious involvement than members of the Leftist category, as shown in Table 39.

In order to find out to what extent political affiliation makes a difference (in terms of value orientation) independently of differential religious involvement the answers of respondents with different political affiliations were compared with each other, holding religious involvement constant (Table 40).

Table 40 shows:

1. Even holding religious involvement constant political affiliation is associated with value orientations in the way which was expected. Indeed, (a) Christian

¹ If instead of considering only two socio-economic groups (high and low, according to the father's education; see page 208) other more refined indicators of socioeconomic status were used, possibly we would find greater differences in the socio-economic composition of different political groups.

TABLE 40. – Theocentrism in value orientations, by political orientation, holding religious involvement constant (Argentine sample).

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of groups expected to have more theocentric orientations, minus the mean theocentrism scores of groups expected to have less theocentric orientations Comparing:		
	Christian Democrats with Leftists	Christian Democrats with Radicals	Radicals with Leftists
Respondents with high religious involvement			
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .07	+ .50	+ .41
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .27	+ .05	- .21
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	- .28	- .27	+ .02
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	- .06	- .18	- .12
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .09	+ .07	+ .06
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .28	+ 1.14	+ .91
Total no. of cases:			
Christian Democrats	(40)	(40)	
Radicals		(17)	(17)
Left	(7)		(7)

TABLE 40. – Continued.

Value Orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of groups expected to have more theocentric orientations, minus the mean theocentrism scores of groups expected to have less theocentric orientations)		
	Comparing:		
	Christian Democrats with Leftists	Christian Democrats with Radicals	Radicals with Leftists
<u>Respondents with low religious involvement</u>			
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .09	+ .57	+ .27
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .03	+ .27	+ .18
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .35	+ .58	+ .23
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .04	+ .33	+ .14
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .27	+ .39	+ .01
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .24	+ .24	.00
Total no. of cases:			
Christian Democrats	(33)	(33)	
Radicals		(43)	(43)
Left	(37)		(37)

Democrats show more theocentric orientation than Leftists and Radicals, except for the orientations towards peers and fellowmen within the group with high religious involvement; (b) Radicals show more theocentric orientations than Leftists, except for the orientation towards friendship and towards fellowmen within the group with high religious involvement.

2. The association between political orientation and value orientations is stronger among respondents with low religious involvement than among respondents with high religious involvement. Indeed, (a) among respondents with low religious involvement Christian Democrats score more theocentric than Radicals and Leftists for all value orientations; and Radicals score more theocentric than Leftists for all value orientations;¹ (b) among respondents with high religious involvement Leftists and Radicals score more theocentric than Christian Democrats in the orientation towards peers and towards fellowmen; and Leftists score more theocentric than Radicals in the orientations towards friendship and towards fellowmen.

Here again religious involvement specifies a condition (low religious involvement) under which the association between political affiliation and value orientations is strongest. This is in accordance to the empirical generalization

¹ The difference is very small in the orientation

stated above: The more strongly a given status of a person is associated with certain value orientations, the less strong will be the association between the value orientations and other statuses. As explained before, high religious involvement is so strongly associated to theocentrism in value orientations, that no room is left for other statuses to associate strongly with these value orientations.

Political involvement is correlated with political affiliation in a very interesting way. The two less traditionalistic groups (the Left and the Democristian) show higher political involvement than Radicals, who seem to take their political identification as a matter of tradition and inertia.

Political involvement does not seem sufficient to explain the differences of value orientations between Christian Democrats, Radicals and Leftists, since the most theocentric political group (Christian Democrat) and the least theocentric (Leftist) are more politically involved than the group in the middle (Radicals). Furthermore, political involvement does not make much difference in regard to theocentrism in value orientations.¹

¹ While among American respondents high political involvement is consistently associated with theocentrism in all value orientations considered, among Argentines high political involvement is associated with theocentrism only in the orientations towards friends and towards ideas, and it is negatively associated with theocentrism in the value orientations towards family, peers, reciprocity and fellowmen.

However, looking at the sample composition, one finds that the Argentine group of high political involvement includes a higher percentage of respondents in the extreme Left than does the group of low political involvement. Since respondents of extreme leftist political identification show more anthropocentric orientations than others, one would think that for this reason high political involvement appears associated with anthropocentrism in the Argentine group. Indeed, holding political affiliation constant in the Argentine sample the association between high political involvement and anthropocentrism was practically eliminated.

CHAPTER VII

AMERICANS AND ARGENTINES

After looking at the differences in theocentrism and anthropocentrism of value orientations among individuals with different social characteristics within a given society, we may raise again the original problem formulated for this study:

Are there differences in value orientations between American and Argentine respondents? If so, are the differences in the expected direction? How do such differences compare with the differences which we found to be associated with other social characteristics (religious involvement, sex, etc.)?

Can the differences between American and Argentine respondents be explained or clarified with the aid of what was said about differences associated with other social characteristics? If so, to what extent can the differences between Americans and Argentines be explained by the religious, social, economical and political factors?

What is the role played by the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension?

Although we would like to be able to answer all the above questions in a satisfactory way, we can claim to be doing only an exploratory analysis, seeking suggestions for possible answers to such questions, rather than providing final answers to them.

The Differences

Table 41 shows how the mean scores of the answers of Argentines compare with the mean scores of the answers of Americans, for the 52 items which were used to compare their value orientations.

Table 42 shows for each value orientation how the combined mean scores of Argentine respondents compare with the combined mean scores of American respondents.

Tables 41 and 42 suggest the following answers to some of the questions raised above:

1. Argentine respondents show more theocentrism in value orientations than do American respondents. Indeed, (a) for 47 of the 52 items used in the test, Argentine respondents score more theocentric than American respondents; (b) in relation to the remaining 10 per cent of the items, the differences between Americans' and Argentines' responses are relatively small, and the items apparently are related to the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension only in an ambiguous way (as we will explain below); (c) for all value orientations considered in the present study Argentines score more theocentric than Americans.
2. For each value orientation the differences in theocentrism are fairly large,

TABLE 41. – Theocentrism in value orientations for American and Argentine respondents.

Item number *		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		American mean scores	Argentine mean scores	Differ.
Orientation towards family relationships				
20*	Obligation to live with parents	3.34	2.05	+1.29
21.	Job demands <u>vs.</u> obligation to live with parents	4.38	3.97	+2.41
22.	Job and future <u>vs.</u> obligations to parents	2.73	2.37	+ .36
23.	Advantages of leaving parental home	3.12	1.68	+1.44
24*	Obligation to love parents	2.82	1.92	+ .90
59*	Consulting parents about job	2.00	1.43	+ .57
60*	Consulting relatives about job	3.44	3.68	- .24
63*	Complete sharing between spouses	2.67	2.32	+ .35
71*	Acceptance of respondent's parents' way of bringing up children	3.20	2.81	+ .39
72*	Acceptance of parent's way of life	3.91	3.48	+ .43
73*	Acceptance of parent's advice about job	3.70	4.01	- .31

* Items for which agreement is indicative of a theocentric orientation are indicated with an (*). Agreement with the remaining items is indicative of an anthropocentric orientation. For complete text of the items see questionnaire in appendix 1.

TABLE 41. – Continued.

		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
Item number		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Argentine</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
Orientation towards family relationships				
76*	Independence <u>vs.</u> following advice	3.38	3.22	+ .16
77*	Consulting parents before marrying.....	2.86	2.66	+ .20
78.	Contingency of love for parents	2.68	2.76	- .08
79.	Contingency of conjugal love.....	2.85	3.48	- .63
Orientation towards friends				
16*	Obligation to help a friend.....	2.72	1.13	+1.59
17*	Guilt for not helping a friend.....	1.97	1.28	+ .69
18*	Obligation to be concerned for a friend	2.70	1.75	+ .95
19*	Obligations to friends <u>vs.</u> obligations to studies, career and job	2.55	1.89	+ .66
62*	Concern about friend who discontinues friendship.....	2.39	2.03	+ .36
Orientation towards peers - direct items				
14*	Obligation to help a fellowstudent	3.54	1.61	+1.93
15*	Guilt for not helping a fellowstudent	2.86	1.94	+ .92

TABLE 41. – Continued.

Item number		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Argentine</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
Orientation towards peers - indirect items				
7*	Disapproval of reporting cheaters	2.96	1.63	+1.33
8.	Right to report cheaters	3.66	1.90	+1.76
9.	Comparison of degrees of disapproval of cheaters and reporters.....	3.71	2.29	+1.42
10.	Teachers' relative disapproval of cheaters and reporters	3.89	2.76	+1.13
11.	Unfairness of reporting and of cheating	3.99	2.71	+1.28
12*	Disapproval of reporting friends as cheaters .	2.69	1.75	+ .94
Relation of man to his fellowmen				
26*	Obligation to help the underprivileged.....	2.58	1.39	+1.19
28*	Guilt for not helping the underprivileged.....	3.01	2.15	+ .86
49*	Obligation to reciprocate friendship	4.06	3.54	+ .52
65.	Value of capability vs. altruism	2.74	2.06	+ .68
Unilateral involvement and reciprocity ^a				
37.	Male-female reciprocity. Respondent of same sex as he involved person	3.71	2.92	+ .79

^aThis orientation includes also item 49, listed under the orientation towards fellowmen.

TABLE 41. – Continued.

Item number		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Argentine</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>				
38.	Male-female reciprocity. Respondent of different sex than the involved person	3.17	2.74	+ .43
39.	Male-female reciprocity, when it is the respondent who was cared for	3.39	2.59	+ .80
40.	Male-female reciprocity, when it is the respondent who cared.....	3.40	2.54	+ .86
45.	Friendship reciprocity: general statement.	3.29	2.46	+ .83
46.	Friendship reciprocity: when the other person wanted the friendship.....	3.05	2.32	+ .73
47.	Friendship reciprocity: when the respondent wanted the friendship	2.90	2.08	+ .82
49*				
<u>Orientation to ideas</u>				
51*	Obligation to defend ideas about family	2.46	1.69	+ .77
52.	Relativity of ideas about family.....	2.97	2.59	+ .38
53.	Respondent feels right but not obligated to defend ideas about family	3.05	3.18	- .13
54*	Obligation to defend ideas about human rights	2.22	1.53	+ .69
55*	Obligation to defend ideas about religion	2.18	1.52	+ .66

TABLE 41. – Continued.

Item number		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Argentine</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
Boomerang items				
66*	Loving and beating children	3.29	2.95	+ .35
68	Most people cannot be trusted	3.65	2.45	+1.20
69*	Putting the blame on others	3.56	3.14	+ .42
Other items				
61*	Consulting friends about job	2.44	2.11	+ .33
64*	Friendship as gratitude	2.46	2.24	+ .22
70*	Value of intention <u>vs.</u> results	2.69	1.68	+1.01
74*	Adherence to church teachings	3.15	2.60	+ .55
80*	Dying in defense of one's country.....	2.21	1.96	+ .25
Total no. of cases		(441)	(289)	

TABLE 42. –Theocentrism in value orientations for American and Argentine respondents. Combined average differences for each value orientation.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .38
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .75
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.86
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .81
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .57
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .61
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(441)
Argentine respondents	(289)

compared with the differences which were found associated with other social characteristics such as age, sex, career orientation, etc. (see chapters V and VI).

3. The association of value orientations with type of culture (American or Argentine) appears especially strong in the orientation towards peers (fellowstudents), and relatively less strong in the orientations towards family relationships and towards ideas.

4. Although relatively large and consistent, the differences are differences only in degree, not in kind.

One of the largest differences between American and Argentine responses correspond to item 70.

Argentines agree considerably more strongly than Americans that "It is the intention and not the results that make an action good" (See Item 70 in Table 41). This is the item which most directly expresses the contrast between the theocentric and anthropocentric major premises. Indeed, the theocentric major premise basically emphasizes the value of intentions. The anthropocentric major premise basically emphasizes the value of results.

Along the same line of reasoning Table 41 shows a fairly large difference between American and Argentine responses to item 65. Indeed, Americans agree considerably more strongly than Argentines that "a capable person motivated for his own gain is more useful to society than an altruistic but less capable one". This again shows the relatively greater emphasis placed on good intentions and lesser emphasis placed on practical results by Argentine respondents, as compared with American respondents.

Some of the largest differences in the answers of Americans and Argentines correspond to items 14, 16 and 26, showing Argentine respondents more ready than Americans, to recognize a moral obligation to help fellowstudents, friends and fellowmen (see Table 41). However, the differences are considerably smaller for items 15, 17 and 28, which refer to the feelings of guilt for not helping much persons (see Table 41). This finding has been predicted (see chapter 4), as an indicator of Argentine respondents' tendency systematically to consider help to people as a matter of moral obligation (theocentric major premise), contrasted with the Americans' tendency to consider help as a matter of individual rights

and spontaneity, but feeling at the same time highly concerned for results, and likely to feel guilty in the face of undesirable results (anthropocentric major premise). Indeed, although "in the United States hardly anybody talks of the beauty of virtue", and "American moralists do not profess that men ought to sacrifice themselves for their fellow creatures", not denying "that every man follow his own interest"¹, "feelings of guilt, conscience, or inadequacy" "play a large part in the psychological aftereffects of failure in North American culture". On the other hand, if the Latin American "fails, after having made a 'good try', he is not torn by feelings of guilt, conscience, or inadequacy".²

Orientations Towards Peers and Towards Friends

As expected, Argentine respondents agree more strongly than American respondents that they are morally obliged to help peers (items 14 and 15) and friends (items 16 and 17); and that loyalty towards friends should be unconditional (item 62) and should lead the actor to identify himself with his friends (item 18), to place high value in friendship (item 19), and eventually to accept his friends' advice (items 61 and 76) (see Table 39).

Why are the differences between Americans and Argentines larger for the orientation towards peers than for the orientation towards friends? This has been explained in chapter 2, when it was shown that the emphasis placed by the theocentric major premise on the obligation to do things as a matter of principle, leads Argentine respondents to recognize their duties towards peers (fellowstudents) as similar to their duties towards friends (universalistic norm). Indeed, Table 42 shows that the means of the answers in the Argentine group are practically the same for the orientation towards peers (fellowstudents) as for the orientation towards friends, while for the American sample the mean scores for the orientation towards friends appear markedly more theocentric than the mean of the scores for the orientation towards peers.

¹ De Tocqueville, Op. cit., II, p. 129 - 130.

² Gillin, op. cit., p. 47.

Some of the largest differences between American and Argentine respondents in Table 41 correspond to the indirect items (items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12). Indeed, the act of reporting a fellowstudent who cheats is much more strongly condemned by Argentine respondents than by American respondents.

However, other "theocentric"¹ social characteristics do not lead to strong condemnation of the act of reporting cheaters. Consequently, although Argentine culture and "theocentric" social characteristics lead to the same type of answers when we consider direct items, they do not lead to the same type of answers when we consider indirect items.

This phenomenon is related to the peculiar nature of indirect items, which has been explained above (See chapter 4): it was said that the expression of extreme solidarity towards fellowstudents (to the point of condemning those who reports cheaters), is only a manifestation of over conformity with the theocentric orientation towards peers; this excess can be institutionalized as legitimate behavior in the Argentine society as an escape from the feeling of guilt that would otherwise result from the failure to conform to the dominant

¹ For convenience we will call "theocentric" social characteristics the social characteristics which were found associated with theocentric value orientations (See chapters 5 and 6). They are high religious involvement, high communal involvement (with the own socio-religious group), attendance at Catholic universities, high cohesion with friends, female sex, young age, Christian Democrat political affiliation, rural background, and planning to enter teaching or social work.

theocentric orientations (boomerang items provide an illustration of such failure). This may be related to what Merton states when speaking about "over-conformity" and "over-compliance" of "bureaucratic virtuosos", some of whom may "over-conform precisely because they are subject to guilt engendered by previous nonconformity with rules".¹

It was also said (chapter 4) that since this type of loyalty to peers (indicated by indirect items) is clearly exaggerated (since cheating and injustice are undesirable from a theocentric view-point) it is unlikely that groups or categories of people having less extensive (in spheres of live and in time) and less intensive influence than society as a whole, can afford to build the common conviction that such exaggeration is a legitimate extension of the theocentric orientation. For this reason "theocentric" social characteristics do not lead to condemn reporters in the way Argentine culture do.²

The special type of relationship between items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, and the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension led to call them indirect items.

In order to further explore the dual behavior of indirect items, the correlations of each indirect item with each direct item were computed, considering that direct items are the most appropriate expression of the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension in the present study. When condemnation of the action of reporting cheaters is associated with theocentric answers to direct items, a positive correlation is obtained. It was found that:

1. Considering the combined (American and Argentine) sample, 88 per cent of the correlations are positive (with an average correlation of +.129) and only 12 per cent are negative (with an average correlation of only -.055);

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 185.

² Condemnation of the act of reporting fellowstudents who cheat appears associated with some "anthropocentric" social characteristics (low religious involvement, attendance at non Catholic Universities, urban background) and with some "theocentric" social characteristics (high communal involvement, high cohesion with friends, young age and planning to enter teaching or social work). For other social characteristics (sex, religious affiliation and political orientation)

2. Considering the American sample alone, only 35 per cent of the correlations are positive (with an average correlation of +.025) and 74 per cent are negative (with an average correlation of -.050).
3. Considering the Argentine sample alone, only 48 per cent of the correlations are positive (with an average correlation of +.058) and 52 per cent are negative (with an average correlation of -.041).

In this way, (a) while condemnation of students reporting cheaters appears associated with the theocentric pole of the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension in the cross-cultural comparison; (b) in the comparison within the Argentine culture it does not show a commitment relation to the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension; (c) and in the comparison within the American culture it shows a small association with the anthropocentric dimension.

These findings confirm the view which consider that indirect items are good indicators of theocentrism-anthropocentrism of value orientation only for the cross-cultural comparison.¹

Probably another reason for the large difference between American and Argentine responses in relation to indirect items, is the fact that Americans' answers are influenced by the highly competitive system characterizing American universities.

Furthermore, in two of the American universities included in the sample -Emory University and Rutgers University- the respondents are under an honor system, in which they are considered responsible - among other things- for reporting students who cheat. Indeed, it was found that respondents attending Rutgers University and Emory University do not condemn the action of reporting cheaters as strongly as respondents attending other American universities.

However, Argentine respondents condemn the action of reporting cheaters much more strongly than American respondents, even if one considers only American respondents who are not under an honor

no consistent association was found.

¹ Later it will be shown that direct items -which form the bulk of the items used in the present study- correlate positively with each other, whether one considers the combined (American and Argentine) sample, or the American or Argentine samples separately.

system, that is, those attending Queens College, The University of Texas, Mississippi State University, Fordham University, or University of California.

On the other hand, the competitive educational system and the honor system in American universities are in some way institutionalized expressions of the value placed by American culture on efficient performance, to be achieved through organized cooperation.

Orientation towards Family Relationship

As expected, Argentine respondents feel more obliged than American respondents: (a) to love their parents (item 24); (b) to live with them (items 20, 21, and 23); (c) to ask and follow their parents' advices (items 59, 76 and 77); (d) and to follow their parents' way of life (items 71 and 72) (See Table 41).

The differences between American and Argentine respondents -in the orientation towards family relationships- are larger for items which, by referring to specific types of behavior towards the family (especially items 20 and 23), are closely linked with family structure and functions, than for items which refer to the recognition of the value and sacredness of family loyalties in more abstract items (e.g., items 21, 22, 24, 63, 71, 72, 73, 76, 77, 78 and 79) (See Table 41). This finding suggests a close connection between the answers to the items which refer to family relations, and the family structure and functions in the Unites States and Argentina.

Four of the five items for which the differences between American and Argentine respondents did not result in the expected direction, are indicators of the orientation towards family relationships (items 60, 73, 78 and 79; see Table 41). This explains why the differences between American and Argentine respondents is not as large for the value orientation towards family relationships as it is for other value orientations.

Item 60: (If you are offered a job in another part of the country): "You would consult other relatives".

Probably the reason why Argentines tend to agree less than American with this item is that their intense concern for loyalty to parents and friends leads them away from asking advice from relatives. This finding may also indicate a reaction on the part of some university students against the extended family practices of less sophisticated sectors. On the other hand, this finding may also be related to the fact that in Argentine society, following the Spanish tradition, the institution of the extended family is relatively weak. Referring to Spanish society, J. A. Pitt-Rivers observes:

The people of Alcalá feel very strongly that every family should possess its own house, and to marry without setting up a separate home is regarded as a make-shift arrangement. The poorer people are the more insistent upon this need for independence, and the economic advantages which might accrue from forming a larger family unit are offset by the desire to be free from the tensions which make family life impossible where there is more than one family in a house. "Cada uno en su casa" ("Each one in his own house") that is the only way to live peacefully. "Casada casa quiere" ("housewife wants house"), the saying rubs in the point. For while a joint family might collaborate in spending money, they cannot collaborate in making it; where each man's income derives from a daily wage.

.....
In summing up, we can see that the lack of mutual rights and obligations outside the elementary family, the lack even of occasions on which the unity of the extended family is expressed ... makes of kinship a facultative rather than a firm bond.¹

These considerations may be applicable to Argentine society to some extent, as a result of the Spanish influence in Argentine family life.

Item 73: "Generally you ought to follow your parents' advice about your choice of career and job".

The reason Argentines tend to agree less than Americans with this statement may be the fact that many Argentine respondents are in the university precisely to assert their fight of free choice of career against the will of their parents, or they may be there against their own will, as a 'result of the parents' pressures.

However, although Argentine respondents agree less than American respondents that they ought to follow their parents' advice about their choice of career and job, they agree more than Americans that if

¹ The People of the Sierra, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 99, 106.

they are offered a job in another part of the country, they would consult their parents (item 59: See Table 41). This finding suggests that the fact of being offered a job "in another part of the country" (item 59) is a more unusual and important event for Argentine than for American respondents, and for this reason Argentines are more likely than Americans to feel the need to consult parents. Furthermore, in Argentina, the decision of the children to move to another province will probably mean an important change in their parents' lives. Indeed, if Argentine respondents are unmarried and live in the same town where their parents live, they usually live in the parental home, even if they are old enough to support themselves.

Item 78: "If parents do not provide a happy childhood for their children, they are not entitled to expect their children to love them".

Item 79: "If a wife (husband) does not do all that is necessary for her (his) husband (wife) to lead a reasonably comfortable and happy life, she (he) is not entitled to expect him (her) to go on loving her (him)".

Although these items were expected to be good and direct indicators of theocentrism or anthropocentrism in value orientations, the following circumstances suggest that they are ambiguous items, rather than clear indicators of theocentrism or anthropocentrism:

1. Agreement with items 78 and 79 can be a result of a theocentric orientations emphasizing the duties of parents and spouses to the extreme of agreeing with these items as an expression of the condemnation of the violation of such sacred duties. On the other hand, agreement with items 78 and 79 could imply that the respondent considers love as an exchange commodity contingent on alter's reciprocity, and this is clearly harmonious with the anthropocentric conception of human value.
2. Items 78 and 79 do not correlate consistently with direct items. Indeed, whether one considers the combined (American and Argentine) sample, or the American or Argentine samples separately, agreement with items 78 and 79 is associated with theocentric answers to certain items and with anthropocentric answers to other direct items, the associations being fairly weak.

Orientations towards Fellowmen

As expected, Argentine respondents tend to agree more than Americans that they are morally obliged to help the underprivileged (items 26 and 28), and that they are morally obliged to reciprocate if someone offers them friendship (item 49¹); they also agree more than Americans that altruism is more important for society than is capability (item 65). (See Table 41).

In this case the differences in the answer between American and Argentine respondents may be partly explained by differences in perception (which may itself be a function of the differences in the situation of the underprivileged in both countries). Indeed, while only 9 Argentine respondents (that is, 3 per cent of the total Argentine sample) fail to recognize the "in the state where they live there are people very poor, undernourished, illiterate or living under very poor health conditions" (item 25), 120 American respondents (that is, 27 per cent of the total American sample) do not recognize this situation as true for the state where they live. Furthermore, 50 per cent of Argentine respondents (as compared with only 21 per cent of American respondents) consider that "it is not these people's fault that they are in this situation".

The Argentine respondents' greater perception of social injustice can be considered partly the result of the fact that the situation of the underprivileged is more critical in Argentine society than in American society. However, it can also be considered a result of the fact that Argentine students are more active in politics than American students, and this way may be associated with Argentine students' special awareness of the social problems and their feeling of a need to change the situation.

This interpretation may be corroborated by the following findings: Argentine respondents agree more than American respondents that "private action, individual or jointly with an institution -for example, a church- is the best way of resolving this type of situation" (item 30), but they also agree more than Americans that "only governmental action can resolve this type of situation" (item 31), and that "not only is governmental action better in resolving this type of situation, but private action is useless" (item 32) (See Table 43). There

¹ This will be explained in more detail when we refer to the orientation towards

seems to be a contradiction between this attitude of favoring governmental action above private action, and favoring private action above governmental action. However, this apparent contradiction may be simply the result of Argentine respondents' strong feeling that something has to be done, and that it is important that both government and private action urgently contribute to solve these problems.¹

TABLE 43. –Attitudes concerning the situation of the underprivileged.

Statements concerning situation E ^a	Mean agreement scores going from 1 ("Strongly agree") to 5 ("Strongly disagree")		
	American mean scores	Argentine mean scores	Differ.
25. Situation E is true for the state where you live.....	2.22	1.22	1.00
26. You are morally obliged to do something to help these people in need	2.58	1.39	1.19
27. There is nothing you can to help them.....	4.05	3.99	.06
28. You sometimes feel guilty because you are not doing enough to help these people	3.01	2.15	.86
29. It is not these people's fault the they are in this situation	3.15	2.66	.49
30. Private action, individual or jointly with an institution -for example, a church- is the best way of resolving this type of situation	2.76	2.56	.20
31. Only governmental action can resolve this type of situation	3.54	3.13	.41
32. Not only is governmental action better in resolving this type of situation, but private action is useless.....	4.09	3.82	.27
33. Such a situation of nee cannot be resolved without a fundamental change in the social structure.	3.18	2.25	.93
Total no. of cases	(447)	(289)	

^a"Situation E - In the state where you live there are people very poor, undernourished, illiterate or living under very poor health conditions".

The differences between American and Argentine respondents in their concern for social reforms further confirmed by the fact that Argentine respondents agree much more strongly than American respondents that "such a situation of need cannot be resolved without a fundamental change in the social structure" (item 33, Table 43).

Another indicator suggesting that the differences in political concern can account (at least partly) for the differences in reported perception of misery, is the fact that a greater proportion of American than Argentines answer "uncertain" to items 30 through 33. Indeed, 25 per cent of American respondents, as compared with only 15 per cent of Argentine respondents, check "uncertain" , instead of agreeing or disagreeing that "private action individual or jointly with an institution, is the best way of resolving this type of situation" (item 30). Twenty per cent of American respondents, as compared with only 10 per cent of Argentine respondents, check "uncertain" instead of agreeing or disagreeing that "only governmental action can resolve this type of situation" (item 31). Eight per cent of American respondents, as compared with 6 per cent of Argentine respondents, check "uncertain" for the statement that "not only is governmental action better in resolving this type of situation, but private action is useless" (item 32). Twenty-three per cent of the American sample, check "uncertain" for the item stating that "such a situation of need cannot be resolved without a fundamental change in the social structure" (item 33).

We do not have appropriate data to decide to what extent the Argentine respondents' perception of the situation of the underprivileged is a result of the respondents' concern for the situation of the underprivileged, or to what extent the objective perception of a particularly critical situation of the underprivileged in Argentina is the reason for Argentine students' greater concern for the political situation. It is logical to expect that both interpretations are partly correct, that is, the perception of the real situation leads to greater concern, while greater concern leads one to intensify his perception of the problem. In any case, the perception of the problem may lead to a greater feeling of obligation and guilt among Argentine respondents; one could argue that the feeling of obligation may lead to intensify the

perception of the problem, in the same way as the perception of the problems may lead to intensify the feeling of obligation. However, one could also speculate that the feeling of moral obligation would lead to diminish the perception of the problems of the underprivileged, as a means for avoiding the burden of fulfilling the obligations, and the guilt for not fulfilling them. Furthermore, one could also speculate that precisely the fact the general standard of living is higher among Americans than among Argentines should lead American respondents to feel even more guilty than Argentine respondents for the misery of the underprivileged.

Summing up, the data clearly suggest a more theocentric orientation towards the underprivileged among Argentine respondents than among American respondents. However, our data do not tell us to what extent Argentine respondents' theocentric orientation towards the underprivileged is a reflection of the greater gravity of the situation of the underprivileged in Argentina, as compared with the United States.

However, the two items indicative of the orientation towards fellowmen which do not refer especially to the situation of the underprivileged, also show more theocentrism among Argentine than among American respondents. This finding suggests that the differences in theocentrism indicated by the items referring to the underprivileged are not simply a reflection of the fact that the situation of the underprivileged is worse in Argentina than in the United States, but they indicate that the dominant orientation towards fellowmen is more theocentric among Argentine respondents than among American respondents. Indeed, Argentine respondents tend to agree more than American respondents that one is morally obliged to reciprocate if someone offers him friendship (item 49), and that altruism is more important for society than capability (item 65) (See Table 41). These items refer to general situations about fellowmen, in which we find no reasons to believe that the problems are more critical in Argentina than in the United States.

Orientation towards Reciprocity

As expected, Argentine respondents tend to perceive the explanation of Student 2 as an accurate description of what usually happens and what happened to them, and American respondents tend to perceive the explanation of Student 1 as an accurate description of reality, in Situations F and G.

SITUATION F - John is a student. He cares for Mary but Mary does not care for him. With only this information, two other students were trying to describe John's situation. Here is what each said:

Student 1: (1) John's basic concern is to have Mary care for him in return. (2) John will become dependent on Mary. (3) As a result John is liable to exploitation by Mary. (4) John will resent his dependence. (5) John's pride will be hurt. (6) John will try to hold back his feelings or withdraw from the relationship. (7) If he does not withdraw, he will become a nuisance. (8) Mary will try to discourage his persistence.

Student 2: (1) John's basic concern is for Mary's problems and needs. (2) John will not become dependent on Mary's caprices. (3) John will not be liable to exploitation by Mary. (4) John will be dependant only in the sense that he will do things that he considers good for Mary. (5) If Mary does not care for him in return John will not consider his pride hurt. (6) John will not withhold his feelings. (7) Mary will not consider John a nuisance. (8) On the contrary, Mary may feel obliged to care for John in return.

SITUATION G - John is a student. He wants to be a friend of Peter, who does not like him. With only this information, two other students were trying to describe John's situation. Here is what each said.

Student 1: (1) John's basic concern is to have Peter like him in return. (2) John will become dependent on Peter. (3) As a result John is liable to exploitation by Peter. (4) John will resent his dependence. (5) John's pride will be hurt. (6) John will try to hold back his feelings or withdraw from the relationship. (7) If he does not withdraw, he will become a nuisance. (8) Peter will try to discourage his persistence.

Student 2: (1) John's basic concern is for Peter's problems and needs. (2) John will not become dependant on Peter's caprices. (3) John will not be liable to exploitation by Peter. (4) John will be dependant only in the sense that he will do things that he considers good for Peter. (5) If Peter does not reciprocate John will not consider his pride hurt. (6) John will not hold back his feelings. (7) Peter will not consider John a nuisance. (8) On the contrary, Peter may feel obliged to reciprocate.

American respondents' agreement with Student 1's interpretation of the situations is considered an indicator of the fact that they are used to looking at these situations from an anthropocentric view-point. Argentine respondents' agreement with Student 2's interpretation of the situations is considered indicative of the fact that they are used to looking at these situations from a theocentric view-point.

However, since these two situations (F and G) involved serious conceptual and language problems

in the construction of the questionnaire, it was considered necessary to add some qualitative material in order to determine to what extent the above interpretation of American and Argentine responses is appropriate.

After Situation G the respondents were invited to comment on their answers to the items included under such situation, with the following results:

1. The picture painted by Argentine respondents was largely in the line of the theocentric orientation towards reciprocity, as it was expected from them:

Student 523 says that he believes that one ought to offer friendship not only to those who have offered friendship to us but to everyone around us.

Student 537 says: "I believe that friendship is given spontaneously, with or without reciprocity, I am guided by the interest to know somebody, be concerned for him and help him".

Student 554 comments: "I believe that when one person seeks the friendship of another, he does it not pursuing a personal interest, but rather in order to try to help that person".

Student 586 says: "it seems to me completely absurd that if I offer my friendship to a person who needs it I will have to be necessarily dependent on his caprices. I give him moral support and not submission".

Student 600 states: "I believe that if someone sincerely wishes to be our friend we ought not to refuse".

Student 604 says: "If someone does not wish my friendship I do not impose myself. If they offer me their friendship, my acceptance will depend on the sincerity of the offer".

Student 610 says: "A true friendship can be offered without malice or thought of furthering our own interests with it. One always has to give a hand to a friend who is confused, and even if he refuses one has to insist and show him the truth".

Student 621 says that in his opinion Peter (Pedro) has to have a strong reason in order to refuse to

be a friend of John (Juan).

Student 627 says: "If among students one wishes to be fiends with another, the other ought to accept his friendship and try to understand him, helping him and making him participate in his activities".

Student 691 comments: "I believe that love in its various forms can exist even without being reciprocated, although this is difficult".

Student 715 says: "I believe that a sincere and unconditional friendship is necessary, where reciprocity is desirable but not a necessary condition".

Student 719 states: "I only understand the acceptance of a friendship that is offered unilaterally (that is, without equal desire on the other) when that person, more than offering needs a friend. If one can help him one ought to accept such friendship. But this is not the most common case, I believe that sincerity, and mutual understanding are indispensable between friends. And in this case it would not exist"

Student 722 says that he would never refuse (even in an hypothetical situation) to be a friend of anyone.

Respondent 739 says: "María can depend on Ines for affection, but not for her whims. Her pride may be very hurt but her affection can be stronger".

Respondent 742 says: "Juan ought to be thankful to María for her friendship and ought to return (or reward) her feelings as much as possible".

Student 743 says: "I believe that when a person wishes to be a friend of another, the other has to reciprocate, and not only this, but furthermore we have to try to be friends of everyone and to be the ones who try to develop such union. As a Catholic I have more responsibility than my non-Christian brothers".

Student 757 says that he would not reject the person who seeks him for a true friend, if he does not become a nuisance.

Student 759 states: "Since friendship is giving oneself, the individual is liable to serve the caprices

of the other one, but this does not mean that he is going to do it, but precisely, since he seeks the perfection of his friend, I feel that he has to realize his errors".

In this way, (a) respondents 739, 759 and 786 play down the possible danger of dependency or exploitation than could result from unilaterally "giving" love, concern, etc.; (b) respondent 739 shows how non-reciprocation will not seriously affect the person "giving" love, concern or friendship; (c) respondents 739 and 586 show how the fact of not obtaining reciprocity does not reduce one's favorable self - evaluation nor hurt his pride, because of the value of "giving" (love, concern of friendship) per se; (d) respondent 715 shows how mutual "giving" is unconditional; (e) respondents 531, 537, 691 and 715 show how love, concern, loyalty or friendship are fully accomplished even if one does not obtain any result in terms of reciprocity; (f) respondents 523, 600, 604, 621, 627, 657, 719, 722, 742 and 743 show how the unilateral "giver" elicits in alter a feeling of moral obligation to reciprocate; (g) respondents 531, 537, 691 and 715 on the one hand, and respondents 523, 600, 604, 621, 627, 657, 722, 738 and 743 on the other, show how the concern for reciprocity will be strongest in the actor after the other party has already "giver" love, concern or friendship.

2. As expected, comments of American respondents provide a picture in line with the anthropocentric orientation towards reciprocity. Their comments tend to cluster in the following categories:

A. Expressing contempt for John:

- "John will become a 'leach'".

- "John should realized that his presence is not wanted and not degrade himself by trying to win Peter's friendship".

- "You should have enough sense to know when someone dislikes you and you are becoming a nuisance".

- "I cannot, will not and do not recognize friends that claim me because of need, reciprocity or desire. My friends are those I select".

- "Student #1 describes a weak-willed clod. Student #2 describes an insipid do-gooder. Both are repugnant to me".

B. John's is a bad policy (if he insists).

- "It is not a good policy to become obnoxious trying to become friends with someone who cares nothing for your friendship".

- "There are enough people in the world to have for friends without having to try for those who do not want to be your friends".

- "I would not insist if he did not reciprocate".

- "John should forget about Peter".

- "The other will consider John a nuisance and tend to exploit him".

C. John's attitude is not a bad policy only when it helps his own ends:

- "It's not a good policy to become obnoxious trying to become friends with someone who cares nothing for your friendship unless it is as a means to some of your personal ends".

- "Much depends on whether Peter is of higher social standing than John. If so John may be trying to get ahead by Peter's association".

- "Friendship is a two-way relationship; mere acquaintances don't have to like you, just use them for what they are worth".

D. Peter should or will try to discourage John instead of feeling obliged to reciprocate:

- "Joan is right to discourage Mary".

- "Peter should try to discourage John as a friend".

- "Usually if someone seeks my friendship and I don't care for him I feel hemmed in and oppressed and try to get out from under".

- "Why must all these situations involve obligations. I don't feel one is obligated to return friendship. What kind of friendship would that be!? A friend is a person that likes you -not has to like you

or is obligated to like you-?".

E. Other statements such as:

- "Males should be strong and independent and not as John painted by Student 2".

- "I don't think anyone wants to make a friendship just for the problems and needs of another".

In contrast with the Argentine comments, these comments show how "giving" (love, concern or friendship) per se is considered valueless and undesirable, something to be feared, and avoided if unilateral. They indicated that the reason for considering valueless and undesirable unilateral "giving" is the fact that it does not bring instrumental results for ego, becoming a good policy only when it is used for the actor's ends. No obligation to reciprocate is recognized and on the contrary the unilateral "giver" is considered a nuisance.

The above comments of American and Argentine respondents are quoted here in order to illustrate our analysis, rather than claiming that they have demonstrative value.

An additional device used to clarify the respondents' orientation towards reciprocity, consisted in asking them to underline the statements which they considered more in line with reality, given the initial information of Situations F and G¹:

As you see, the accounts of Student 1 and Student 2 are both composed of a series of statements (numbered from 1 to 8). Please go over the 16 statements again and underline those that you consider would be most often true given the initial information (that is, those which describe the situations which are most likely to happen).

Since for each statement in the description of Student 1, there corresponds an opposite statement in the description of Student 2, it was expected that the ratio resulting from dividing the proportion of Argentine respondents underlining a statement of student 2 by the proportion of Argentine respondents underlining a statement of student 1, would be larger than the corresponding ratio for American respondents. In other words, it was considered that for any given pair of polar statements, Argentine respondents would tend to accept the reality of the statement of Student 2 more than Americans, and

Americans respondents would tend to accept as real the statement of Student 1 more than Argentine respondents.

Indeed, as Table 44 shows, this was the case:

1. "If John cares for Mary but Mary does not care for him", both American and Argentine respondents tend to consider that "John's basic concern is to have Mary care for him in return" (Student 1) more than "for Mary's problems and needs" (Student 2); however, American respondents tend to recognize that "John's basic concern is to have Mary care for him in return" more than Argentines do; and Argentine respondents tend to recognize that "John's basic concern is for Mary's problems and needs" more than Americans do (Table 44).

Similarly, if John wishes to be a friend of Peter, who does not like him, both American and Argentine respondents consider that the basic concern of John is "to have Peter like him in return", rather than "for Peter's problems and

¹ See Situations F and G in pp. 279 - 280.

TABLE 44. – Orientation towards unilateral involvement and reciprocity, for American and Argentine respondents.

Anthropocentric statement about a person unilaterally involved. ^a	(Ratios obtained dividing the proportion of respondents agreeing with each theocentric statement by the proportion of respondents agreeing with corresponding anthropocentric statement)			
	Male-female love		Friendship	
	American sample	Argentine sample	American sample	Argentine sample
1. Ego's basic concern is for reciprocity (opposed to basic concern for alter's problems and needs)	.30	.65	.31	.87
2. Ego depends on alter's caprices	1.31	1.50	1.58	4.17
3. Ego is liable to exploitations by alter	.38	1.84	.63	2.79
4. Ego resents his dependence	2.91	3.62	2.17	3.50
5. Ego's pride is hurt	.23	1.48	.59	1.82
6. Ego will try to hold back his feelings and withdraw from the relationship	.76	.67	.44	.95
7. Ego is a nuisance	.27	.72	.37	.72
8. Alter will discourage ego (opposed to "alter will feel obligated to reciprocate")	.29	.30	.52	1.03
No. of cases	(447)	(289)	(447)	(289)

^aEach theocentric statement is simply the opposite of the corresponding anthropocentric statement. Student 1's statements are considered anthropocentric. Student 2's statements are considered theocentric.

needs". However, 46 per cent of Argentine respondents, as compared with only 20 per cent of American respondents, consider that the basic concern of John is "for Peter's problems and needs"; and 53 per cent of Argentine respondents, as compared with 65 per cent of American respondents, consider that the basic concern of John is "to have Peter like him in return".¹

2. Among both American and Argentine respondents a greater proportion tend to agree that "John will not become dependent on Mary's (or Peter's) caprices" than to agree that "John will become dependent on Mary (or Peter)". However, among American respondents 19 per cent consider that John will become dependent on Peter, as compared with 12 per cent among Argentine respondents; and 30 per cent consider that John will not become dependent on Peter's caprices, as compared with 50 per cent among Argentines. In this way, while among American respondents the proportion indicating that John will not become dependent on Peter's caprices exceeds by only 30 per cent the proportion reporting that John will become dependent on Peter, among Argentine respondents the proportion indicating that John will not become dependent on Peter's caprices exceed by 400 per cent the proportion reporting that John will become dependent on Peter.

3. The same phenomenon occurs for the other statements: American respondents tend to agree more than Argentine respondents that (a) John is liable to exploitation by Mary (or Peter)" (statement 3), (b) John will resent his dependence (statement 4), (c) John's pride will be hurt (statement 5), (d) "if John does not withdraw he will become a nuisance" (statement 7) and (e) Mary (or Peter) will try to discourage his persistence rather than feeling obliged to reciprocate (statement 8) (Table 44).

4. The data also show that American respondents tend to agree more than Argentine respondents that if

¹ The ratios shown in Table 44 for statement 1 referring to unilateral friendship were obtained as follows: (a) for the American sample we divided 20 (per cent agreeing with statement 1 by Student 2) by 65 (per cent agreeing with statement 1 by Student 1) obtaining .31; for the Argentine sample we divided 46 (per cent agreeing with statement 1 by Student 2) by 53 (per cent agreeing with statement 1 by Student 1) obtaining .87. The same procedures was used to obtain the rest of the scores shown in Table 44.

John wants to be a friend of Peer, who does not like him, John will try to hold back his feelings or withdraw from the relationship (statement 6). However, Argentine respondents do not tend to agree more than American respondents that if John cares for Mary but Mary does not care for him, John will try to hold back his feelings or withdraw from the relationship (statement 6) (See Table 44).

5. In this way the data suggest that whether one considers a sentimental relationship between a boy and a girl or a friendship relationship, American respondents have a less favorable idea of unilateral involvement than Argentine respondents do. However, since in the love relationship there is a biological and cultural function of mutual possession and formation of a family, this factor influences the answers independently of the theocentric or anthropocentric orientation of the respondent. For this reason Situation G (related to unilateral offer of friendship) is more sensitive as an indicator of theocentrism or anthropocentrism in value orientations than is Situation F (which refers to a student who unilaterally cares for another student of different sex).¹ Indeed, a theocentric orientation does not lead a girl to feel obliged to marry a man who loves her even if she does not particularly like him; however, a theocentric orientation may lead a girl to feel obliged to reciprocate the friendship of another girl whom she does not particularly like, if she sees that the other girl needs her friendship. For this reason, the differences between Americans and Argentines in statement (8) are much larger for Situation G (which refers to unilateral offer of friendship) than for situation F (which refers to unilateral involvement in a love relationship). Indeed, Argentine respondents feel considerably more obliged to reciprocate friendship than American respondents feel, but Argentine respondents feel only slightly more obliged to reciprocate unilateral love than is true for American respondents.

Similarly Argentine respondents feel as much as American respondents that Mary will try to discourage John's persistence (love relationship), but they agree much less than Americans that Peter will

¹ This was predicted in a paper presented to the author's adviser at Columbia University, in May 1962, before the data had been collected.

try to discourage John's persistence (friendship relationship) (Table 44). Similarly the expected differences between American and Argentine respondents resulted larger in regard to Situation G than for situation F, in relation to statements 1 (John's basic concern), 2 (dependence), 3 (exploitation), 4 (resenting dependence), and 6 (holding back feelings or withdrawing from the relationship) (Table 44). However, the differences between American and Argentine respondents in the expected direction are larger for Situation F than for Situation G, in relation to statements 5 ("John's pride will be hurt") and 7 (becoming a nuisance), but the differences between the differences corresponding to Situation F and Situation G are considerably smaller for statements (5) and (7) than for the rest of the statements (Table 44).

Orientation towards Ideas

As expected, Argentine respondents recognize more strongly than American respondents their moral obligation to defend their ideas about family life (item 51), their ideas about human rights (item 54) and their ideas about religion (item 55). As expected, Americas also tend to accept a relativistic philosophy of life, more than do Argentines (item 52). (See Table 41).

However, contrary to what was expected, Argentine respondents agree with item 53 more than do American respondents:

SITUATION H - In a conversation at school another student attacks a conception of family life which you accept (with specific reference to marital responsibilities, infidelity, children's duties towards their parents, polygamy, etc.). To what extent would you agree with each of the following statements?

Item 51: "You would feel morally obliged to take a strong stand, trying to give your reasons".

Item 52: You would feel that family life is a matter of preferences and opinions, and there are no right or wrong answers to such questions.

Item 53: You would feel that you are right but that you are not morally obliged to argue or try to convince other of your viewpoints.

The fact that American and Argentine responses to item 53 do not differ much from each other (and the difference is not in the expected direction) may be explained as a result of the ambiguity of this item. Indeed, (a) item 53 contains two statements making it difficult to determine to which of them the

respondent is referring when he agrees or disagrees with the item; to agree that one is right (non relativistic attitude) harmonizes with the theocentric major premise, while to agree that one is not morally obliged to argue harmonizes with the anthropocentric major premise to a certain extent; (b) items 51 and 52 are more clear-cut statements for the same situation; they show more clearly than item 53 the attitudes of American and Argentine respondents towards the two statements contained in item 53; indeed, Argentines tend to agree more than Americans that they are right (item 52), and Americans tend to agree less than Argentines that they are morally obliged to take a strong stand (item 51); (c) the ambiguity of item 53 is also suggested by the fact that the answers to this item do not correlate consistently with the answers to direct items.

Boomerang items

As expected¹, Argentine respondents agree more than American respondents that: (a) "a man who loves his children but beats them when he is drunk is better than a man who never pays much attention to them" (item 66); (b) "most people cannot be trusted" (item 68); and (c) usually when the respondent and another student were angry with each other, it was mainly the other's fault (item 69) (See Table 41).

The attitude of Argentine respondents may be explained as follows: the actor, who according to the theocentric value orientations dominant in Argentine culture is supposed to show generosity and brotherly love to everybody, needs to justify his failure to do so by appealing to "extenuating circumstances" (father who "loves" his children) or through the "imputation of exaggerated deviance to alters"², considering them untrustworthy or hostile (See chapter 4). In this way, agreement with boomerang items can be considered as an indicator of the dominance of theocentric value orientations in Argentine culture (more so than in American culture), to the extent that otherwise it would not be

¹ See appendix 2, about the way in which this expectation was stated before the collection of the data.

² Parsons, The Social System, p. 266 - 267.

necessary to justify oneself in these terms.

However, the clearly deviant nature of the nationalizations used to justify the violations of the theocentric norms does not make it possible for individuals or groups, but only for whole societies or cultures, to rationalize in this way the legitimacy of the violations. For this reason "theocentric"¹ social characteristics do not lead to agree that most people cannot be trusted (item 68); nor they lead to put the blame on others (item 69) or to approve of the action of a "loving" father who beats his children when he is drunk (item 66).

Consequently, although Argentine culture and theocentric social characteristics influence answers to direct items in a similar direction, they do not influence answers to boomerang items in a similar direction, but rather in opposite directions.²

In order to further clarify the relations of boomerang items with the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension, the correlations of each boomerang item with each direct item were computed. If a tendency to agree³ with boomerang items is associated with a tendency to give theocentric answers to direct items, it will be said that there is a positive correlation between the boomerang item and the direct item considered. It was found that:

1. Considering the combined sample (American and Argentine), 75 per cent of the correlations are positive (with an average correlation of +.078) and 25 per cent of the correlations are negative (with an average correlation of -.024).
2. Considering the American sample alone, only 40 per cent of the correlations are positive (with an

¹ For convenience, we call 'theocentric' social characteristics the social characteristics which were found associated with theocentric value orientations (See chapters 5 and 6).

² High religious involvement, female sex, high cohesion with friends and planning to enter teaching or social work (in the American sample) are associated with disagreement with the boomerang items. For the other social characteristics no consistent association was found.

³ That is, to state that most people cannot be trusted, to put the blame on others, and to approve of the "loving" father who beats his children.

average correlation of +.080) and 60 per cent are negative (with an average correlation of -.075).

3. Considering the Argentine sample alone, only 48 per cent of the correlations are positive (with an average correlation of +.048) and 52 per cent of the correlations are negative (with an average correlation of -.044).

These findings suggest:

Agreement with boomerang items is associated with theocentrism in value orientations, in the cross-cultural comparison (between American and Argentine respondents), because Argentines, who agree with the boomerang items more than Americans, tend to show more theocentrism than Americans in their answers to direct items.

2. Agreement with boomerang items is somewhat associated with anthropocentrism in value orientations within a give culture (American or Argentine).

3. For a whole cultural group (American or Argentine) agreement with boomerang items may be an indicator of the dominance of theocentric value orientations. For a sub-group of social category within a society, agreement with boomerang items is not an indicator of the dominance of theocentric value orientations, and it may be an indicator of dominance of the anthropocentric value orientations.

The Tendency to give Extreme Answers

Argentines' theocentric orientation was expected to lead them to place high value on extreme positions, since that seems to be appropriate orientation towards the absolute supra-human principles from which the value of man and of his actions derive. Indeed, if the value of man and of his actions depends upon his conformity with supra-human laws (theocentric major premise), once a statement is considered to be in conformity with supra-human laws, the agreement with that statement should be unqualified. Once a statement is considered conflicting with supra-human laws, disagreement with it should be extreme. The theocentric orientation demands a position of complete devotion to what is sacred, and complete hostility

to what is anti-sacred. For this reason, a high premium is placed among Argentines on feeling strongly about things, and being able to show definite opinions. On the contrary, emphasis on the fact that the value of man and of his actions depends primarily on the practical results of his behavior (anthropocentric major premise), leads Americans to emphasize the value of a more relativistic attitude, in which rigid positions (such as strong loyalties to family and ideologies) will not obstruct the adaptability and flexibility necessary for successful achievement of instrumental results.

As expected, Argentine respondents tended to give more extreme answers (more "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree", and less "uncertain") than American respondents. Indeed, an index of extremity of answers was constructed as follows: For each individual: (a) each "disagree" and "each agree" were added as if they had a numerical value of "one" (1); (b) each "strongly agree" and each "strongly disagree" were added as if they were numerical "two" (2); (c) "undecided" answers were treated as if they were of zero (0) value; (d) the addition of (a) + (b) + (c) was divided by the number of items considered. The score in the index could go from 0 (maximum uncertainty) to 2 (maximum extremity). Table 45 shows that for each value orientation Argentine respondents tend to score as more extreme in their answers than American respondents.

However, looking at Table 41 (pp. 273 - 277) one finds that for most of the items both the means of the answers of American respondents and the means of the answers of Argentine respondents are closer to the theocentric pole (score 1) than to the anthropocentric pole (score 5). Consequently, one may think that the greater extremity shown by Argentine respondents is merely an artifact resulting from the circumstance that since both groups (American and Argentine respondents) score theocentric, the group scoring more theocentric has to appear more extreme in our index. In order to see if Argentine respondents score more

TABLE 45. – Tendency to give extreme answers among American and Argentine respondents.^a

Value orientations	Mean scores	
	American sample	Argentine sample
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	.99	1.26
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	1.08	1.59
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	1.14	1.57
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	1.01	1.48
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	1.11	1.41
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	1.13	1.55
Total no. of cases	(447)	(289)

^aIn the text we explained how the indices of "extremity" of answers were computed. The scores range from 0 (maximum uncertainty) to 2 (maximum extremity).

extreme than American respondents, even if this artifact is not present, we selected items for which the American means and the Argentine means were equidistant from the mid-point (score 3) between the theocentric and anthropocentric poles. We consider that if the apparent extremism of Argentines were only an artifact of the way in which the items were constructed, Argentines would not appear more extreme than Americans for items on which the Argentine and American means are equidistant from score 3. However, the test revealed that even for these items, Argentine respondents did score considerably more extremist than American respondents, as shown in Table 46.

In order to provide an even stronger test for the differences between American and Argentine respondents in their tendency to give extreme answers, we selected those items in which the mean of the answers of Americans was closer to one of the poles (score 1 or score 5) than the mean of the answers of Argentine respondents. One would expect that if there were no special tendency of Argentine or American respondents to give extreme answers, American respondents would score more extreme in their answers to these items, simply as a result of the fact that their mean scores are closer to one pole than the Argentines' mean scores. However, even for these items, not only did Americans not score more extreme in their answers than Argentines, but Argentines still scored considerably more extreme (Table 47).

TABLE 46. – Tendency to give extreme answers^a. Items for which the American and Argentine means are equidistant.

Item	"Extreme answer" scores	
	American sample	Argentine sample
	.99	1.37
9. Comparison of degrees of disapproval of cheaters and reporters.....	1.33	1.34
39. Male-female reciprocity, when it is the respondent who cared.....	1.04	1.32
71. Acceptance of respondents' parents' way of bringing up children.....	.99	1.37
78. Contingency of love for parents.....	.92	1.28
Total no. of cases	(447)	(289)

^aIn the text (p. 318) we explained how the indices of extremity were computed. The scores range from 0 (maximum uncertainty) to 2 (maximum extremity). The complete text of the items can be seen in Appendix 1 (text of the questionnaire).

These findings suggest that, as expected, Argentine respondents place a greater premium than American respondents in showing an extreme attitude, strong feelings and definite opinion.¹

¹ These findings are in harmony with J. P. Gillin's observation: "For Latin Americans, to be alive is to feel strongly", op. cit., p. 43.

TABLE 47. – Tendency to give extreme answers^a. Items for which the mean of the answers of Americans is closer to one or the poles (1 or 5) than the mean of the answers of Argentine respondents.

Item	"Extreme answer" scores	
	American sample	Argentine sample
10. Teachers' relative disapproval of cheaters and reporters	1.24	1.22
11. Unfairness of reporting and of cheating	1.26	1.36
21. Job demands <u>vs.</u> obligation to live with parents ...	1.44	1.37
37. Male-female reciprocity. Respondent of same sex as the involved person	1.08	1.36
49. Obligation to reciprocate friendship	1.22	1.36
60. Consulting relatives about job94	1.32
63. Complete sharing between spouses	1.17	1.47
66. Loving and beating children.....	.91	1.12
68. Most people cannot be trusted.....	1.03	1.36
69. Putting the blame on others.....	.73	.94
72. Acceptance of parents' way of life.....	1.10	1.32
73. Acceptance of parents' advice about job	1.02	1.46
76. Independence <u>vs.</u> following advice.....	.98	1.05
79. Contingency of conjugal love.....	.95	1.35
Total no. of cases	(447)	(289)

^aIn the text we explained how these indices were computed. The scores range from 0 (maximum uncertainty) to 2 (maximum extremity). The complete text of the items can be seen in Appendix 1. The means for American and Argentine respondents can be seen in Table 41.

The Group from the National University

Of Buenos Aires

After most of the analysis reported in this study was done, 180 questionnaires were received from the National University of Buenos Aires.¹

This additional data provided a good opportunity to test to what extent the conclusions suggested by the data originally used (which included 289 Argentine respondents) were plausible.

The group from the National University of Buenos Aires was considered especially important because this is the largest and most important university of the country, and is located in a city whose residents account for almost a third of the total population of Argentina.

Other interesting features characterizing the group of respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires are: (a) Leftist political orientation, with 40 per cent of the respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires identifying themselves with the Socialist party (compared with 9 per cent in the original Argentine sample), and 6 per cent identifying themselves with the Communist Party (compared with 1 per cent in the original Argentine sample); (b) only 46 per cent of the respondents attending the National University of

¹ Although these questionnaires were sent to the National University of Buenos Aires at the same time when the rest of the questionnaires were sent to Argentine universities, they were returned much later than the rest.

Buenos Aires declare themselves Catholic (compared with 90 per cent in the original Argentine sample), 33 per cent declare themselves atheist or agnostics (as compared with 7 per cent in the original Argentine sample), and 12 per cent accept the Jewish faith (as compared with 1 per cent in the original Argentine sample); (c) only 12 per cent of the respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires select religious beliefs or activities as one of the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life (compared with 31 per cent in the original Argentine sample); (d) 59 per cent of the respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires report high exposure to academic psychology (as compared with 51 per cent for the original Argentine sample).

Considering all these circumstances, one would expect, in the light of the findings reported earlier in the present study, that respondents attending the National University of Buenos Aires would tend to show more anthropocentric value orientations than respondents from the original Argentine sample. Indeed, this was the case, as Table 48 shows.

However, the most interesting expectation from the data from the National University of Buenos Aires was: would these Argentines (with such a combination of social characteristics leading them to anthropocentrism of value orientation) still answer more theocentric than Americans?

TABLE 48. – Theocentrism in value orientations for respondents on the original Argentine sample, and respondents attending the National University of Buenos Aires. Combined average differences for each value orientation.

	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents on the original Argentine sample, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents attending the National University of Buenos Aires)
<hr/>	
Value orientations	
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .62
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .10
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .05
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .13
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .14
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .23
<hr/>	
Total no. of cases	
Original Argentine sample	(289)
National University of Buenos Aires	(180)
<hr/>	

Since the present study started with the assumption that the differences in value orientations between the American and the Argentine groups would be larger than most differences within each group, and since the original analysis supported this expectation, it was expected that even this special group of respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires would answer more theocentric than American respondents.

As expected, respondents attending the National University of Buenos Aires scored more theocentric than did American respondents, except for the orientation towards family relationships (and even here the difference is smaller than for the other orientations), as shown in Table 49.

The above finding suggests that the differences found between American and Argentine university students are valid for the Argentine university population as a whole; the group selected from the National University of Buenos Aires is exceptional in that it combines a set of social characteristics (primarily, political and religious orientations) associated with anthropocentrism in values, which are not really representative of the Argentine university population as a whole, or of the total Argentine population; they neither represent the social characteristics of the students of the National University of Buenos Aires as a whole.

TABLE 49. – Theocentrism in value orientations for American respondents and respondents attending the National University of Buenos Aires. Combined average differences for each value orientation.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents attending the National University of Buenos Aires, minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	- .24
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .64
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.38
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .68
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .62
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .24
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(441)
Respondents attending the National University of Buenos Aires	(180)

Indeed, the group of respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires come from the Department of Sociology in the Faculty of Philosophy, where the student body as a whole has an especially strong inclination towards the political left and away from the religious tradition of the Catholic Church.

The reason respondents attending the National University of Buenos Aires do not score more theocentric than American respondents in the orientation towards family relationships may be explained as follows: the group of respondents attending the National University of Buenos Aires shows an attitude of clear rebellion against traditional authorities. They see in the authority of the family (and the authority of the church) the main force which preserves loyalty to the status quo and to the traditional structure of society. They are probably struggling with their own families because their parents may not approve of their rebelliousness against the existing order of society. They probably see the family as the strongest threat to their freedom. For this reason it is not strange that they strongly disagree with statements such as the following:

Item 71: "Generally you ought to bring up your children in the same way your parents brought you up".

Item 72: "You ought to live the way your family did, even if most of the people in your country live differently".

Item 73: "Generally you ought to follow your parents' advice about your choice of career and job".

Item 77: "You ought to consult your parents before deciding whether to marry the person you love".

What is especially interesting about this group is that although they rebel against the cultural system in which they live, they still show the same values of that system (towards peers, friends, ideas, reciprocity and fellowmen), except for those values which they see clearly conflicting with their rebellious attitude. Indeed, they are caught in the values of the system which they wish to destroy. Although they are rebelling against traditional loyalties and they often declare themselves atheists, their rebellion is not strong enough to lead them to free themselves from the ideas that they are morally obliged to be loyal to their friends, to their peers, to their fellowmen, to their ideas, and to look with favorable eyes on the feelings of the person unilaterally involved in love or friendship (orientation towards reciprocity). They still tend to believe more strongly than do Americans (difference = .87) that it is the intention and not the results that makes an action good (item 70). For this reason the differences between American respondents and respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires are larger: (a) for item 14 (recognition of moral obligation to help a fellowstudent); (b) for item 16 (recognition of moral obligation to help a friend) than for item 17 (feeling of guilt for not helping him); and (c) for item 26 (recognition of moral obligation to do something to help the underprivileged) than for item 28 (feeling of guilt from not helping them). (See Table 50).

Respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires still tend to recognize the obligation to help an ordinary student with almost equal strength to the obligation to help a close friend (items 14 and 16). The difference is .50 for respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires and .81 for American respondents (See Table 50).

TABLE 50. – Theocentrism in value orientations for American respondents and respondents from the National University of Buenos Aires.

Item number *		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		American mean scores	Buenos Aires mean scores	Differ.
Orientation towards family relationships				
20*	Obligation to live with parents	3.34	2.71	+ .63
21.	Job demands <u>vs.</u> obligation to live with parents	4.38	4.34	+ .04
22.	Job and future <u>vs.</u> obligations to parents	2.73	3.16	- .43
23.	Advantages of leaving parental home.....	3.12	2.30	+ .82
24*	Obligation to love parents	2.82	3.54	- .72
59*	Consulting parents about job	2.00	1.43	+ .28
60*	Consulting relatives about job	3.44	3.91	- .47
63*	Complete sharing between spouses	2.67	2.63	+ .04
71*	Acceptance of respondent's parents' way of bringing up children	3.20	3.62	- .42
72*	Acceptance of parent's way of life	3.91	4.12	- .21
73*	Acceptance of parent's advice about job	3.70	4.46	- .76

* Items for which agreement is indicative of a theocentric orientation are indicated with an (*). Agreement with the remaining items is indicative of an anthropocentric orientation. For the complete text of the items see questionnaire in appendix 1.

TABLE 50. – Continued.

Item number		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Buenos Aires</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
Orientation towards family relationships				
76*	Independence <u>vs.</u> following advice	3.38	3.58	- .20
77*	Consulting parents before marrying.....	2.86	3.79	- .93
78.	Contingency of love for parents	2.68	3.09	- .41
79.	Contingency of conjugal love.....	2.85	3.46	- .61
Orientation towards friends^a				
16*	Obligation to help a friend.....	2.72	1.21	+1.51
17*	Guilt for not helping a friend.....	1.97	1.41	+ .56
18*	Obligation to be concerned for a friend	2.70	1.87	+ .83
19*	Obligations to friends <u>vs.</u> obligations to studies, career and job	2.55	1.74	+ .81
61*	Consulting friends about job	2.44	2.04	+ .40
62*	Concern about friend who discontinues friendship.....	2.39	2.06	+ .33
Orientation towards peers - direct items				
14*	Obligation to help a fellowstudent.....	3.54	1.71	+1.83
15*	Guilt for not helping a fellowstudent	2.86	1.94	+ .92

^aItem 76 (listed under the orientation towards family relationships) is also an indicator of this orientation.

TABLE 50. – Continued.

Item number		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Buenos Aires</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
Orientation towards peers - indirect items				
7*	Disapproval of reporting cheaters	2.96	1.74	+1.22
8.	Right to report cheaters	3.66	1.58	+2.08
9.	Comparison of degrees of disapproval of cheaters and reporters.....	3.71	2.10	+1.61
10.	Teachers' relative disapproval of cheaters and reporters	3.89	2.73	+1.16
11.	Unfairness of reporting and of cheating	3.99	2.51	+1.48
12*	Disapproval of reporting friends as cheaters .	2.69	1.69	+1.00
Relation of man to his fellowmen				
26*	Obligation to help the underprivileged.....	2.58	1.58	+1.00
28*	Guilt for not helping the underprivileged.....	3.01	2.06	+ .95
49*	Obligation to reciprocate friendship	4.06	4.00	+ 06
65.	Value of capability vs. altruism	2.74	2.03	+ .71

TABLE 50. – Continued.

Item number		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Buenos Aires</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity^a</u>				
37.	Male-female reciprocity. Respondent of same sex as he involved person	3.71	2.56	+1.15
38.	Male-female reciprocity. Respondent of different sex than the involved person	3.17	2.63	+ .54
39.	Male-female reciprocity, when it is the respondent who was cared for	3.39	2.74	+ .65
40.	Male-female reciprocity, when it is the respondent who cared.....	3.40	2.81	+ .59
45.	Friendship reciprocity: general statement.	3.29	2.59	+ .70
46.	Friendship reciprocity: when the other person wanted the friendship	3.05	2.40	+ .65
47.	Friendship reciprocity: when the respondent wanted the friendship	2.90	2.36	+ .54
<u>Orientation to ideas</u>				
51*	Obligation to defend ideas about family	2.46	1.69	+ .77
52.	Relativity of ideas about family	2.97	2.59	+ .38

^aThis orientation includes also item 49, listed under the orientation towards fellowmen.

TABLE 50. – Continued.

Item number		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Buenos Aires</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
Orientation to ideas				
53.	Respondent feels right but not obligated to defend ideas about family	3.05	3.26	- .2
54*	Obligation to defend ideas about human rights	2.22	1.62	+ .6
55*	Obligation to defend ideas about religion	2.18	1.87	+ .3
Boomerang items				
66*	Loving and beating children	3.29	3.06	+ .2
68	Most people cannot be trusted	3.65	2.71	+ .9
69*	Putting the blame on others	3.56	3.28	+ .2
Other items				
64*	Friendship as gratitude	2.46	2.63	- .1
70*	Value of intention <u>vs.</u> results	2.69	1.81	+ .8
74*	Adherence to church teachings	3.15	3.82	- .6
80*	Dying in defense of one's country	2.21	2.56	- .3
Total no. of cases		(441)	(180)	

University Students from Spain

It was hoped to be able to incorporate in this study a sample of students from Spain. However, only a small number of questionnaires were filled in by Spanish students at the Universities of Granada (100 respondents), Deusto (28 respondents) and Barcelona (20 respondents). Consequently, no representativeness can be assigned here to this group of 148 Spanish students.

Nevertheless, once having made these reservations, it is interesting to notice that for all value orientations, the Spanish respondents score considerable more theocentric than do American respondents and not much less theocentric than do Argentine respondents (Tables 51 and 52).

It is also interesting to note that, similar to Argentine respondents, Spanish respondents recognize much more strongly than Americans that it is the intention rather than the results which makes an action good (item 70; See Table 51). Similar to Argentine respondents, Spanish respondents tend to recognize that they are morally obliged to help their fellowstudents, close friends, or underprivileged, more than to recognize feelings of guilt for not helping them, while American respondents recognize that they would feel guilty, more than to recognize a moral obligation to help. For this reason the differences between Spanish and American respondents are larger: (a) for item 14 (recognition of moral obligation to help a fellowstudent) than for item 15 (feeling of guilt for

TABLE 51. – Theocentrism in value orientations for American and Spanish respondents.

Item number *		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Spanish</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
Orientation towards family relationships				
20*	Obligation to live with parents	3.34	2.22	+1.12
21.	Job demands <u>vs.</u> obligation to live with parents	4.38	4.30	+ .08
22.	Job and future <u>vs.</u> obligations to parents	2.73	2.92	- .19
23.	Advantages of leaving parental home	3.12	2.45	+ .67
24*	Obligation to love parents	2.82	1.56	+1.26
59*	Consulting parents about job	2.00	1.48	+ .52
60*	Consulting relatives about job	3.44	3.62	- .18
63*	Complete sharing between spouses	2.67	2.02	+ .65
71*	Acceptance of respondent's parents' way of bringing up children	3.20	2.49	+ .71
72*	Acceptance of parent's way of life	3.91	3.08	+ .83
73*	Acceptance of parent's advice about job	3.70	3.39	+ .31

* Items for which agreement is indicative of a theocentric orientation are indicated with an (*). Agreement with the remaining items is indicative of an anthropocentric orientation. For complete text of the items see questionnaire in appendix 1.

TABLE 51. – Continued.

		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
Item number		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Spanish</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
Orientation towards family relationships				
76*	Independence <u>vs.</u> following advice	3.38	3.18	+ .28
77*	Consulting parents before marrying.....	2.86	2.23	+ .63
78.	Contingency of love for parents	2.68	2.64	+ .04
79.	Contingency of conjugal love.....	2.85	3.12	- .27
Orientation towards friends ^a				
16*	Obligation to help a friend.....	2.72	1.50	+1.22
17*	Guilt for not helping a friend.....	1.97	1.80	+ .17
18*	Obligation to be concerned for a friend	2.70	2.04	+ .66
19*	Obligations to friends <u>vs.</u> obligations to studies, career and job	2.55	2.33	+ .45
61*	Consulting friends about job	2.44	2.38	+ .06
62*	Concern about friend who discontinues friendship.....	2.39	1.94	+ .45

^aItem 76 (listed under the orientation towards family relationships) is also an indicator of this orientation.

TABLE 51. – Continued.

		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
Item number		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Spanish</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
Orientation towards peers - direct items				
14*	Obligation to help a fellowstudent.....	3.54	2.11	+1.43
15*	Guilt for not helping a fellowstudent	2.86	2.43	+ .43
Orientation towards peers - indirect items				
7*	Disapproval of reporting cheaters.....	2.96	1.76	+1.20
8.	Right to report cheaters	3.66	1.80	+1.86
9.	Comparison of degrees of disapproval of cheaters and reporters.....	3.71	1.80	+1.91
10.	Teachers' relative disapproval of cheaters and reporters	3.89	3.37	+1.26
11.	Unfairness of reporting and of cheating	3.99	2.47	+1.52
12*	Disapproval of reporting friends as cheaters .	2.69	1.49	+1.20
Relation of man to his fellowmen				
26*	Obligation to help the underprivileged.....	2.58	1.53	+1.07
28*	Guilt for not helping the underprivileged.....	3.01	2.21	+ .80

TABLE 51. – Continued.

Item number		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Spanish</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
Relation of man to his fellowmen				
49*	Obligation to reciprocate friendship	4.06	3.38	+ .68
65.	Value of capability vs. altruism	2.74	2.46	+ .28
Unilateral involvement and reciprocity ^a				
37.	Male-female reciprocity. Respondent of same sex as he involved person	3.71	2.93	+ .78
38.	Male-female reciprocity. Respondent of different sex than the involved person	3.17	3.14	+ .03
39.	Male-female reciprocity, when it is the respondent who was cared for	3.39	2.76	+ .63
40.	Male-female reciprocity, when it is the respondent who cared.....	3.40	2.78	+ .62
45.	Friendship reciprocity: general statement.	3.29	2.78	+ .51
46.	Friendship reciprocity: when the other person wanted the friendship.....	3.05	2.63	+ .42
47.	Friendship reciprocity: when the respondent wanted the friendship	2.90	2.51	+ .39

^aItem 49 (listed under the orientation towards fellowmen) is also included in this orientation.

TABLE 51. – Continued.

Item number		Mean theocentrism scores going from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric) *		
		<u>American</u> mean scores	<u>Spanish</u> mean scores	<u>Differ.</u>
<u>Orientation to ideas</u>				
51*	Obligation to defend ideas about family	2.46	1.76	+ .70
52.	Relativity of ideas about family.....	2.97	2.18	+ .79
53.	Respondent feels right but not obligated to defend ideas about family	3.05	2.50	+ .55
54*	Obligation to defend ideas about human rights	2.22	1.94	+ .28
55*	Obligation to defend ideas about religion	2.18	1.44	+ .74
<u>Boomerang items</u>				
66*	Loving and beating children.....	3.29	2.23	+1.06
68	Most people cannot be trusted.....	3.65	2.64	+1.01
69*	Putting the blame on others.....	3.56	3.20	+ .36
<u>Other items</u>				
64*	Friendship as gratitude.....	2.46	2.14	+ .32
70*	Value of intention <u>vs.</u> results.....	2.69	1.83	+ .85
74*	Adherence to church teachings.....	3.15	1.99	+1.16
80*	Dying in defense of one's country.....	2.21	2.10	+ .11
Total no. of cases		(441)	(149)	

TABLE 52. – Theocentrism in value orientations for American and Spanish respondents. Combined average differences for each value orientation.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Spanish respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .47
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .52
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .93
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .71
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .57
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .61
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(441)
Spanish respondents	(149)

TABLE 53. – Theocentrism in value orientations for Spanish and Argentine respondents. Combined average differences for each value orientation.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of Spanish respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	- .09
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .25
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+ .50
Relation of man to his <u>fellows</u>	+ .11
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .19
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	- .14
Total no. of cases	
Spanish respondents	(149)
Argentine respondents	(289)

not helping a fellowstudent); (b) for item 16 (recognition of moral obligation to help a friend) than for item 17 (feeling of guilt for not helping him); (c) for item 26 (recognition of moral obligations to do something to help the underprivileged) than for item 28 (feeling of guilt for not helping them) (See Table 51).

Spanish respondents also do not make as strong a distinction as do American respondents between the recognition of the obligation to help friends and the obligation to help fellowstudents. (See items 14, 15, 16 and 17 in Table 51).

For 49 of the 52 items used in the cross-cultural comparison the Spanish group scores more theocentric than do Americans. Two of the three items for which Americans score more theocentric than Spanish respondents are also two of the five items for which Americans score more theocentric than Argentines (See items 60 and 79, in Tables 41 and 51).

Not only in the direct items Spanish respondents answer more theocentric than Americans, but also in relation to indirect and boomerang items Spanish answers compare with American answers on the same way as Argentine answers compare with American answers (See Tables 41 and 51).

The above findings show that the answers of Spanish respondents compare with the answers of American respondents in a very similar way as the answers of Argentine respondents compare with those of American respondents.

These findings suggest that the differences which were found between American and Argentine university students may be linked to the traditions which Latin American societies inherited from Spain, including of course the religious tradition

The group of Spanish respondents shows the following social characteristics: (a) 48 per cent of the Spanish respondents report religious beliefs and activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life, as compared with 32 per cent of Argentine respondents, and 38 per cent of American respondents; (b) ninety-seven per cent of the Spanish respondents identify themselves with the

Catholic faith, as compared with 90 per cent in the Argentine sample and 36 per cent in the American sample: (c) only 2 per cent of the Spanish group plans to enter teaching or social work, as compared with 37 per cent in the American sample, and 44 per cent in the Argentine sample; 59 per cent of the Spanish respondents plan to practice law, and 13 per cent plan to go into business.

The social characteristics of the group of Spanish students studied are not very similar to those of the American and Argentine groups, but the differences in social characteristics do not seem sufficient to explain why the differences in value orientations found between Spanish and Americans are so similar to the differences found between Argentines and Americans.

Cultural Differences and Social Characteristics

The fact that the differences in value orientations between American and Argentine respondents appear much larger than the differences which were found to be associated with other social characteristics (chapters 5 and 6), would suggest that: (a) the association between value orientations and type of culture (American or Argentine) is stronger than the association between value orientations and other social characteristics (analyzed in chapters 5 and 6); (b) the differences between American and Argentine respondents cannot be explained by any of the social characteristics analyzed above taken alone; (c) the differences, however, could be accounted for by the particular combination of social characteristics considered above (chapters 5 and 6), as evolved throughout the history of the societies considered.

In order to clarify to what extent these conclusions suggested by Tables 41 and 42 (compared with the tables presented in chapters 5 and 6) are supported by the present research, it was decided to analyze the relation of the American and Argentine samples to each of the social characteristics associated with the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension, in the following way:

1. Religious involvement. The proportion of respondents reporting high religious involvement is not higher in the Argentine sample than it is in the American sample (32 per cent as against 38 per cent). This fact led us to discard the possibility that the differences in value orientations between Americans and Argentines could be explained by the greater religious involvement of Argentines in our sample.

However, the question remained, is the association between value orientations and religious involvement stronger, equal or weaker than the association between American or Argentine cultural identification, and value orientations?

In order to give much weight to the religious involvement variable, we compared Americans who select religious beliefs or activities as the one thing from which they expect most satisfaction in life, with

Argentines who do not select religious beliefs or activities among the three things from which they expect most satisfaction in life. Even comparing Americans and Argentines under such unfavorable conditions, Argentines score more theocentric than Americans for 39 of the 52 items used in comparison. Argentines show more theocentric orientations than Americans, except for the orientations towards family and towards ideas, for which there is practically no difference.

This finding suggests that even dichotomizing religious involvement in this way, the association between "type of culture" (American or Argentine) and value orientations is stronger, on the whole, than the association between religious involvement and value orientations. However, the latter association is also very strong, especially for the orientations towards family relationships and towards ideas. The orientations towards family relationships and towards ideas seem the most directly associated with high religious involvement in these two groups of university students most of whom are Christians, and many of whom are Catholics, all of them living in Christian societies. (See Table 54)

2. Communal involvement. Seventy-nine per cent of the respondents in the Argentine sample, as compared with only 52 per cent in the American sample, were classified as having high communal involvement. This meant that 79 per cent of Argentine respondents reported that their two best friends were Catholic, and 52 per cent in the American sample reported that their two best friends belonged to the same religion as themselves. This finding would suggest that the differences in value orientations found between American and Argentine respondents can be explained to some extent by the differences in the religious homogeneity of their reference groups, since (as shown in chapter 5) respondents with high "communal involvement" tend to show more theocentric value orientations than others, in both national samples.

TABLE 54. – Theocentrism in value orientations of American respondents with high religious involvement and Argentine respondents with low religious involvement.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	- .03
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .32
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.25
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .42
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .44
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	- .01
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(52)
Argentine respondents	(198)

In order to determine the relative strength of the association for the two variables (cultural differences and communal involvement), Argentine respondents with low communal involvement were compared in their value orientations with American respondents with high communal involvement.

Even under such unfavorable conditions the Argentine respondents still score more theocentric than do American respondents for all value orientations. The differences are not significantly smaller (except for the orientations towards family relationships) than the differences found between the whole American and Argentine samples, as shown in Table 35 (See also Table 42).

These findings suggest that differences in communal involvement are not an adequate explanation for the differences found between the American and the Argentine samples. They also confirm the fact that value orientations are more strongly associated with the type of culture (American or Argentine) than with high or low communal involvement. However, the fact that the association between type of culture and value orientations is greatly reduced for the orientation towards family relationships, suggest that the lead of the "type of culture" variable over the communal involvement variable is weaker for this value orientation than for the other value orientation.

TABLE 55. – Theocentrism in value orientations of American respondents with high communal involvement and Argentine respondents with low communal involvement.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .07
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .63
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.50
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .93
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .50
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .30
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(229)
Argentine respondents	(35)

3. Religious orientation variable. Forty-one per cent of the American respondents are Protestants, as compared with 1 per cent of the Argentine sample. Ninety per cent of the Argentine respondents are Catholics, as compared with 36 per cent in the American sample. Seventeen per cent of the American respondents are Jews, as compared with 1 per cent in the Argentine sample. Since in our study Jews and, to some extent, Protestants, show less theocentric orientations than Catholics (see chapter 5), one might think that the differences between American and Argentine respondents are associated with the fact that Catholics are more highly represented in the Argentine sample, and Jews and Protestants are more highly represented in the American sample.

However, comparing Catholics in the American sample with Catholics in the Argentine sample, we find that Argentine respondents still show more theocentrism than Americans, for all value orientations (Table 56).

This finding suggests that the differences between American and Argentine respondents cannot be explained simply as a result of the different religious composition of the samples.

It was not possible to compare American Catholics with Argentine Protestants or Jews, because there was not a sufficient number of Protestants or Jews in the Argentine sample.

TABLE 56. – Theocentrism in value orientations of American Catholic and Argentine respondents.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents, minus mean theocentrism scores of American Catholic respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .17
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .69
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.42
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .98
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .72
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .13
Total no. of cases	
American Catholics	(160)
Argentine respondents	(289)

4. Type of university attended. In the American sample 34 per cent of the respondents attend a Catholic university (Fordham), while in the Argentine sample 46 per cent of the respondents attend Catholic universities. Could these relative proportions explain the differences in theocentrism of value orientations found between American and Argentine respondents?

Table 57 shows that even comparing Argentine respondents attending a non Catholic university with American respondents attending a Catholic university, Argentines score more theocentric than Americans, except for the value orientations towards family and ideas. This exception may be explained as a result of the emphasis placed by the Catholic tradition on the theocentric orientations towards family relationships and towards ideas, and the strong reaction of Argentine leftists against the traditional emphasis on submission to family loyalties.

Holding the type of university attended (Catholic or not) constant, still Argentine respondents score considerable more theocentric than American respondents in all value orientations, except for a small negative difference in the value orientation towards family relationship, in the comparison between Fordham University and the Catholic University of Buenos Aires.

TABLE 57. –Theocentrism in value orientations of respondents attending Fordham University, and respondents attending Argentine state universities.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of respondents attending Argentine state universities, minus the mean theocentrism scores of respondents attending Fordham University)		
	Comparing respondents attending Fordham with respondents attending:		
	National University of Buenos Aires	National University of Tucumán	National University of Córdoba
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	- .56	- .04	- .08
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .57	+ .20	+ .42
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.36	+1.19	+1.54
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .70	+ .66	+ .77
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .59	+ .75	+ .78
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	- .18	- .03	- .21
Total no. of cases			
Fordham University	(123)	(123)	(123)
Argentine universities	(180)	(127)	(26)

5. Sex roles. Thirty-five per cent of Argentine respondents are males, as compared with 56 per cent of American respondents. Since in both national samples females show more theocentrism in value orientations than males, one might think that the differences in value orientations between the Argentine and the American samples are a result of the fact that females are more strongly represented in the former than in the latter.

However, even comparing American females (the more theocentric sex group in the American sample) with Argentine males (the less theocentric sex group in the Argentine sample), Argentine respondents score more theocentric than do American respondents for 46 of the 52 items used in the test, and for all value orientations considered (Table 58). The differences between Argentine males and American females are not considerably smaller than the differences found comparing the whole American sample with the whole Argentine sample (Table 42).

This finding suggest that: (a) the differences between American and Argentine respondents cannot be explained as a result of the different sex composition of the samples; (b) the "type of culture" (American or Argentine) variable is more strongly associated with the value orientations than is the sex roles variable.

TABLE 58. – Theocentrism in value orientations of American females and Argentine males.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .27
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .60
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.22
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .66
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .50
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .34
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(160)
Argentine respondents	(81)

6. Age. In the American sample the proportion of respondents born before 1941 (37 per cent) is not significantly different from the proportion of respondents born after 1941 (39 per cent). Similarly in the Argentine sample the proportion of respondents born after 1941 (46 per cent) is not significantly different from the proportion of respondents born before 1941 (45 per cent). Consequently, the sample composition does not suggest age as a variable which could explain the differences in value orientations between Americans and Argentines.

In order to test the relative strength of the "culture type" and age variables, the value orientations of the younger group (the most theocentric age group within the sample) in the American sample were compared with the value orientations of the older (the most anthropocentric age group within the sample) group in the Argentine sample.

It was found that even under these conditions Argentine respondents answer more theocentric than do American respondents 45 of the 52 items used in the test; older Argentine respondents show more theocentrism than younger American respondents for all value orientations considered, and the differences in value orientations thus found are not considerably smaller than the differences found considering the total American and Argentine samples (Tables 42 and 59).

TABLE 59. – Theocentrism in value orientations of American respondents 20 years old or younger and Argentine respondents 22 years old or older.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .05
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .66
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.41
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .70
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .32
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(169)
Argentine respondents	(127)

7. Ecological background. Although on the whole respondents with rural background tend to answer more theocentric than respondents with urban backgrounds, respondents from towns of less than 20,000 people constitute the ecological group which answers most theocentric in the American sample, and which answer more anthropocentric in the Argentine sample. Twelve per cent of Argentine respondents and 16 per cent of American respondents report that they grew up in towns of less than 20,000 people.

In order to determine the relative strength of the ecological background and "culture type" variables, American respondents who grew up in towns of less than 20,000 people (most theocentric American ecological group) were compared with Argentine respondents who grew up in towns of less than 20,000 people (most anthropocentric ecological group).

Even under such circumstances Argentine respondents still score more theocentric than American respondents for all value orientations (Table 60), and the differences are not considerably smaller than when we consider the whole American and Argentine samples (Table 42). For 47 of the 52 items used in the test Argentines score more theocentric than Americans.

This finding suggests that theocentrism-anthropocentrism of value orientations is more strongly associated with the "type of culture" variable, than with the ecological background variable.

TABLE 60. – Theocentrism in value orientations of American and Argentine respondents who grew up in towns of less than 20,000.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .34
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .76
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.07
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .62
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .53
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .24
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(71)
Argentine respondents	(35)

8. Career orientation. The proportion of respondents planning to enter teaching or social work is somewhat higher in the Argentine sample (44 per cent) than in the American sample (37 per cent). However, in the Argentine sample, respondents planning to enter teaching or social work do not show more theocentrism in value orientations than those planning to enter other occupations. On the other hand, even comparing American respondents who plan to enter teaching or social work with Argentines who plan to enter other occupations, Argentine respondents score more theocentric than American respondents for 47 of the 52 items: Table 61 shows that even under these conditions Argentine respondents show more theocentrism than American respondents in all value orientations, and the differences are not considerably smaller than the differences found considering the total American and Argentine samples.

9. Exposure to psychology. Sixty-five per cent of American respondents, as compared with only 51 per cent of Argentine respondents, report high exposure to academic psychology.

However, even comparing Argentine respondents who report high exposure to academic psychology, with American respondents who do not report high exposure to psychology, Argentines show more theocentrism than Americans for all value orientations (Table 62); the differences are not considerably smaller than for the whole sample, except for

TABLE 61. – Theocentrism in value orientations of American respondents planning to enter teaching or social work, and Argentine respondents planning to enter other occupations..

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .31
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .70
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.38
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .76
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .59

Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .47
<hr/>	
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(164)
Argentine respondents	(159)
<hr/>	

TABLE 62. – Theocentrism in value orientations of American respondents non exposed to academic psychology, and Argentine respondents exposed to academic psychology.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .30
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .77
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.34
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .55
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .67
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .67
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(149)
Argentine respondents	(146)

the orientations towards fellowmen, where the difference is .55 instead of .82. Argentines score more theocentric than Americans for 47 of the 52 items used in the test.

10. Cohesion with friends. The proportion of respondents showing high, medium and low cohesion with their friends is 30 per cent, 27 per cent and 40 per cent in the Argentine sample; and 34, 29 and 34 per cent in the American sample. Since Americans report relatively higher cohesion with their friends than do Argentines, this variable does not seem appropriate to explain the differences between American and Argentine respondents.

Comparing the group with low cohesion in the Argentine sample with the group with high cohesion in the American sample, we find that for all value orientations Argentines score more theocentric than Americans; the differences are not considerably smaller than those found considering the total American and Argentine samples (See Tables 41 and 63). For 47 of the 52 items used in the test Argentine respondents score more theocentric than American respondents, even under such unfavorable conditions.

TABLE 63. – Theocentrism in value orientations of American with high cohesion with their friends, and Argentines with low cohesion with their friends.

Value orientations	Average differences in theocentrism scores. (Mean theocentrism scores of Argentine respondents, minus the mean theocentrism scores of American respondents)
Relation of man to his <u>family</u>	+ .29
Relation of man to his <u>friends</u>	+ .62
Relation of man to his <u>peers</u>	+1.44
Relation of man to his <u>fellowmen</u>	+ .72
<u>Unilateral involvement and reciprocity</u>	+ .57
Relation of man to <u>ideas</u>	+ .26
Total no. of cases	
American respondents	(150)
Argentine respondents	(117)

Sources of Cultural Differences

The findings reported above show that value orientations are more strongly associated with the "type of culture" (American and Argentine) variable than with any other of the variables considered, and that the differences between American and Argentine respondents cannot be attributed to differences in sampling composition.

However, it is considered here that although the social characteristics measured in the present study cannot by themselves explain the differences found between the American and the Argentine samples, they may serve to illuminate the sources of such differences.

Indeed, it has been found that the theocentric value orientations which are associated with Argentine culture are also associated with high religious involvement, high communal involvement (with one's socio-religious group), attendance at Catholic universities, identification with the Christian Democrat Party, and, to some extent, with Catholic faith. In other words, it has been found that the religious factor is associated the value orientations in a similar way (although with somewhat less intensity) as the "type of culture" (American or Argentine) variable.

This finding suggest that the reason for the differences between the value orientations of American respondents and the value orientations of Argentine respondents may be related in some way to the religious traditions in both countries.

The following considerations suggest that the influence of the Catholic tradition and high religious homogeneity in Argentina, and the Protestant tradition and religious pluralism in the United States, may be related to the differences found in value orientations: (a) the answers of Spanish and Argentine respondents, who are under the influence of a similar Catholic tradition and live in societies characterized by high religious homogeneity, tend to differ in a similar way from the answers of American respondents, who are under the influence of a Protestant tradition and pluralistic society; (b) the value orientations which were found associated with attendance at Catholic universities, identification with a Catholic party

(the Argentine Christian Democrat Party), having Catholic friends, and, to some extent, being a Catholic, were also found associated with identification with the Argentine culture; (c) according to Parsons' observations, the branches of Protestantism which have been important for modern industrialism (highly developed in American society) have led to a secularization where the responsibility of man for the empirical results of his actions is emphasized more than his dependence upon receptivity of God's grace, while Catholic tradition places a greater emphasis upon reliance on authority and receptivity to God's grace¹; Lenski observes that "doctrinal orthodoxy proved more frequent among Catholics than among Protestants"², and Goldsen et al report that "The Catholics are most agreed [than Protestants and Jews] on the necessity for a religious or ethical belief system to be based on absolute and traditional values"³; Parsons also observes that "Catholic Christianity" "displace the whole emphasis away from the occupations achievement complex"⁴, explaining the origins of modern capitalism in Protestant traditions, Max Weber observes: "Thus the Calvinist, as it is sometimes put, himself create his own salvation, or as would be more correct, the conviction of it".⁵ (Italics mine).

The fact that theocentrism in value orientations was found to be associated also with cohesion with one's friends suggests that the type of society with close personal solidary relations among its members, which is probably more characteristic in Argentine than in the United States, may be a social structural reason for Argentine's greater theocentrism in value orientations.

The fact that Argentine respondents do not report higher cohesion with their friends than American respondents do, may be simply an artifact of the different habits of expression in both countries. Indeed, Argentines probably

¹ "Christianity and Modern...", pp. 31 - 49.

² Op. cit., p. 57.

³ Op. cit., p. 164.

⁴ The Social System, p. 190.

⁵ The Protestant Ethic ..., p. 115.

would not say that they "form a group" with their friends, unless they were a highly cohesive clique.

The fact that theocentrism in value orientations was found to be associated with rural background suggests that the greater anthropocentrism in value orientations found in the American sample may be associated with the modern industrialization characteristic of the United States, in contrast to the still largely pre-industrial situation in Argentina.

In this way, "type of culture" (American or Argentine) can be seen as a combination of factors (including religious, social, political and economic factors). However, it is important to notice that although a combination of religious, social, economic and political factors may be considered responsible for the differences between American and Argentine respondents, such factors act indirectly by influencing the cultures for centuries, leading to effects different from the effects of the original factor. This phenomenon can be illustrated as follows:

1. We saw that the differences between Protestant and Catholic respondents appear greater within the group with low religious involvement than within the group with high religious involvement. This finding suggests that the religious factor, acting through the Protestant and Catholic traditions in the United States and Argentina, is associated more with the secularized derivations of these traditions than with the specific religious values of people high in religious involvement (who accept the most orthodox doctrines and values of their faith).

This finding is particularly important, since it is in the context of a whole culture that such secularized expressions of religious movements take shape. These considerations are not intended to deemphasize the influence that the Catholic and Protestant doctrines themselves have on the cultural differences found in value orientations, since the nature of the secularization is largely determined by the doctrines and orthodox movements which are secularized, as Max Weber states:

The Puritan wanted to work in a calling; we are forced to do so. For when asceticism was carried out of monastic cells into everyday life, it began to dominate worldly morality, it did its part in building the tremendous cosmos of the modern economic order. This order is now bound to the technical and economic conditions of machine production ... In Baxter's view the care for

external goods should only lie on the shoulders of the "saint like a light cloak, which can be thrown aside at any moment". But fate decreed that the cloak should become an iron cage.¹

2. As explained above, although Argentine culture leads to agree with boomerang items and to strongly condemn reporting cheaters (indirect items); high religious involvement, attendance at Catholic universities and rural background tend to be associated with the opposite answers to these items. As explained above, this phenomenon can be seen as a result of certain institutionalized rationalizations which can only be highly developed by a whole culture.

3. More similarity of patterns was found in the answers of Spanish and Argentine respondents, than in the type of answers associated with Argentine culture and with "theocentric" social characteristics. Indeed, the data suggests that: (a) "theocentric" social characteristics do not lead to recognize the obligation to help an ordinary student with almost equal strength to the obligation to help a closer friend (items 14, 15, 16 and 17), in the way Argentine and Spanish culture do; (b) "theocentric" social characteristics do not lead to recognize moral obligations more strongly than feelings of guilt (items 14, 15, 16, 17, 26 and 28), in the way Argentine and Spanish culture do; (c) "theocentric" social characteristics are not associated as strongly and consistently with theocentric value orientations as identification with Argentine and Spanish culture are.

To add more than these few suggestions about the sources of the differences between American and Argentine respondents, would involve the risk of obscuring the purpose of the present study, which is not aimed at explaining the answers or origins of the differences which are found.

¹ The Protestant Ethic ..., p. 181.

CHAPTER VIII
THE THEOCENTRISM-ANTHROPOCENTRISM
UNDERLYING DIMENSION

At this stage one may ask: what does our empirical study tell us about the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension itself?

The value orientations considered in the research appear to be associated with each other. Indeed, it was found that Argentine respondents score more theocentric than American respondents in all value orientations considered. It was also found that both within the American sample and within the Argentine sample: (a) respondents with high religious involvement score more theocentric than respondents with low religious involvement for all value orientations considered (Table 7); (b) respondents whose two best friends belong to the same religious faith as themselves (American sample), or whose two best friends are Catholic (Argentine sample) score more theocentric than other respondents for all value orientations considered (Table 9); (c) Catholics score more theocentric than Jews for all value orientations, and more theocentric than Protestants for most value orientations (especially among respondents with high religious involvement). (Tables 11 and 12); (d) Catholics and Protestants score more theocentric than irreligious respondents for all value orientations, and Jews score more theocentric than irreligious respondents for five of the six value orientations considered (Table 13); (e) respondents attending Catholic universities score more theocentric than respondents attending other universities (taken as a block) for all value orientations considered (Tables 14 and 15); (f) females score more theocentric than males on all except the value orientations towards the family in the Argentine sample (Table 18); (g) respondents 20 years old or younger score more theocentric than respondents 22 years old or older for all value orientations considered in the American sample, and for all except the value orientation towards friends in the Argentine sample (Table 20); (h) respondents coming from rural areas score more theocentric than

respondents coming from urban areas for most value orientations (Table 21); (i) respondents planning to enter teaching or social work score more theocentric than those planning to enter other occupations, for most value orientations considered¹ (Tables 30 and 31); (j) respondents more exposed to academic psychology score less theocentric than those less exposed to academic psychology, in a secular context (Tables 32 and 33)²; (k) respondents with higher cohesion with their friends score more theocentric than those with lower cohesion with their friends, for most value orientations considered (Table 34).

¹ Once we control for type of university attended in the Argentine sample.

² For respondents from Fordham University, the opposite is the case in all except the value orientation towards the family.

These findings suggest that the value orientations considered are associated with each other, to the extent that they tend to be associated with the same social characteristics in a similar way. Indeed, if value orientation (A) and value orientation (B) are each associated with the same social statuses (C), (D), (E), (F), and (G), one would conclude that value orientation (A) is associated with value orientations (B)¹.

The association of the value orientations with each other was directly tested by finding out how the indices with which they were measured correlate with each other. (Positive correlation means here that respondents scoring theocentric in one value orientation, tend to score theocentric in another, and respondents who score anthropocentric in one value orientation tend to score anthropocentric in another).

The correlations matrixes obtained show:

1. Considering the combined sample (both American and Argentine respondents), every value orientation correlates positively with every other value orientation, as shown in matrix 1.
2. Considering the American sample only, every value orientation correlate positively with every other value orientation, except for a small negative

¹ We saw that for all value orientations Catholics score more theocentric (relatively to Protestants) among respondents with low religious involvement than among respondents with high religious involvement, suggesting that all value orientations tend to variate simultaneously in the same direction.

MATRIX 1.-- Correlation of the respondents' theocentrism-anthropocentrism in each value orientation with their theocentrism-anthropocentrism in each value orientation. Combined sample (American and Argentine respondents).

	Value orientation towards					
	Family	Friends	Peers	Fellow-men	Reciprocity	Ideas
Value orientation towards:						
Family		+ .32	+ .20	+ .28	+ .19	+ .32
Friends			+ .60	+ .50	+ .25	+ .31
Peers				+ .45	+ .30	+ .25
Fellowmen					+ .19	+ .32
Reciprocity						+ .20
Ideas						
Total no. of respondents						(730)

MATRIX 2.--. Correlation of the respondents' theocentrism-anthropocentrism in each value orientation with their theocentrism-anthropocentrism in each other value orientation. American sample.

	Value orientation towards					
	Family	Friends	Peers	Fellowmen	Reciprocity	Ideas
Value orientation towards:						
Family		+ .28	+ .07	+ .22	+ .17	+ .34
Friends			+ .36	+ .33	+ .05	+ .12
Peers				+ .09	- .04	+ .09
Fellowmen					+ .18	+ .26
Reciprocity						+ .10
Ideas						
Total no. of respondents						(441)

MATRIX 3.--. Correlation of the respondents' theocentrism-anthropocentrism in each value orientation with their theocentrism-anthropocentrism in each other value orientation. Argentine sample.

Value orientation towards:	Value orientation towards					
	Family	Friends	Peers	Fellowmen	Reciprocity	Ideas
Family		+ .17	-.02	+ .16	+ .03	+ .18
Friends			+ .31	+ .26	+ .04	+ .18
Peers				+ .28	+ .16	+ .12
Fellowmen					+ .18	+ .15
Reciprocity						+ .14
Ideas						
Total no. of respondents						(289)

correlation between the orientation towards reciprocity and the orientation towards friendship (Matrix 2).

3. Considering the Argentine sample only, every value orientation correlates positively with every other value orientation, except for a small negative correlation between the orientation towards family relationships and the orientation towards peers (Matrix 3).

4. The positive correlations are stronger when we consider the total sample (Matrix 1), than when we consider the American or Argentine samples separately (Matrixes 2 and 3).

5. In all three samples (American, Argentine, or combined) the orientation towards ideas is the orientation most strongly associated with the orientation towards the family and vice-versa.

6. In all three samples the orientation towards peers is the most strongly associated with the orientation towards peers and vice-versa.

7. In all three samples the orientation towards friends is the most strongly positively correlated with the orientation towards fellowmen.

8. In the American and Argentine samples the orientation towards fellowmen is the most strongly associated with the orientation towards reciprocity, but in the total sample the orientation towards peers is the most strongly associated with the orientation towards reciprocity.

These findings suggest:

1. Both in the American and in the Argentine samples theocentric orientations are associated with each other, and anthropocentric orientations are associated with each other.
2. The fact that theocentric orientations are strongly associated to the Argentine culture, and anthropocentric orientations associated to the American culture, results in a stronger association among theocentric or anthropocentric value orientations when one considers the combined (American and Argentine) sample, than when one considers the American or the Argentine samples separately.
3. However, the association among theocentric or anthropocentric value orientations is stronger for certain pairs (family-ideas; friends-peers) than for other pairs. This finding suggests that even if all value orientations can be considered linked by the underlying theocentric or anthropocentric major premise, the particular content of each orientation determines the relative strength of the association. Probably one of the reasons the orientations towards family and ideas are so strongly emphasized by the Catholic tradition. The orientation towards peers and friends are so strongly correlates with each other probably because friends are only a special part of the peer-group. One of the reasons the orientation towards fellowmen is most strongly associated with the orientation towards reciprocity in the American and Argentine samples is because both orientations refer to strangers (fellowmen, or persons offering friendship or love to the actor). Probably one of the reasons the orientation towards peers in the total sample is most strongly associated with the orientation towards reciprocity is because peers (ordinary fellowstudents) can be considered strangers, in contrast with friends or family. One of the reasons than, in all three samples, the orientation towards fellowmen is most strongly associated with the orientation towards friends may be related to the favorable disposition towards people in general which is likely to characterized a person who is able to maintain warm and honest relations with his friends.

The association among value orientations not only leads respondents who show theocentrism in one value orientation to show theocentrism in another value orientation as well. It also leads respondents

who tend to show inconsistency in their answers to one value orientation also to show inconsistency in relation to other value orientations.

Considering the items used as indicators of a value orientation, if an individual tends to agree with the theocentric pole of some of them and with the anthropocentric pole of others, it is considered that he shows inconsistency in relation to that value orientation. If he tends to agree with the theocentric pole of all the items or with the anthropocentric pole of all the items, it is considered

than he shows consistency in relation to that value orientation.¹

¹ The indices of value-consistency were constructed as follows:

1. The answers to items indicators of values were ranked from 1 (most theocentric) to 5 (most anthropocentric), according to the following scale:

	<u>Group A</u> Items for which agreement indicates a theocentric orientation. They were indicated with an (*) above.	<u>Group B</u> Items for which agreement indicates an anthropocentric orientation.
- Strongly agree	1	5
- Agree	2	4
- Uncertain	3	3
- Disagree	4	2
- Strongly disagree	5	1

"No answer" is given a value of 3 (the same for "uncertain") in every case.

2. For each individual the following operations were performed:

A. All the individual's "4" scores were added as if they were "1" scores and all his "5" scores were added as if they were "2". The result from adding all "4" and "5" as if they were "1" and "2" was called F.

B. "2" scores were added as if they were "1", and "1" scores as if they were "2", calling E the result.

C. Considering E and F, the smallest of them was divided by the largest. The result was called R, that is, rough index of consistency, going from 0 (maximum consistency) to 1 (maximum inconsistency).

D. Adding E + F and dividing the total by the number of items taken into consideration for the construction of the index, we obtained an index of extremity of answers (D) going from 0 (maximum indecision, uncommitment or uncertainty) to 1 (maximum tendency to answer in extremes: e.g.: "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree").

E. Multiplying D times R a corrected index of inconsistency I was obtained, going from 0 to 2. The correction resulting from multiplying D times R was necessary in order to account for the greater degree of inconsistency involved when the contradictory answers are extreme. With this correction, an individual agreeing with the theocentric pole of half of the items and with the anthropocentric pole of the other half, will appear less inconsistent than an individual strongly agreeing with the theocentric pole of half of the items, and strongly agreeing with the anthropocentric pole of the other half.

The expected association between consistency or inconsistency in relation to one value orientation, and consistency or inconsistency in relation to another value orientation, was tested by computing the correlations between indices of consistency corresponding to different value orientations. It was found that:

1. Considering the combined sample (American and Argentine respondents), the consistency scores for any one value orientation are positively correlated with the consistency scores for any other value orientation (except for a small negative correlation between consistency in the orientation towards reciprocity and consistency in the orientation towards peers), as shown in Matrix 4.
2. Considering either the American sample or the Argentine sample the consistency scores for any value orientation are positively correlated with the consistency scores for any other value orientation (Matrixes 5 and 6).
3. The correlations among consistency scores (Matrixes 4, 5 and 6) are not as strong as the correlations among theocentrism scores (Matrixes 1, 2 and 3).

These findings suggest:

1. In both the American and the Argentine groups theocentrism or anthropocentrism in one value orientation is not only associated with theocentrism or anthropocentrism in any other orientation, but also consistency in theocentrism or anthropocentrism in one orientation, is associated with consistency in another orientation.

MATRIX 4.--. Correlation of the respondents' consistency in relation to each value orientation with their consistency in relation to each other value orientation. Combined sample (American and Argentine respondents).

	Value orientation towards					
	Family	Friends	Peers	Fellow-men	Reciprocity	Ideas
Value orientation towards:						
Family		+ .08	+ .02	+ .15	+ .22	+ .16
Friends			+ .13	+ .08	+ .00	+ .07
Peers				+ .02	- .02	+ .05
Fellowmen					+ .11	+ .15
Reciprocity						+ .16
Ideas						
Total no. of respondents						(730)

MATRIX 5.--. Correlation of the respondents' consistency in relation to each value orientation with their consistency in relation to each other value orientation. American sample.

	Value orientation towards					
	Family	Friends	Peers	Fellowmen	Reciprocity	Ideas
Value orientation towards:						
Family		+ .10	+ .04	+ .09	+ .18	+ .08
Friends			+ .06	+ .03	+ .01	+ .09
Peers				+ .04	+ .02	+ .09
Fellowmen					+ .10	+ .16
Reciprocity						+ .02
Ideas						
Total no. of respondents						(441)

MATRIX 6.-- Correlation of the respondents' consistency in relation to each value orientation with their consistency in relation to each other value orientation. Argentine sample.

	Value orientation towards					
	Family	Friends	Peers	Fellowmen	Reciprocity	Ideas
Value orientation towards:						
Family		+ .13	+ .11	+ .15	+ .11	+ .15
Friends			+ .18	+ .16	+ .10	+ .11
Peers				+ .05	+ .02	+ .08
Fellowmen					+ .05	+ .10
Reciprocity						+ .17
Ideas						
Total no. of respondents	(289)					

2. The association among consistency scores is not as strong as the association among theocentrism or anthropocentrism scores. To explain this it is suggested that the association between consistency (or inconsistency) in one value orientation, and consistency (or inconsistency) in another value orientation may be considered simply a manifestation of the association between theocentrism (or anthropocentrism) in one value orientation, and theocentrism (or anthropocentrism) in another value orientation. Indeed: (a) extreme theocentrism (or anthropocentrism) in value orientation A is associated with extreme theocentrism (or anthropocentrism) in value orientation B (Matrixes 1, 2 and 3); (b) since extreme theocentrism (or anthropocentrism) in value orientations is reflected in consistently theocentric (or anthropocentric) answers, extreme theocentrism (or anthropocentrism) in A and B will be associated with consistency answers to items indicating A and B; (c) consequently, consistency in the answers to items indicatives of value orientation A is associated with consistency in the answers to items indicative of value orientation B.

The Theocentrism-anthropocentrism Dimension and the Items Used

Even after the above reasoning one may still think that the association found among the various value orientations could be at least partly a result of the particular ways in which the indices for each value orientation were constructed.

In order to determine to what extent theocentric or anthropocentric answers to each individual indicator of the value orientations are associated with theocentric or anthropocentric answers to each other individual indicator of the same or other value orientations, the correlation between the items (indicative of various value orientations) was computed.

Only direct items were used in the construction of indices of theocentrism-anthropocentrism of value orientation, and indices of consistency-inconsistency of value orientation. As explained before, direct items are those which fulfill the two following requirements: (a) they are indicators of an attitude which is central to a given value orientation; (b) an answer to these items cannot be interpreted as an indicator of two value orientations or different direction (one theocentric and one anthropocentric). Consequently, it is considered that direct items are the most clear and direct indicators of the underlying theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension in the present study.

Computing the correlations of each direct item with each other direct item (indicative of the same value orientation or of another value orientation) it was found that:

1. Considering the combined sample (American and Argentine) in 95 per cent of the cases (each "case" is a correlation of one direct item with another direct item), direct items correlate positively with each other (with an average positive

correlation of +.154), and in 5 per cent of the cases they correlate negatively with each other (with an average correlation of -.045).

2. Considering the American sample, in 84 per cent of the case direct items correlate positively with each other (with an average correlation of +.190), and in 16 per cent of the cases they correlate negatively with each other (with an average correlation of -.033).

3. Considering the Argentine sample, in 78 per cent of the cases direct items correlate positively with each other (with an average correlation of +.101), and in 22 per cent of the cases they correlate negatively with each other (with an average correlation of -.042).

These findings suggest that not only are theocentric (or anthropocentric) orientations associated with each other, but that various items used as indicators of various value orientations are all on the same dimension, which has been identified as the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension.

The above conclusion is also suggested by the way in which ambiguous items correlate with direct items. As explained above, agreement with ambiguous items may be interpreted as an indicator of two contradictory value orientations (one theocentric and one anthropocentric) depending on which aspect of the item the respondent is considering in answering it. If this is the case, one would expect that ambiguous items would not correlate with direct

items in the consistency way in which direct items correlate with each other. This expectation was bore out by our data, as follows:

1. Considering the combined sample (American and Argentine respondents), in only 44 per cent of the cases did ambiguous items correlate positively with direct items (with an average correlation of $+0.058$) and in 56 per cent of the cases they correlate negatively with direct items (with an average correlation of -0.065).
2. Considering the American sample, in only 59 per cent of the cases did ambiguous items correlate positively with direct items (with an average correlation of $+0.072$) and in 41 per cent of the cases they correlate negatively (with an average correlation of -0.053).
3. Considering the Argentine sample, in only 56 per cent of the cases did ambiguous items correlate positively with direct items (with an average correlation of $+0.064$) and in 44 per cent of the cases they correlate negatively (with an average correlation of -0.063).

These finding suggest (now not only on logical grounds, but also on empirical grounds) the legitimacy of not giving ambiguous items the same treatment given to direct items, and the appropriateness of excluding ambiguous items from most of our analysis, which was primarily oriented to compare different groups along a single dimension (theocentrism-anthropocentrism)

dimension). By contrast, this suggests the appropriateness of using direct items as indicators of a single underlying dimension (theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension).

It was suggested above (Introduction to Part II) that there is a trend towards status-consistency, in the sense that a status associated with theocentric value orientations will tend to enter in status-sets in which the other statuses are also associated with theocentric value orientations, rather than in status-sets in which the other statuses are associated with anthropocentric value orientations.

This trend towards status-consistency assumes that statuses associated with a theocentric or anthropocentric value orientation are to some extent associated with the underlying theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension, consequently they are to some extent associated with all theocentric or all anthropocentric value orientations. If this is the case, it is expected that individuals under cross-pressures (that is, showing status-inconsistency: one status is associated with theocentric orientations and another status is associated with anthropocentric orientations) would tend to be less consistent in their answers to items indicative of any value orientation, than are individuals with a more consistent status-set. This expectation was based in the following considerations: (a) if all (or most of) the statuses in a status-set are associated with theocentric value orientations, or all (or most) are associated with

anthropocentric value orientations, the actor will tend to be strongly theocentric or strongly anthropocentric in all his value orientations (assuming that all value orientations are in the same dimension); (b) if some statuses are associated with theocentric value orientations and other statuses in the same status-set are associated with anthropocentric value orientations, the actor is likely not to show strong theocentrism or strong anthropocentrism in any of his value orientations; (c) if the orientation of an individual is strongly theocentric or strongly anthropocentric he is more likely to give theocentric answers to all (or most) items, or anthropocentric answers to all (or most) items (High value-consistency), than if he does not feel strongly one way or another¹; (d) consequently, an individual with high status-consistency is more likely to show high value-consistency than is an individual with low status-consistency.

In order to test the possible association between status-consistency and value-consistency, we used: (a) indices of value-consistency², which show to what extent individuals tend to give only theocentric or only anthropocentric answers (consistency) or tend to give theocentric answers to some items and anthropocentric answers to other (inconsistency); (b) an index of status-consistency¹ which show to what extent the social characteristics considered for

¹ This index was constructed in the same way as the indices of value-consistency, giving to the actor's statuses the following scores:

- Cultural identification:	Argentine	1
	American	5
- Religious involvement:	High	1

¹ The effect of cross-pressures upon intensity and consistency in a person's feelings and orientation can be illustrated with Berelson *et al* findings that an individual under cross-pressures is "likely to change his mind in the course of the campaign (pp. 19 - 20), to make up his mind late (p. 284) and to show low political interest (p. 27)". B. R. Berelson, P. F. Lazarsfeld and W. N. McPhee, Voting (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954). The meaning given by Berelson *et al* to "cross-pressures" is broader given here to "status-inconsistency", including opinions and values among the "pressures" (See op. cit., pp. 283 - 284).

² The way they were constructed was explained above in foot-note 1, page 384.

	Low	4
- Affiliation (political for Argentines; religious for Americans)	Catholics (United States) or Christian Democrats (Argentina)	2
	Atheists (United States); Communists or Socialists (Argentina) ⁴	4
	Others	3
- Sex	Female	2
	Male	4
- Ecological background	Rural	2
	Large towns	4
	Other	3
- Communal involvement	High	2
	Low	4
	Other	3
- Career orientation	Teaching or social service	2
	No answer	3
	Others	4
- Cohesion with friends	High	2
	Low	4
	Medium and others	3
- Exposure to psychology	High	2
	Low	4
	No answer	3
- Type of university attended	Catholic	2
	Other	4

The different scores assigned for various statuses roughly reflect the degrees of association found between them and theocentric or anthropocentric value orientations, as reported in chapters 5 and 6.

each individual are all associated with theocentric value orientations, or are all associated with anthropocentric value orientations (consistency) or some of them are associated with theocentric and others with anthropocentric value orientations (inconsistency).

As expected, it was found that the index of status-consistency is positively correlated with each of the indices of value-consistency corresponding to each value-orientation, whether one considers the American sample, the Argentine sample or the combined sample, except for a small negative correlation between the index of status consistency and the index of value-consistency corresponding to the value orientation towards ideas, and even this exception is only in the American sample (Table 64).

TABLE 64. -- Correlations of the respondent's index of status-consistency with the indices of value-consistency corresponding to each value orientation.

	Group considered:		
	American sample	Argentine sample	Combined sample
Value orientation towards:			
Family	+ .16	+ .11	+ .15
Friends	+ .01	+ .13	+ .04
Peers	+ .04	+ .04	+ .04
Fellowmen	+ .06	+ .23	+ .15
Reciprocity	+ .11	+ .09	+ .12
Ideas	- .03	+ .17	+ .06
Total no. of cases	(441)	(289)	(730)

Conclusion

Thus we are led to conclude that the data suggested that the differences between the American and Latin American value clusters described in chapter 1, can be characterized as differences in theocentrism-anthropocentrism of value orientations. It is also suggested that the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension underlies not only the differences between Americans and Latin Americans, but also the differences associated with other social characteristics (religious involvement, sex, political affiliation, etc.) within each society.

Consequently, the data may be interpreted as suggesting that the theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension is the common underlying factor which links: (a) each value orientation with each other value orientation; (b) each "direct" indicator (direct item) of value orientations, with each other "direct" indicator of value orientations; (c) each value orientation with the social characteristics found to be associated with it; (d) the underlying theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension would also link each other various social characteristics (or statuses) which are associated with the same type (theocentric or anthropocentric) of value orientations; (e) in this way the underlying theocentrism-anthropocentrism dimension may help to clarify the association between Latin American and American value orientations, and the religious, political, social and economic factors linked to the historical development of these cultures.

Although the evidence offered to support the above suggestions is weak -and limited to responses of a small group of students, it is hoped that future studies will confirm that there is some truth in them.

APPENDIX I

1. English version of the questionnaire

Below we describe a number of situations. After each description you will find a number of statements relative to the corresponding situation. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with these matters of opinion. First impressions are usually best in such matters. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers.

Read each statement carefully. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the number in front of each of them. The numbers and their meaning are indicated below:

For office
use only

5/179

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| If you <u>agree strongly</u> | Circle 1 |
| If you <u>simply agree</u> | Circle 2 |
| If you <u>are uncertain</u> | Circle 3 |
| If you <u>simply disagree</u> | Circle 4 |
| If you <u>disagree strongly</u> | Circle 5 |

Give your opinion on every statement. If you find that the answers that you can check do not adequately indicate your own opinion, use those closest to the way you feel.

SITUATION A - A student in your University is cheating in an examination and a classmate reports him to the teacher. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
6-	1	2	3	4	5	a- You would disapprove of the action of the student who is cheating.
7-	1	2	3	4	5	b- You would disapprove of the action of the student who reports the teacher.
8-	1	2	3	4	5	c- A student has the right to report a classmate who is cheating.
9-	1	2	3	4	5	d- You would disapprove more of the student who cheats than of the one who reports him.
10-	1	2	3	4	5	e- The teachers would disapprove more of the student who cheats than of the one reporting him.
11-	1	2	3	4	5	f- We are more unfair to our fellow students when we cheat in an examination than when we report teachers.
12-	1	2	3	4	5	g- If the two students were close friends, you would disapprove of the action of one reporting the other.

SITUATION B - A student has great difficulties in a course only because he lacks understanding of certain basic concepts. A classmate who is doing very well notices his difficulties. He also sees that if he devotes a few hours to helping the student who is in difficulty he may keep him from failing. Everyone in the class badly needs time to study for the examinations that will take place in a few days. The student in difficulty does not ask for help. He is only an acquaintance of the student who is doing very well.

1- Do you remember ever having been in the situation of the student having this sort of difficulty in a course?

13- Yes.....0
No.....1

2- If so, have you been offered help by any of your acquaintances in the class? (If you had this sort of difficulty several times, answer what usually happened.)

Yes.....3
No.....4

3- When you have not been having difficulty with a course have you usually offered to help an acquaintance having trouble with the course?

Yes.....6
No.....7

In this situation, in which the student having trouble and the successful student are acquaintances, indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
14-	1	2	3	4	5	a- The successful student is morally obliged to offer help to his classmate who is in difficulty.
15-	1	2	3	4	5	b- You would feel guilty if you did not offer such help and he failed the course.

SITUATION C - Keeping in mind Situation B, assume that the student having difficulty and the successful student are close friends. They have both male (or both female). Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
16-	1	2	3	4	5	a- The successful student is morally obliged to offer help to his close friend.
17-	1	2	3	4	5	b- You would feel guilty if you did not offer help and your close friend failed the course.
18-	1	2	3	4	5	c- A close friend should be concerned about the personal problems and future of his friend almost to the same extent as he is concerned about his own.
19-	1	2	3	4	5	d- A man's obligations towards his friends are at least as important as his obligations towards such things as his studies, career, or job.

SITUATION D - Some people feel that a young man about 22 years old -even if unmarried- should live away from his parents' home, in order to avoid a sense of dependency, etc. Others feel that since children are morally obliged to love their parents, they should be willing to remain close to them as long as possible. Therefore they should leave their parents' home for good only when they marry. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
20-	1	2	3	4	5	a- If your parents want you to live with them as long as you are unmarried, and you are about 22 years old, you would feel guilty if you left their home of our own free will.
21-	1	2	3	4	5	b- If you are offered a very good job in another state, there is nothing wrong in accepting it, although it requires you to leave your parental home.
22-	1	2	3	4	5	c- To do well in your job and build your own future is more important than your obligations to your parents.
23-	1	2	3	4	5	d- In general, it is better for a boy about 22 years old not to go on living in his parents' home, even if unmarried.
24-	1	2	3	4	5	e- We are morally obliged to love our parents even if they have treated us badly.

SITUATION E - In the state where you live there are people very poor, undernourished, illiterate or living under very poor health conditions.

Keeping in mind this situation, indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statement:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
25-	1	2	3	4	5	a- Situation E is true for the state where you live.
26-	1	2	3	4	5	b- You are morally obliged to do something to help these people in need.
27-	1	2	3	4	5	c- There is nothing you can do to help them.
28-	1	2	3	4	5	d- You sometimes feel guilty because you are not doing enough to help these people.
29-	1	2	3	4	5	e- It is not these people's fault that they are in this situation.
30-	1	2	3	4	5	f- Private action, individual or jointly with an institution -for example. a church- is the best way of resolving this type of situation.
31-	1	2	3	4	5	g- Only governmental action can resolve this type of situation.
32-	1	2	3	4	5	h- Not only is governmental action better in resolving this type of situation, but private action is useless.
33-	1	2	3	4	5	i- Such a situation of need cannot be resolved without a fundamental change in the social structure.

34- If you did anything to help alleviate the situation described: What did you do and how did you do it?

.....
.....
.....

SITUATION F - John is a student. He cares for Mary but Mary does not care for him. With only this information, two other students were trying to describe John's situation. Here is what each said:

35- Student 1: (1) John's basic concern is to have Mary care for him in return. (2) John will become dependent on Mary. (3) As a result John is liable to exploitation by Mary. (4) John will resent his dependence. (5) John's pride will be hurt. (6) John will try to hold back his feelings or withdraw from the relationship. (7) If he does not withdraw, he will become a nuisance. (8) Mary will try to discourage his persistence.

36- Student 2: (1) John's basic concern is for Mary's problems and needs. (2) John will not become dependent on Mary's caprices. (3) John will not be liable to exploitation by Mary. (4) John will be dependant only in the sense that he will do things that he considers good for Mary. (5) If Mary does not care for him in return John will not consider his pride hurt. (6) John will not withhold his feelings. (7) Mary will not consider John a nuisance. (8) On the contrary, Mary may feel obliged to care for John in return.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
37-	1	2	3	4	5	a- <u>Student 1</u> describes better than <u>Student 2</u> what <u>usually</u> happens in such cases.
38-	1	2	3	4	5	b- If a girl was the one who cared and the boy did not care for her, the situation would be closer to that described by <u>Student 1</u> than to that described by <u>Student 2</u> .
39-	1	2	3	4	5	c- Usually when someone has cared for you without your caring for her, the situation was closer to that described by <u>Student 1</u> than to that described by <u>Student 2</u> . (If this has never happened to you, base your answer upon what you would expect to happen).
40-	1	2	3	4	5	d- Usually when you have cared for someone without her caring for you, the situation was closer to that described by <u>Student 1</u> than to that described by <u>Student 2</u> . (If this has never happened to you, base your answer upon what you would expect to happen).
41-	1	2	3	4	5	e- You would not care for somebody who did not care for you.
42-	1	2	3	4	5	f- Mary is morally obliged to care for John in return.

As you see, the accounts of Student 1 and Student 2 are both composed of a series of statements (numbered from 1 to 8). Please go over the 16 statements again and underline those that you consider would be most often true, given the initial information (that is, those which describe the situations which are most likely to happen).

SITUATION G - John is a student. He wants to be a friend of Peter, who does not like him. With only this information, two other students were trying to describe John's situation. Here is what each said.

43- Student 1: (1) John's basic concern is to have Peter like him in return. (2) John will become dependent on Peter. (3) As a result John is liable to exploitation by Peter. (4) John will resent his dependence. (5) John's pride will be hurt. (6) John will try to hold back his feelings or withdraw from the relation ship. (7) If he does not withdraw, he will become a nuisance. (8) Peter will try to discourage his persistence.

5/27)

44- Student 2: (1) John's basic concern is for Peter's problems and needs. (2) John will not become dependant on Peter's caprices. (3) John will not be liable to exploitation by Peter. (4) John will be dependant only in the sense that he will do things that he considers good for Peter. (5) If Peter does not reciprocate John will not consider his pride hurt. (6) John will not hold back his feelings. (7) Peter will not consider John a nuisance. (8) On the contrary, Peter may feel obliged to reciprocate.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
45-	1	2	3	4	5	a- <u>Student 1</u> describes better than <u>Student 2</u> what <u>usually</u> happens in such cases.
46-	1	2	3	4	5	b- Usually when somebody has taken the initiative in trying to be your friend the situation was closer to that described by <u>Student 1</u> than to that described by <u>Student 2</u> . (If this has never happened to you, base your answer upon what you would expect to happen).
47-	1	2	3	4	5	c- Usually when you have taken the initiative in trying to be someone else's friend the situation was closer to that described by <u>Student 1</u> than to that described by <u>Student 2</u> . (If this has never happened to you, base your answer upon what you would expect to happen).
48-	1	2	3	4	5	d- You would not want to be friends with somebody who did not want to be your friend.
49-	1	2	3	4	5	e- Peter is morally obliged to reciprocate.

As you see, the accounts of Student 1 and Student 2 are both composed of a series of statements (numbered from 1 to 8). Please go over the 16 statements again and underline those that you consider would be most often true, given the initial information (that is, those which describe the situations which are most likely to happen).

12- Please use this space to comment on your answers to Situation G
.....
.....

SITUATION H - In a conversation at school another student attacks a conception of family life which you accept (with specific references to marital responsibilities, infidelity, children's duties towards their parents, polygamy, etc.). To what extent would you agree with each of the following statement?

- | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | |
|-----|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|--|
| 50- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | a- You would feel morally obliged to take a strong stand, trying to give your reasons. |
| 51- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | b- You would feel that family life is a matter of preferences and opinions, and there are no right or wrong answers to such questions. |
| 52- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | c- You would feel that you are right but that you are not morally obliged to argue or try to convince others of your viewpoints. |

5/37) SITUATION I - In another conversation what is being attacked is your conception of basic human rights (e.g., political, religious, or economic freedom). To what extent would you agree with the following statements?

- | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | |
|-----|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|--|
| 53- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | a- You would feel morally obliged to take a strong stand, trying to give your reasons. |

SITUATION J - In another conversation what is being attacked is your own religion or your ideas about religion. To what extent would you agree with the following statements?

- | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | |
|-----|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|--|
| 54- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | a- You would feel morally obliged to take a strong stand, trying to give your reasons. |

SITUATION K - While traveling on a train, you meet a congenial person of your own age and sex. After an hour's conversation:

- | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | |
|-----|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|--|
| 55- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | a- You would consider inviting him to your home. |
| 56- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | b- You might discuss your family and friends with him. |
| 57- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | c- You might discuss your personal problems with him. |

SITUATION L - You are offered a job in another part of the country. Before deciding whether to accept:

- | | Strongly Agree | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | |
|-----|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|--|
| 58- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | a- You would consult your parents. |
| 59- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | b- You would consult other relatives. |
| 60- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | c- You would consult your close friends. |

OTHER SITUATIONS - Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
61-	1	2	3	4	5	a-	If a close friend of yours fail into bad habits, and is no longer friendly with you, you would still feel obliged to be concerned about him.
62-	1	2	3	4	5	b-	You have the right to ask the person who is, or is going to be, your wife (or husband) to share everything with you, even innermost desires and secrets.
63-	1	2	3	4	5	c-	Usually if someone who is not your friend goes out of his way to do you favors, you start to consider him a friend.
64-	1	2	3	4	5	d-	A capable person motivated for his own gain is more useful to society than an altruistic but less capable one.
65-	1	2	3	4	5	e-	A man who loves his children but beats them when he is drunk is better than a man who never pays much attention to them.
66-	1	2	3	4	5	f-	You are not entitled to apply your own moral standards to other people's behavior.
67-	1	2	3	4	5	g-	Most people cannot be trusted.
68-	1	2	3	4	5	h-	Usually when you and another student were angry with each other, it was mainly his fault.
69-	1	2	3	4	5	i-	It is the intention and not the results that makes an action good.
70-	1	2	3	4	5	j-	Generally you ought to bring up your children in the same way your parents brought you up.
	1	2	3	4	5	k-	You ought to live the way your family did, even if most of the people in your country live differently.
	1	2	3	4	5	l-	Generally you ought to follow your parents' advice about your choice of career and job.
	1	2	3	4	5	m-	In religious matters you ought to adhere to all the teachings of your church.
	1	2	3	4	5	n-	A person who makes up his own mind about every thing is better than someone who always takes an expert's word.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		
28-	1	2	3	4	5	o-	A person who makes up his own mind about everything is better than someone who always follows his parents' or friends' advice.
29-	1	2	3	4	5	p-	You ought to consult your parents before deciding whether to marry the person you love.
30-	1	2	3	4	5	q-	If parents do not provide a happy childhood for their children, they are not entitled to expect their children to love them.
31-	1	2	3	4	5	r-	If a wife does not do all that is necessary for her husband to lead a reasonably comfortable and happy life, she is not entitled to expect him to go on loving her.
32-	1	2	3	4	5	s-	Dying in defense of one's country is worthwhile.
33-	Think of your closest friend. For one reason or another you sought or accepted her friendship rather than the friendship of other persons. Please indicate your main reason for choosing her.....						
						
						

Now we would like to know how you feel the attitudes and ideas expressed in your answers to this questionnaire compare with the ideas and attitudes held on the same subject by:

(Please check the appropriate box)

		Exactly the same as yours	Largely the same as yours	Different from yours	Completely different from yours
34-	<u>Your brothers</u>0123
35-	<u>Your church</u>0123
36-	<u>The books</u> that you have read on the subject0123
37-	<u>Your father</u>0123
38-	<u>Your teachers</u>0123
39-	<u>Your mother</u>0123
40-	<u>Your sisters</u>0123
41-	<u>Your fellow students</u>0123

Please fill in the following background data:

- 42-
43- Year of birth:
- 44- Married: Yes.....0 Engaged. "pinned" or Yes.....1
 No..... "going steady" No.....2
- 45- Religion: Protestant.....5
 Catholic.....6
 Jewish.....7
 Other.....8 Which?.....
 None.....9
- 46- How often do you attend religious services?
 More than once a week..... 0
 Once a week..... 1
 Once a month..... 2
 Less than once a month..... 3
 Never or almost never..... 4
- (If Catholic) How often do you go to Communion?
 Once a week or more..... 6
 At least once a month..... 7
 At least once a year..... 8
 Never or almost never..... 9

- 47- Parent's religion
Father Mother
- 48- Religion of your two best friends
.....
- 49- Where did you grow up?
city state country
- 50- Was it a: Rural area 6
Town of less than 20,000 people.....7
- 51- Town of less than 200,000 people.....8
Larger town9
- 52- Where do your parents live now?
city state country
- 53- In how many different communities did your parents live since you were born?
.....
- 54- With whom do you live? Alone..... 0
With parents 1
With friends..... 2
With relatives 3
With spouse..... 4
In college or universities
dormitories 5
Other (indicate with whom) ... 6
- 55- Your father's occupation is (was, if deceased or retired) (please indicate in detail, e.g.,
56- if a physician, indicate specialty; if a skilled worker, indicate precise nature of job such as
lathe operator, etc.)
.....
- 57- What was the highest school attended by your father?
58- 0..... Grammar school
1..... High school, but did not finish
2..... Finished high school
3..... College
4..... Graduate school
5..... Other (which)

- 59-62 What year in school are you? 0..... Freshman
1..... Sophomore
2..... Junior
3..... Senior
4..... Graduate (1st. year)
5..... Graduate (after 1st. year)
6..... Other (specify).....

Name the college or university you are attending

- 60- What is your major area of study?

- 61- Have you taken any course in psychology or engaged in extensive reading in psychology?
Yes.....0 No.....1

- 62- Are you a full-time student? Yes.....3 No.....4

- 63- What career or occupation do you think you will follow after finishing school? (Please indicate specialty)

- 64- To what clubs and associations do you belong?

- 65- What is your political preference? 0..... Democrat
1..... Republican
2..... Independent
3..... Other (specify)

- 66- How important is politics in your life?
Very important 6
Fairly important..... 7
Not too important 8
Unimportant 9

67- The elementary school that you attended was:

- 0..... Public school
- 1..... Parochial school (specify affiliation)
- 2..... Private school with Church affiliation (specify)
- 3..... Private school without church affiliation

68- The secondary school that you attended was:

- 0..... Public school
- 1..... Parochial school (specify affiliation)
- 2..... Private school with Church affiliation (specify)
- 3..... Private school without church affiliation

69- How many close friends do you have?

70- How many of them are male?

71- From approximately when do you date the friendship with your two best friends?

.....
.....

72- How many brothers and sisters do you have?

Are you the oldest? Yes..... No.....

73- From what countries did most of your ancestor come?

.....

74- How close are relationships among your friends?

- 0..... We form a group
- 1..... They are in different groups to which I belong
- 2..... We don't form a group

75- What three things or activities in your life do you expect to give you the most satisfaction?

Please write a 1 in the space preceding the most important; a 2 in the space preceding the next most important; and a 3 in the space preceding the third most important.

Rank

three

- Your career or occupation
- Family relationships
- Leisure-time recreational activities
- Religious beliefs or activities
- Participation as a citizen in the affairs of your community
- Participation in activities directed toward national or international betterment

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you want to make any comment, please write it down.

.....
.....
.....
.....

APPENDIX II

BRIEF INTELLECTUAL STORY OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The author of the present study is an Argentine lawyer. He was worried about Argentine peoples' -and especially Argentine leaders'- failure to cooperate peacefully and constructively for the progress of their country. He was worried because although Argentina has important natural and cultural resources (including a very high literacy rate), the social, political and economic situation of the country has been critical in the last decade.

The author observed that the United States and some West European countries had apparently solved some of the major problems hindering peaceful, constructive and rational cooperating, which afflicted Argentine society. He thought that the success (in the social, political and economic spheres) in these countries resulted basically from the fact that social policies were carefully planned on the basis of an accurate knowledge of social facts.

He therefore wanted to learn the methods for accurately assessing social phenomena, in order to be able to reach rational solutions for Argentine social

problems. However, he soon realized that there was no mathematical formula for successful planning, and that the modern techniques and organization of western industrial society were often more successful in solving economic and physical problems, than in making people happier and making human life more meaningful, warm, rich and satisfying.

The author compared societal planning with planning in individual life, and thought of many cases in which people are taught what is correct, but they nevertheless act irrationally and contrary to what they are taught. He then became convinced that: (a) success in planning is not only a matter of how much we know about specific social phenomena; (b) the consequences of social planning largely depend on the basic value orientations of the planners; (c) the basic attitudes or value orientations of the planners are largely received by them from the society in which they grow up, their position in that society, and the groups with which they come into contact; (d) the social policies in a society largely depend upon the dominant value orientations in that society. This type of thinking is in line with Max Weber's and Sorokin's emphases on the influence of basic values upon the social, political and economic structure of society.

The author thought that differences in dominant value orientations could help to explain the differences between American and Argentine social situations, but he was perplexed about the true nature of these differences. Indeed, when he wanted to look systematically at this problem, he was confronted with the following paradoxes: (a) people commented upon the high interpersonal solidarity and warmth of Latin Americans (compared with the "cold and competitive" impersonality of Americans); but on the other hand, one could see more trustfulness, friendliness, and peaceful cooperation among Americans, compared with the mistrust, hostility and lack of cooperative spirit found among Latin Americans; (b) people commented on the materialism of American society, but notwithstanding the constant claims of high spirituality by Latin Americans, we find in Latin American generalized phenomena of social injustice and cruel indifference towards the underprivileged, uncooperative egoism or hostility towards the larger community, administrative corruption, and even failure to fulfill the religious practices required by the Catholic Church; (c)

Argentines constantly claim that they strongly support certain ideas, and that they are intransigent in their loyalty to principles or to people, but it is in Argentina and not so much in the United States where one constantly hears complaints about the unreliability, irresponsibility and untrustworthiness of people; (d) it has been often claimed that American society leads to individual independence and initiative, but Argentine visitors are often impressed by what they call the lack of originality and lack of initiative of Americans (which is described by William H. Whyte in The Organization Man, and by David Riesman in his "other-directed" type in The Lonely Crowd); (e) it has been observed that political and social instability and unpredictability led Argentines to a psychological insecurity largely unknown among Americans; but for different reasons Americans show a psychological insecurity which surprises Argentines; (g) Argentines observe that Americans are short-sighted, in the sense that they do not look at the long-range consequences of their spectacular technical, economical and organizational development; Americans observe that Latins are oriented to the present-time rather than to the future, and are not inclined to long range investments for a distant future, characteristics of enlightened self-interest.

The author looked for some central values or ideas which could help one to understand the paradoxical differences which had been pointed out between Americans and Argentines. In this way he arrives at the idea of the theocentric and anthropocentric major premises. Indeed, it seemed that the following considerations were relevant for characterizing such differences:

1. Argentine dominant values lead to classifying the world into the good and the bad -the sacred and the anti-sacred- in absolute terms. People are friends or enemies¹; ideas are right or wrong. American dominant values would lead one to see people simple as people, characterizing them on the basis of the objective performance or guarantees offered.

¹ J. P. Gillin observes that "a Latin American, when first confronting an unfamiliar individual, typically 'sees' in him a 'soul' whose essence he must endeavor to understand and respect for what it is.", Op. cit., p. 30.

Once someone is characterized as sacred, Argentines would feel strongly morally obliged to be loyal to him. Once someone is characterized as anti-sacred, Argentines would feel that it is legitimate and even mandatory to be hostile to him. Consequently, Argentines would show more solidarity than Americans with their sacred in-group, and less solidarity than Americans with the non-sacred or anti-sacred out group.

2. Argentines place high emphasis on the value of good intentions, "good soul", and "good hearth", and relatively little emphasis upon the value of performance. This would explain why, although they claim high spirituality, they often show less discipline and responsibility than Americans in compliance with their social and religious duties. This also explains why, although Argentines claim strong and intransigent support for ideas, principles and people, we still find a great deal of disloyalty and unreliability among Argentines.

3. Argentines emphasizes the devotion to the absolute and the sacred (with supra-human value) by contrasting it with an open contempt for the instrumental. Consequently, whatever is a violation of instrumental norms tend to be considered by them a sign of valuable originality, especially when the violation is for the sake of a non-instrumental value. Argentines' tendency to arrive late at appointment and to spend much time in expressive activities may be a manifestation of the contempt for the instrumental aspects of time (time is considered "money" by Americans). On the other hand Americans wish to free themselves from strong loyalties, to the extent that these loyalties would interfere with their desire for optimizing instrumental performance (especially occupational performance)¹. This is why Argentines can boast of their independence from instrumental norms, while remaining in rigid dependence upon their friends, family and other loyalties; and Americans can boast of their independence from expressive loyalties, while remaining in rigid dependence upon organizational and instrumental norms.

4. The high respect for social organization and instrumental norms in the United States, lead to a great security about the protection of society in general; however, the lack of emphasis upon depth of

¹ See Parsons, The Social System, p. 189.

interpersonal relations and absolute solidarity with the in-group, lead to insecurity in interpersonal relations. In Argentine, the high rate of violation of organizational norms of society and the unpredictability of others' economic and political behavior leads to insecurity at the level of the out-group; however, the emphasis placed on the value of deep interpersonal relations and the moral obligation of solidarity with the in-group, leads to security in interpersonal relations.

5. Argentines who are concerned with spiritual scopes (including the after-life) consider the concern for concrete material increments characteristic of the instrumental achievement complex as short-sighted. Americans, who are concerned with achieving instrumental expediency, consider the Argentines' failure to multiply their instrumental efficiency by making an optimum instrumental use of time -including the planning of the future- as short-sighted.

The author thought that the above considerations could be better understood as derived from the assumption that Americans accept what has been called above the anthropocentric major premise more than Argentines do, and Argentines accept what has been called above the theocentric major premise more than Americans do. Indeed, if the value of man and of his actions depends upon his submission to a supra-empirical principle or power (theocentric major premise): (a) empirical results become unimportant; if the actor's intentions are to submit himself to what is sacred, this is enough; only intentions can be submitted by man in an absolute way; results depend on many outside factors; (b) the value of people and ideas is absolute, and their positive or negative character depends upon their position in relation to the supra-empirical power. If persons or ideas are seen to conform to supra-empirical principles, they are considered sacred objects (friends, right ideas); if they are in conflict with supra-empirical principles, they are considered anti-sacred (enemies, wrong ideas).

If the value of man and of his actions depend upon his ability to reach empirical results (anthropocentric major premise): (a) intentions become unimportant, and what matters is good performance; (b) specific objects (people and ideas) have no absolute sacred or anti-sacred character, but they have to be looked upon simply as neutral elements of the environment, which have to be evaluated solely in terms of their performance.

The theocentric major premise could also explain the out-group hostility of Argentines, as an adaptive rationalization allowing them to feel free from commitment towards persons whose association would involve disadvantages for them, by means of the device of considering them anti-sacred. Americans' emphasis on the anthropocentric major premise would make it unnecessary for them to justify their positive choices or exclusions of associates.¹

The Empirical Study

The author selected a group of values which could be logically derived from the theocentric and anthropocentric major premises, and which he thought were characteristic of Argentine and American cultures. A questionnaire was constructed in order to explore who these values tend to cluster around that theocentric and the anthropocentric poles, and to observe whether the theocentric cluster is dominant in Argentine culture, and the anthropocentric cluster is dominant in Argentine culture.

The construction of the questionnaire involved serious conceptual and language difficulties, probably resulting partly from the author's Argentine

¹ The indicators of these attitudes were called above boomerang items.

cultural background: this factor led the author to formulate questions which referred mostly to intangible feelings and intentions, rather than to the empirical manifestations of basic values, and to include in the questionnaire a variety, number and length of items which would make the practical application of the questionnaire and the interpretation of its results difficult. The advice of professors, fellowstudents and friends led to the correction of these defects, to the extent that they have in fact been corrected in the final version of the questionnaire.

In order to increase the statistical significance of the test the hypotheses and expectations were specified in advance, in a paper handed to the author's adviser at Columbia University in May 1962, before the data had been collected. That paper, in summary, stated: (a) there is a strain towards consistency among value, leading theocentric values to cluster with each other and anthropocentric values to cluster with each other; (b) Argentine nationality, Catholic faith, high religious involvement, female sex, rural background, Catholic friends (or parents), attendance at Catholic Schools and universities, and low socio-economic status, are associated with theocentric value orientations; American nationality, non-Catholic orientation, low religious involvement, male sex, urban background, non-Catholic friends (or parents), attendance at non-Catholic schools or universities, and high socio-economic status, are associated with anthropocentrism in value orientations; (c) value orientations (theocentric or anthropocentric) are more strongly associated with type of culture (American or Argentine) than with other social characteristics; (d) persons or groups under cross-pressures (that is, having some social characteristics associated with theocentric orientations, and other social characteristics associated with anthropocentric orientations) will show less consistent value orientations (some theocentric and some anthropocentric) than others; (e) there are culturally defined rationalization leading Argentines to consider persons untrustworthy or hostile if association with them would be disadvantageous for the actor (as indicated by the boomerang items); such rationalizations are not elaborated by isolated individuals but are a result of a long cultural elaboration; (f) Argentines' emphasis on obligations as a matter of principle (theocentric major premise), would lead them to greater universalism than Americans, in recognizing their obligations towards peers as

similar to their obligations towards friends; (g) Argentine respondents' emphasis on moral obligations as a matter of principle and on the value of intentions, would lead them to recognize the feeling of moral obligation to help another more than to recognize guilt from not helping whole Americans' emphasis on results and spontaneity would lead them to recognize the feeling of guilt for not helping more than the feeling of moral obligation to help (peers, fellowmen, or friends); (h) a list of the items indicative of value orientations was given, predicting that Argentines and respondents with other "theocentric"¹ social characteristics would tend to agree more than Americans and persons having "anthropocentric" social characteristics, with the direct and ambiguous items that are indicated with an asterisk in chapter IV of this volume, that is, items for which agreement is considered logically harmonious with theocentric value orientations²; it was also indicated that Americans and persons having other "anthropocentric" social characteristics would tend to agree more than Argentines and persons having other "theocentric" social characteristics with items not indicated with an asterisk in chapter IV, that is, items for which agreement is considered logically harmonious with anthropocentric value orientations³; (i) it was indicated that Argentine respondents would agree with "indirect" items indicated with an asterisk⁴ and disagree with other indirect items⁵ more than Americans, but respondents with "theocentric" social characteristics -other than Argentine nationality- would not agree with indirect items indicated with an asterisk nor disagree with other indirect items more than respondents with "anthropocentric" social characteristics (other than

¹ When we speak here about "theocentric" or "anthropocentric" social characteristics we refer to social characteristics which we expected would be associated with theocentric or anthropocentric value orientations (See b in the text).

² See Appendix I (text of the questionnaire), items 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 42, 49, 51, 54, 55, 62, 63, 64, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77 and 80. It was also indicated that Argentines would tend to agree more than Americans respondents with items 59, 60 and 61.

³ See Appendix I, items 21, 22, 23, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52, 53, 65, 67, 76, 78 and 79. It was also indicated that Argentine respondents would tend to agree less than American respondents with items 56, 57 and 58.

⁴ See Appendix I, items 7 and 12.

⁵ See Appendix I, items 8, 9, 10 and 11.

American nationality): (j) it was indicated that Argentine respondents would tend to agree more than Americans with boomerang items¹, but respondents with "theocentric" social characteristics (other than Argentine culture) would not tend to agree more than respondents with "anthropocentric" social characteristics (other than American culture) with these items. On the contrary, respondents with "theocentric" social characteristics (other than Argentine culture) would tend to disagree with boomerang items 68 ("Most people cannot be trusted") and 69 ("Usually when you and another student were angry with each other, it was mainly his fault") more than respondents with "anthropocentric" social characteristics.

The above predictions were tested through the application of the questionnaire to a sample of American and Argentine university students². The data suggest that all the predictions made were correct on the whole. The only significant exceptions are: (a) a few items (called ambiguous items) did not lead to the differences expected between the answers of respondents with "theocentric" and "anthropocentric" social characteristics; however, these few items were found not to correlate consistently with the bulk of direct items, and were found to involve logical ambiguities; such ambiguities in most of the cases had been pointed out in the paper in May 1962, where it was indicated that what we call now direct items would be the most sensitive indicators for the value orientations; (b) socio-economic status was found not to correlate consistently with theocentric or anthropocentric answers to indicator of value orientations; (c) although Catholic respondents consistently scored more theocentric than Jews or Atheists, their lead in theocentrism was less clear and consistent when they were compared with Protestant respondents; (d) in several comparisons there were some items which did not behave as expected, but the great majority did.

In the paper presented to the author's adviser in May 1962 it was also predicted that the

¹ See Appendix I, items 66, 68 and 69.

² The sample included 469 Argentine respondents (from the National University of Buenos Aires, Catholic University of Buenos Aires, National University of Tucumán, Catholic University of Tucumán, National University of Córdoba, Catholic University of Córdoba, and Catholic Institute of Santiago del Estero) and 447 American respondents (from the following universities: Emory, Mississippi S.U., Fordham, Rutgers, Queens College, The

answers of Spanish respondents would tend to compare with the answers of American respondents in the same way as the answers of Argentine respondents compare with the answers of American respondents. The application of the questionnaire to a group of 149 Spanish students (from the universities of Granada, Deusto and Barcelona) suggests that this prediction was correct.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Banfield, F. C. The Moral Basis of a Backward Society. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958.
- Durkheim, E. La Division du Travail Social. Paris: F. Alcan, 1893.
- Fillol, T. R. Social Factors in Economic Development. Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1961.
- Freud, Sigmund. A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis. New York: Permapbooks, 1953.
- Goldsen, R. K., et al. What College Students Think. New York: Van Nostrand, 1960.
- Gosnell, H. Getting Out the Vote. An Experiment in the Stimulation of Voting. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- Homans, G. C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950.
- Hyman, H. Survey Design and Analysis. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
- Kluckhohn, F. R., and Strodtbeck, F. L. Variations in Value Orientations. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Co., 1961.
- Lenski, G. The Religious Factor. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1963.
- Lipset, S. M. Political Man. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1963.
- McClelland, D. C. The Achieving Society. New York: Van Nostrand, 1961.
- Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Rev. and enl., Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1959.
- Morris, Ch. Variations of Human Value. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Parsons, T. The Social System. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1959.
- _____. The Structure of Social Action. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949.
- Parsons, T., and Shils, F. A. Toward a General Theory of Action. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Parsons, T., and Smelser, N. J. Economy and Society. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956.
- Pitt-Rivers, J. A. The People of the Sierra. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Rosenberg, M. Occupations and Values. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.
- Sorokin, P. Social and Culture Dynamics. New York, The Bedminster Press, 1962.
- Tocqueville, A. de. Democracy in America. New York, Vintage Books, 1961.
- Weber, M. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. Trans. and ed. H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills. New

York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

_____. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Articles and Unpublished Material

Barton, A. "Measuring the Values of Individuals", Religious Education, 1962.

Berelson, B. "Communications and Public Opinion", W. Schramm (ed.), Mass Communication. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960.

_____. "Content Analysis", G. Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

Brown, R. W. "Mass Phenomena", G. Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

Censo Universitario, Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires, 1958.

Child, I. L. "Socialization", G. Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

Gillin, J. P. "Some Signposts for Policy", Social Change in Latin America Today. New York, Vintage Books, 1961.

Hirschman, A. O. "Ideologies of Economic Development in Latin America", A. O. Hirschman (ed.), Latin American Issues. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1961.

Hyman, H. "The Value Systems of Different Classes: A Socio-psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification", Class, Status and Power. R. Bendix, S. M. Lipset (ed.). Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953.

Lazarsfeld, P. F., et al. "The Process of Opinion and Attitude Formation", Lazarsfeld P. F., and Rosenberg, M. (ed.). The Language of Social Research. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.

Lazarsfeld, P. F. "Evidence and Inference in Social Research", Publ. no. A-276, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.

Parsons, T. "Christianity and Modern Industrial Society", Studies in Sociology 1. Buenos Aires: Omeba, 1961.

Redfield, R. "The Folk Society", The American Journal of Sociology, 52, January 1947.

Rosenberg, M. "Occupational Values and Occupational Choice", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,

Columbia University, Sociology Department.

Silvert, K. H., and Bonilla, F. "Education and the Social Meaning of Development: A Preliminary Statement". New York. American University Field Staff.

Stoodley, B. H. "A Cross-cultural Study of Structure and Conflict in Social Norms", American Journal of Sociology. Vol. 65 (1959 - 1960).

Stouffer, S. A. "An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms", American Sociological Review. Vol 14, 1949.

Stouffer, S. A., and Toby, J. "Hole-conflict and Personality", American Journal of Sociology. Vol. 56, 1951.