

HUMANISTS AND THEIR VALUES

Robert B. Tapp

Are religious humanists "born" or "made"? This might sound like a theological question, but my intention is to focus on sociological explanation of institutional behaviour. By including the adjective "religious," I am limiting myself to individuals with some kind of local church or society. In a superficial sense, the answer is obvious: religious liberals (many of whom are humanists) are clearly not "born" that way since 90 percent of them were born and/or raised as something else.¹ A 1985 survey of 502 adult members of the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, a church that has historically seen itself as "humanist," showed that 92 percent of the adult members were not raised (even) as Unitarian Universalists, let alone as humanists.² What follows is an exploration of these "nature vs. nurture" questions using data from this group.

In addition to the customary items of demographic information, we have responses to Milton Rokeach's Value Survey.³ Rokeach winnowed the value literature, ending up with a set of "terminal" values (desired end-states) and a set of "instrumental" values (desirable means). These are all essentially "positive" values for most persons, and the differentiations become the ways in which individuals rank them. In the Form D version we used, there are 18 values in each set. For our purposes, this widely-used instrument has the additional advantage of having been used by Robert L.H. Miller⁴ in a national study of adult Unitarian Universalists in 1974. Table I (Tables 1-4, and 6-7 are printed at the end of this article) lists the terminal and instrumental value rankings of FUS members (column 1) and UUA members (column 2).⁵ What is striking is the parallelism in listing. Remember that the UUA respondents were drawn from churches of a variety of theological identifications and persuasions while the FUS respondents are almost exclusively persons identifying themselves as "humanists." If we use a moderate criterion of three-rank differences as significant (which seems conservative for samples this large), the only significant value differences between FUS members and UU's at large occur with the terminal values of peace and family security. The shift to a higher valuation of PEACE may be largely explained in terms of cultural differences, at least as culture is perceived by religious liberals between 1974 and 1985. Disarmament issues, and revived tensions of the Reagan period might well be equally reflected in a more contemporary UU sample. The drop of 3 ranks in FAMILY SECURITY is harder to explain. Among FUS members, family security receives a higher valuation among older members. Since the median age of FUS members has become higher during this decade, this shift is even harder to explain. As a tentative hypothesis, I would suggest that FUS members (as well as UU's) often go against the fads of the times, and that we therefore have here a reaction formation in a time of right-wing "family" rhetoric.

In 1963, I was chair of a commission on science and religion that distinguished between "liberal perspectives" (i.e. theological stances of considerable variety) and a "liberal style" (which was thought to be coherent and widely shared).⁶ These present data delineating aspects of "style" seem to offer clear confirmation of that hypothesis.

If these religious liberals, despite their theological diversities - Christian, humanist, deist, pantheist, etc. - are essentially homogeneous in terms of their patternings of values, it might be the case that they were "born" that way and they simply had to emerge from a wide range of family religions and regroup as religious liberals. Rather like the old slogan, "I was a . . ." without knowing it." For better or for worse, this is by no means the case, as the next six columns of Table I illustrate. Members had designated their "childhood religion." Data on the major background groups are presented here. What becomes clear upon inspection is the persistence of childhood religious/valuational patternings.

If we imagine a church to be a typical social institution where older members socialize younger members into certain historic patterns, it is clear that "the born UU's" (column 3), carryover some traditional New England post-Puritan patterns in the high rank [4] that they give to A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (central to the "Protestant ethic"), in their low ranking [9] for INNER HARMONY (remember Luther, Calvin, and Kierkegaard on the ambiguities and anxieties of the life of faith). Their placement of FRIENDSHIP [10] suggests this same sense of loneliness and isolation. If friendship is too much to expect from existence, however, we can at least try to be HELPFUL [5]. The likelihood of successful socialization into such patterns of the convert members must be projected in awareness of the fact that these "historic UU's" represent only 8 percent of the group.

We should also not be surprised at the persistence among ex-Lutherans of a relatively low estimate of A WORLD AT PEACE OR EQUALITY. These social-gospel values have been historically absent from the Lutheran traditions. Similarly the in-group value of FRIENDSHIP rates highest [4] for ex-Lutherans. Toleration was not a characteristic of these traditions, accounting for the somewhat low value [6] for BROADMINDEDNESS.

The ex-Methodists and ex-Congregationalists have been lumped together here because of the small sample and they, not suprisingly, resemble the born UU's in almost every respect. Given the common New England parentage, in the latter case, and the non-ritualistic social activism of the former, these patterns fit expectations very well.

The high ranking [4] given by ex-Jews to EQUALITY similarly fulfills a prediction of values of persons who have grown up with memories of unequal treatment. Why ex-Jews rate ACCOMPLISHMENT lower than any other group [10] is more puzzling. The most likely hypothesis is a reaction to the stereotype of undue stress on accomplishment - an acting out of self-hatred. But we do not have sufficient information to test this.

A similar line of exploration would be in order to explain two salient characteristics of ex-Catholics - the low ranking for EQUALITY [10] and the high ranking for MATURE LOVE [6]. The second-class equality, especially for the pre-Vatican II laity, and the continuing inability to deal maturely with human sexuality, both suggest ways for tentatively explaining these patterns.

Granting the validity of these data, there clearly are persisting patterns of childhood religious conditioning and experience that survive the radical change to a new, humanistic, religious orientation. For this very reason, speculation about reasons for variant value rankings among those of no childhood religion would be highly suspect. We would require further information on the kinds of "non-religiousness" found in such homes. Ex-Catholic and ex-Lutheran, for example, would probably raise children in many ways that could only be explained by reference to patterns of the respective former religions.

Assume that we have delineated the value patternings of religious liberalism (since different persons were depicted, we should be hesitant in saying religious liberals) to be relatively stable (at least over the decade since Miller's study), and that we have additionally shown these value patterns to exhibit a persisting modulation from childhood religious environments. It is also the case that these patterns are quite distinctive within American culture.⁷ Tables 3 and 4, attached, makes this clear. We have included Rokeach data from 1968 and 1974.⁸ This latter also includes gender breakdowns. The 1974 and 1981 data on terminal values in Table 3 are from the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan.⁹

Examination of the United States data indicates how stable values are within large groups over time. Among terminal values, only EQUALITY, ACCOMPLISHMENT, COMFORT, and NATIONAL SECURITY show significant variation. When we compare FUS value rankings to this larger matrix, we can specify more clearly the "humanist difference" alleged above. In this and subsequent tables, we focus on a subsample of FUS members to eliminate some of the possibly confounding effects of age and mobility. We will select members who are between 25 and 44 years of age. We will additionally select those who are converts and who joined FUS as their first Unitarian Universalist church (this is possible because we have information on their length of UU membership as well as their FUS membership). Given the variation among UU churches, some new members might have joined a "Christian" UU church elsewhere and subsequently found FUS uncongenial. Subsampling eliminates confusions resulting from such factors.

Using the 1981 U.S. figures for terminal values, the FUS members give significantly higher rankings to HARMONY, MATURE LOVE, SELF-RESPECT, and EQUALITY. At the same time, they put lower value on SALVATION, FAMILY SECURITY, HAPPINESS, and COMFORT. If we use the older, available national data for U.S. instrumental values, additional differences emerge. FUS members place significantly more stress on LOVING, INTELLECTUAL, INDEPENDENT, IMAGINATIVE, and LOGICAL; and less stress on AMBITIOUS, CLEAN, FORGIVING, and SELF-CONTROL.

Tables 3 and 4 also contain value rankings for FUS men and women. Gender can be expected to play a role in value patternings, and Rokeach's 1971 U.S. data was reported with gender breakdowns which have been included in Tables 3 and 4. We can first note that U.S. women (albeit in 1971), compared to men, ranked SALVATION higher and COMFORT and HAPPINESS lower. A much broader gender-gap occurred in instrumental values. LOVING, FORGIVING, and CHEERFUL ranked higher while CAPABLE, AMBITIOUS, COURAGEOUS, and INDEPENDENT were lower.

In the FUS subsample, we will further narrow our focus to those who report weekly attendance. The FUS gender-gap was totally different in terminal values. Women ranked HARMONY, HAPPINESS, and FAMILY SECURITY higher and EXCITEMENT lower. In instrumental values the direction of the gap was reversed for AMBITION, with FUS women placing it higher than FUS men. They also gave higher place to FORGIVING, HELPFUL, LOVING, and CHEERFUL. Lower ranking, as compared to FUS men, went to INTELLECTUAL, IMAGINATIVE, COURAGEOUS, and BROADMINDED.

In comparing the value patternings of different groups, we need to analyze directionality as well as difference. The overall hypothesis of this paper is that the minority value patternings of FUS members are hard to sustain and have a tendency to "regress toward the mean." In other words, the larger culture exerts a counterpull on the reorganized valuing of minority groups. Activity within the group is a means of resisting this counterpull, and conversely, a lowered level of activity within the minority group should reduce the distinctiveness. Taking the 1981 U.S. pattern of terminal values as a cultural center, we can test the hypothesis with the data on activity and gender in Table 3. If we compare the values of women who attend weekly to those who seldom or never attend, using the same statistically-conservative significance differential of 3 rank-orders, there are 8 significant values. In every case, the less-active members' value rankings have moved toward the U.S. level of ranking. With the men, the confirmation is almost as robust. Out of 7 significant shifts, 5 are in the predicted direction. We can confidently state that FUS activity maintains a different value-patterning, which tends to disappear with inactivity.

Using this same data of Tables 3 and 4, let us now examine the actual effects of inactivity upon value patterns. We have placed the significant shifts in Table 5 (next page). We have included the number of rank-orders of change in parentheses often after each value

This information reveals the impacts of FUS upon male and female members. In most cases, the impacts differ. This could be due to a recruitment of very differing types of men and women or a programming that is sufficiently gender-varied to have differing successes with men and women. In any event, the persons who are inactive (about to leave?) give PEACE, IMAGINATIVENESS, COURAGEOUSNESS, and ACCOMPLISHMENT a higher ranking. Men and women reverse on FAMILY SECURITY and INTELLECTUALITY. Men want less FAMILY SEC-

VALUE CHANGES, BY GENDER, ASSOCIATED WITH NON-ATTENDANCE AMONG FUS CONVERTS (ages 25-44)

TERMINAL VALUES

women	men
<i>increased (ranks of importance)</i>	
FAMILY SECURITY(9) ACCOMPLISHMENT(8) PEACE(?)	PEACE(9) ACCOMPLISHMENT(4) COMFORT(4) FRIENDSHIP(3)
<i>decreased (ranks of importance)</i>	
WISDOM(?) SELF-RESPECT(5) EQUALITY(3) BEAUTY(3) EXCITEMENT(3)	WISDOM(6) EQUALITY(5) FAMILY SECURITY(3)

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

women	men
<i>increased (ranks of importance)</i>	
COURAGEOUS(5) IMAGINATIVE(4) LOVING(3) POLITE(3)	INTELLECTUAL(8) BROADMINDED(6) IMAGINATIVE(5) COURAGEOUS(3) CAPABLE(3)
<i>decreased (ranks of importance)</i>	
INTELLECTUAL(8) HONEST(3) AMBITIOUS(3) RESPONSIBLE(3)	INDEPENDENT(10) HELPFUL(6) AMBITIOUS(6)

table 5

URITY and more INTELLECTUALITY. Both men and women want less EQUALITY and WISDOM as they become inactive.

The inactive men also want more COMFORT and FRIENDSHIP, as well as more BROADMINDEDNESS and CAPABLENESS. Inactive women increase their valuation of SELF-RESPECT, BEAUTY, and EXCITEMENT, as well as LOVINGNESS and POLITENESS. For inactive women, AMBITIOUS, HONEST, and RESPONSffILE are less attractive qualities, while inactive men downplay INDEPENDENT, HELPFUL, and AMBITIOUS.

Taken together, this information gives a reasonably good picture of an organization and its discontents. It is clear that there are gender differences that relate to value patterns, within the larger culture as well as among humanists. For all the foregoing reasons, we may consider the FUS composite value patternings to characterize and institutional/organ-

izational environment and raise questions about the role of such an environment in sustaining values. No one has employed a proper strategy to assess this (i.e. come up with sufficient funding to locate and interview those who have joined, and then left, these institutions). What we propose to do here is to approximate that statistical/ longitudinal dream with a cross-sectional analysis.

In what follows, we will move back one step from this level of analysis and adopt a complementary strategy. Our criterion of activity hereafter will not be the report of actual activity and attendance but the more subjective measure of how active persons think themselves to be.

Since we have information on amounts of time that individuals have been affiliated with religiously liberal institutions and we also have their own self-estimates of activity level, we can explore the effects of exposure to institutional value patterns. Attached Tables 5 and 6 carry this information for terminal and instrumental values, respectively. The first two columns contrast value rankings, using the entire FUS sample, for persons who indicated very "active" and "inactive" on the question about their activity levels. Were we to employ our 3-rank differential criterion here, we would focus on 3 terminal and 6 instrumental values. Had our sample been smaller, it might have been necessary to settle for this. However, it is clear that values vary somewhat with age. This could be in fact a generational-cohort effect rather than an age effect (i.e. A WORLD AT PEACE might have a typical rating for the generation who were of military age during the Vietnam war, but this might be specific to that conflict rather than a characteristic of age level as such). We have therefore, in the remaining 4 columns of Tables 5 and 6, pursued the analysis within a generational subsample of converts to FUS between the ages of 25 and 44. In effect, this curtails the possible effects of age as well as the contrasts among born UU's, converts to the movement from other churches, and those who became UU's only when joining FUS. Within this subsample, we contrast those with less than 5 years of exposure/ longevity and those exposed for more than 5 years. We also make the assumption that almost all persons in this age bracket who are inactive are so for voluntary reasons rather than reasons of infirmity. To the extent that these assumptions are correct, we can view these persons as being one step short of ceasing to be members. This should let us look at value changes as both the effects of reduced contacts with other FUS members and as indicative of the value preferences of those who may be about to leave the institution.

Focusing on these smaller subsamples reveals some shifts in values that the broader age range obscured. It also indicates differences between those who become inactive after a short exposure to the new values of the Society and those who have remained in touch for longer periods and are presently inactive (how long they have been in an inactive status is, unfortunately, unknown). We can best understand these patterns by placing these values in the briefer format of Table 8. This will let us compare value changes within short-term and long-term members who become inactive. We have included the number of rank-orders of change in parentheses after each value. These numbers give a more complete idea of the significance and magnitude of the activity-effect.

VALUE CHANGES ASSOCIATED WITH INACTIVITY
AMONG FUS CONVERTS (ages 25-44)

TERMINAL VALUES

member less than 5 yrs. member 5-20 yr.

Increased (ranks of) Importance

FAMILY SECURITY(9)
HAPPINESS(5)
COMFORT(4)

HARMONY(9)
NATIONAL SECURITY(6)
EQUALITY(S)
FAMILY SECURITY(5)

decreased (ranks of) Importance

FREEDOM(?)
BEAUTY(6)
PEACE(3)
FRIENDSHIP(3)

FRIENDSHIP(9)
SELF-RESPECT(?)
HAPPINESS(S)
WISDOM(3)

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

member less than 5 yrs. member 5-20 yr.

Increased (ranks of) Importance

AMBITIOUS(?)
RESPONSIBLE(6)
BROADMINDED(4)
CAPABLE(4)

HELPFUL(5)
LOGICAL(S)
COURAGEOUS(3)

decreased (ranks of) Importance

COURAGEOUS(?)
INTELLECTUAL(6)
IMAGINATIVE(5)
HONEST(4)

FORGIVING(6)
CAPABLE(3)

It is clear from these data that those whose activity levels drop early (i.e. within their first 5 years of membership) have a different value patterning as well as a different pattern of value shifts from those whose activity levels drop late (i.e. after 5 years of membership). Regardless of length of membership, FAMILY SECURITY increases and FRIENDSHIP decreases. In the case of HAPPINESS, a reversal occurs. It increases with inactivity in the short-run, but decreases among those of longer membership. Reversals also occur with the instrumental values COURAGEOUS and CAPABLE.

Looking beyond these special cases to the overall pattern of the early inactives, we need to note one more qualifying condition: these persons all joined FUS during the tenure of the present minister. While FUS, as noted, has historically been humanist in orientation and leadership, the years since 1979 have seen a more explicit and overt humanist articulation and emphasis. Although this could be a factor in the case of the inactivity of long-term members, it must be a factor in the short-run. While we could, in

the case of short-run inactivity, assume individual value changes to have occurred, it seems more likely that these are persons with variant values who became aware of "mismatch" and reduced their activity levels. This plausible explanation would not detract from the basic contention here, that liberal churches are axiocentric institutions whose value structures intensely affect their members, in maintaining as well as in modifying certain values.

EARLY INACTIVITY

Religious humanists who describe themselves as institutionally inactive during their first 5 years of membership now place significantly higher value on FAMILY SECURITY, HAPPINESS, and COMFORT than members whose activity levels are higher. At the same time, such inactivity leads to a downgrading of FREEDOM, A WORLD OF BEAUTY, PEACE, and FRIENDSHIP.

Instrumental values that increase (i.e. are valued more highly) for this group are AMBITIOUS, RESPONSIBLE, BROADMINDED, and CAPABLE. Decreases occur for COURAGEOUS, INTELLECTUAL, IMAGINATIVE, and HONEST.

To what extent are such value consequences of institutional activity explicable and comprehensible? To what extent could they be viewed as predicted results of inactivity in future studies? Clearly, FUS activity involves a "communalism," an assumption that desirable social values require common commitment and group effort. These activities necessarily downplay such hedonistic and individualistic values as COMFORT, FAMILY SECURITY, or HAPPINESS. By this same logic, if one were to drop away from an institutional setting that was strongly focused on culture-changing commitments for PEACE, BEAUTY, and FREEDOM, some downgrading of these values would be predictably precedent. As a corollary of this process, the FRIENDSHIP developing as a high value for more active participants would need to attenuate.

In relation to instrumental value changes, most are similarly comprehensible. Communal activism within any minority group of the FUS variety requires considerably high valuation of COURAGEOUS and IMAGINATIVE. In the particular minority situation of FUS, it seems quite reasonable that HONEST and INTELLECTUAL would be additionally valued. The instrumental values that *increase* with inactivity are somewhat harder to interpret. Perhaps BROADMINDED is now stressed as a defense against the high consensus among many FUS members on many issues. AMBITIOUS, CAPABLE, and RESPONSIBLE are currently important values in the conservative upswing of the larger society, and therefore alienation from FUS may well pull people in these more individualistic directions.

LATER INACTIVITY

This subgroup comes to place higher importance on HARMONY, NATIONAL SECURITY, EQUALITY, and FAMILY SECURITY. At the

same time, they regard FRIENDSHIP, SELF-RESPECT, HAPPINESS, and WISDOM, as of lessened importance.

Among instrumental values, the later inactives have increased their estimates of being HELPFUL, LOGICAL, and COURAGEOUS. Losing importance are FORGIVING and CAPABLE.

Can we again, in the case of this subgroup, find conceptual comprehensibility in the cases of these value shifts? We must start with the recognition that these persons all joined the group before the tenure of the present minister and may therefore have carried over into recent years different expectations and patternings of values. It is, of course, possible that their values have been changed by outside ("exogenous") forces (which would include in this case "inward" shiftings not related to influences of the religious group). For these reasons, it is not surprising that different patterns of value-shifting appear within this subgroup as compared to the early inactives.

FAMILY SECURITY persists as increased value within this group. We have interpreted this as an individualistic rather than communal value. NATIONAL SECURITY is both a conservative value and one that would be expected higher among those who are disaffected with the generally high estimate of PEACE among the active members. HARMONY seems a predictable value for those whose values have shifted toward the "outside" majority values of the culture.

FRIENDSHIP decreases as a value for these late inactives as it had for the early inactives. Since they have been associated longer with FUS, this is even more understandable. We saw earlier that SELF-RESPECT was an important value for many of the new FUS converts. Very possible this reflects a need that was fulfilled among those who remained longer, as well as no longer being achievable by a higher level of activity. The lowered valuation of HAPPINESS does not appear to make conceptual sense, and no ready explanation appears for the value of WISDOM beyond the fact that, in this as well as other samples studied, it appears to vacillate greatly in desirability.

The shifts in instrumental values among the late inactives do not seem conceptually-patterned in any plausible ways, and possible explanations of them would seem to require larger samples and further exploration.

SUMMARY

We began with the question as to whether religious humanists are born or made. The data we have reviewed seems to suggest that both possibilities have some empirical grounding. We can probably add that if humanists are "made," they are also "unmade." The shifts in values that cause/reflect this unmaking are quite clearly patterned and, with a few exceptions at this stage of the analysis, are conceptually plausible. We feel that this analysis represents the first in the literature to document some of the value-effects of becoming religiously inactive. In this case, to discern these patterns is

also to discern the effects of becoming active. Needless to say, 'first' findings must be viewed with some caution.

NOTES:

- I. See my *Religion among the Unitarian Universalist: converts in the stepfathers' house* (NY: Academic Press, 1973) for an analysis of a U.S. - Canadian sample of 12,000.
2. Robert B. Tapp, 1985 *Membership Survey: Summary Report* (offset published by First Unitarian Society, Minneapolis, MN, 1987).
3. Milton Rokeach's pioneering work in studying values from transcultural and transideological frameworks began with *The Open and Closed Mind*, (1960). See also his *Beliefs, Values, and Values*, Jossey-Bass, 1968; *The Nature of Human Values*, Free Press, 1973; and *Understanding Human Values*, Free Press, 1979.
4. Robert L.H. Miller, "Religious Value Systems of Unitarian Universalists." *Review of Religious Research*, Spr. 1976,17, 189-208.
5. These numbers derived from median value of individual value rankings, ranked in ascending order, i.e. a rank of 11, indicates the smallest median, which represents the value rated most highly, (closest to I) by most respondents. In all these tables, values have been arranged in the order of their ranking by the full FUS group.
6. See *The Free Church in a Changing World* Boston: Unitarian Universalist Association, 1963, pp. 25-27.
7. Miller, *op.cit.*, confirms via the Rokeach Survey an earlier judgment by Dorothy Spoerl that UU's (in her case, the focus was on youth) are "differently religious." The values of Unitarian-Universalist youth. *Journal of Psychology*, 1961,51,421-37. Using different items, these empirical judgments were also supported in (Tapp, 1973).
8. a. (Rokeach,1974).
9. Ronald Inglehart, "Aggregate Stability and Individual-Level Flux in Mass Belief Systems: The Level of Analysis Paradox." *American Political Science Review*, 1985, 79, 110.

table 1
 TERMINAL VALUES AMONG FUS MEMBERS
 (rankings in descending order)

values	FUS 1985	UUA 1974	childhood religion						
			UU	Luth.	Me.I	Conq	Jew	Cath.	none
self-respect	1	1	3	2	1	3	1	5	
a world at peace	2	8	1	5	2	1	4	2	
freedom	3	3	2	1	3	2	3	4	
wisdom	4	2	5	3	4	5	2	1	
inner harmony	5	5	9	7	7	6	5	3	
a sense of accomplish	6	6	4	8	5	10	9	7	
family security	7	4	8	6	6	8	8	8	
true friendship	8	10	10	4	8	7	7	9	
equality	9	9	6	10	9	4	10	6	
mature love	10	7	7	9	10	9	6	10	
happiness	11	12	13	11	12	11	11	11	
a world of beauty	12	11	12	13	11	13	12	12	
an exciting life	13	13	11	12	13	12	13	14	
a comfortable life	14	16	14	14	14	16	14	17	
social recognition	15	14	16	16	15	15	15	15	
pleasure	16	15	15	15	16	14	16	13	
national security	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16	
salvation	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	
	502	1979	33	94	98	17	56	23	

table 2
 INSTRUMENTAL VALUES AMONG FUS MEMBERS
 (rankings in descending order)

values	FUS 1985	UUA 1974	childhood religion						
			UU	Luth.	Me.I	Conq	Jew	Cath.	none
honest	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	
loving	2	3	1	3	2	3	2	5	
broad minded	3	2	3	6	4	6	4	2	
responsible	4	4	4	2	3	2	7	4	
intellectual	5	7	7	5	6	5	6	3	
independent	6	6	6	4	8	9	3	11	
courageous	7	5	9	7	7	4	8	6	
helpful	8	9	5	9	5	8	10	a	
capable	9	8	8	8	9	10	5	7	
imaginative	10	10	10	10	12	12	9	9	
forgiving	11	11	12	12	11	11	13	10	
logical	12	12	11	11	13	7	12	14	
cheerful	13	13	13	13	10	14	11	12	
self-control	14	14	14	14	14	13	15	13	
ambitious	15	15	15	15	15	17	14	17	
poille	16	16	16	16	16	15	16	16	
clean	17	17	17	17	17	16	17	15	
obedient	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	
	502	1979	33	94	98	17	56	23	

Table 3
 TERMINAL VALUES
 AS AFFECTED BY GENDER AND SUNDAY ATTENDANCE
 (rankings in descending order)

Values	FUS 1985	U.S.					Sunday Attendance, FUS Converts, 25-44			
		1971	1974	1981	1971		Women		Men	
					female	male	weekly	sel'd m/v	weekly	sel'd m/v
1. Liberty	1	5	.	.	5	5	1	6	.	2
2. World at peace	2	1	2	2	1	1	8	1	10	4
3. Freedom	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	5
4. Democracy	.	7	6	6	7	7	3	10	2	8
5. Inner harmony	5	12	11	13	11	13	7	9	1	1
6. Personal accomplishment	6	11	7	7	12	10	12	4	11	9
7. Family life	7	2	1	1	2	2	11	2	6	9
8. Friendship	8	10	9	10	10	11	6	8	9	6
9. Security	9	.	12	12	.	6	.	7	7	12
10. Mature love	10	15	.	5	5	5	8
11. Happiness	11	6	5	5	8	..	13	11	8	7
12. World of beauty	12	15	15	16	..	5	10	13	12	11
13. Intellectual life	13	18	17	15	18	7	9	12	13	14
14. Comfortable life	..	13	8	8	13	9	16	15	17	3
15. Individualism	15	17	18	18	16	18	..	16	16	7
16. National security	16	16	16	17	17	16	15	14	15	5
17. National unity	17	8	13	11	9	8	17	17	..	15
18. Nationalism	18	9	10	9	6	12	18	8	18	1
	502		n.a.	n.a.	687		11			

Table 4
 INSTRUMENTAL VALUES
 AS AFFECTED BY GENDER AND SUNDAY ATTENDANCE
 (rankings in descending order)

Values	FUS 1985	U.S.					Sunday Attendance, FUS Converts, 25-44			
		1971	1974	1981	1971		Women		Men	
					female	male	weekly	sel'd m/v	weekly	sel'd m/v
1. Honesty	1	1	n.a.	n.a.	1	1	1	4	2	5
2. Loving	2	11	.	.	4	12	8	5	3	3
3. Broadminded	3	5	.	.	5	4	4	6	8	2
4. Dependable	4	3	.	.	3	3	6	9	6	5
5. Intellectual	5	15	.	.	15	15	2	10	12	4
6. Independent	6	13	.	.	13	10	3	3	1	11
7. Courageous	7	6	.	.	8	5	7	2	11	8
8. Helpful	8	7	.	.	7	9	9	7	4	10
9. Capable	9	9	.	.	12	6	10	8	9	6
10. Imaginative	10	18	.	.	18	18	5	1	14	9
11. Forgiving	11	4	.	.	2	7	11	11	5	7
12. Logical	12	17	.	.	17	16	12	3	13	14
13. Cheerful	13	12	.	.	10	13	14	12	10	12
14. Self-control	14	10	.	.	11	8	15	15	15	15
15. Ambitious	15	3	.	.	8	2	13	6	7	13
16. Polite	16	14	.	.	14	14	17	14	17	17
17. Clean	17	8	.	.	9	11	16	17	16	16
18. Obedient	18	16	.	.	16	17	18	18	18	18
	N. 502	1430	n.a.	n.a.	687	743	11	9	8	6

TERMINAL VALUES
AS AFFECTED BY ACTIVITY AND LONGEVITY
(rankings in descending order)

table 6

values	activity		activity			
	high	low	high		low	
			yrs. in FUS, converts aQes 25-44			
			-4	5-20	-4	5-20
self-respect	1	2	1	2	2	9
a world at peace	2	6	10	3	13	2
freedom	3	1	2	5	9	4
wisdom	4	3	6	4	5	7
Inner harmony	8	9	3	10	1	1
a sense of accomplishment	6	5	7	6	6	5
family security	10	4	13	8	4	3
true friendship	5	10	5	1	8	10
equality	9	7	8	11	10	6
mature love	7	8	4	9	3	8
happiness	13	11	12	7	7	12
a world of beauty	12	13	9	13	15	13
an exciting life	11	12	11	12	11	14
a comfortable life	15	14	16	16	12	15
social recognition	14	16	17	15	16	17
pleasure	16	15	14	14	14	16
national security	17	17	15	17	17	11
salvation	18	18	18	18	18	18
N=	56	64	7	10	12	5

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES
AS AFFECTED BY ACTIVITY AND LONGEVITY
(rankings in descending order)

table 7

values	activity		activity			
	high	low	high		low	
			yrs. in FUS, converts aaes 25-44			
			-4	5-20	-4	5-20
honest	1	1	1	4	5	2
loving	2	5	3	1	3	3
broadminded	5	2	5	2	1	4
responsible	4	4	8	7	2	6
intellectual	6	9	6	11	12	13
independent	8	3	4	10	4	12
courageous	3	6	7	8	14	5
helpful	9	7	10	6	11	1
capable	7	11	12	5	8	8
Imaginative	10	8	2	9	7	10
forgiving	12	10	11	3	9	9
logical	11	13	15	12	13	7
cheerful	13	12	9	13	10	11
self-control	14	14	14	15	15	17
ambitious	15	15	13	14	6	14
polite	16	16	17	16	16	16
clean	17	17	16	17	17	15
obedient	18	18	18	18	18	18
N=	56	64	7	10	12	5