A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF VIETNAMESE AND AMERICAN VALUE SYSTEMS.
CHUONG, TRAN NHU
ProQuest Dissertations and Theses; 1976; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global

76-23,739

CHUONG, Tran Nhu, 1931-
A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF VIETNAMESE AND AMERICAN VALUE SYSTEMS.

University of South Florida, Ph.D., 1976
Psychology, industrial

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF VIETNAMESE AND AMERICAN VALUE SYSTEMS

by

Tran nhu Chuong

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Psychology
in
The University of South Florida

June, 1976

Thesis supervisor: Associate Professor Louis A. Penner

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Graduate Council
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

PH.D. THESIS

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Tran nhu Chuong

with a major in Industrial/Organizational Psychology
has been approved by the Examining Committee as
satisfactory for the thesis requirement for the
Ph.D. degree at the convocation of

June, 1976.

Thesis committee:

Thesis supervisor:
Louis A. Penner, Ph.D.

Member: Stephen L. Cohen, Ph.D.

Member: David E. Clement, Ph.D.

Member: Gilbert Kushner, Ph.D.

Member: Francis Sistrunk, Ph.D.

Member: Donald K. Stein, Ph.D.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TO

My Parents

and My Wife

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of people to whom the author is extremely grateful for their help in the planning and the carrying out of this research.

First, I would like to thank Dr. Louis A. Penner, not only for his invaluable assistance in this research, but also for what he has taught me over the past three years. I would like to thank Dr. Stephen L. Cohen for his advice and for what he has taught me in numerous courses. I would like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. David E. Clement, Dr. Francis Sistrunk, Dr. Donald K. Stein, Dr. Gilbert Kushner and Dr. William R. Dannenburg for their extremely helpful suggestions.

I would like to thank those people who assisted me in the conducting of the survey and I regret that I cannot mention their names here.

Finally, and more importantly, I would like to thank my wife, THAN-THI-HONG, for everything she has done in helping me reach this point.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
INTRODUCTION	1
Definitions of Values	1
A History of Vietnam	7
Hypotheses About Value Differences Within Vietnamese Sample	15
American-Vietnamese Comparison	19
Hypotheses About Cross-Cultural Differences in Value Systems	25
METHOD	28
Subjects	28
Vietnamese Sample	28
Sampling Technique	29
American Sample	29
Procedure	30
Interviewers	30
The Questionnaire	31
RESULTS	33
Response Rate	33
Mode of Analyses	33

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table of Contents (Cont.)

	Page
Comparisons of Vietnamese Subgroups' Value Systems	36
Differences as a Function of Gender	36
Differences as a Function of Religion	40
Differences as a Function of Education	43
Differences as a Function of Age	46
Differences as a Function of Occupation	49
Differences as a Function of Residence	52
Differences as a Function of Income	55
Comparisons Between American and Vietnamese Value Systems	58
Overall Comparison	59
Same Sex Comparisons	62
Differences in Value Systems Among Educational Groups	68
DISCUSSION	78
Value System Differences Within Vietnamese Sample	78
Differences as a Function of Gender	81
Differences as a Function of Religion	82
Differences as a Function of Education	83
Differences as a Function of Age	87
Differences as a Function of Occupation	88
Differences as a Function of Residence	88
Differences as a Function of Income	89

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table of Contents (Cont.)

Page

Differences Between American and Vietnamese Value Systems 90

Overall Differences in Value Systems 91

Same Sex Comparisons 95

Educational Comparisons 96

Implications of Research Findings 99

Gender 101

Education 102

Age 103

Other Variables of Importance 104

REFERENCES 105

FOOTNOTES 109

APPENDICES 110

Appendix A - Questionnaire and Value Survey 111

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Proposed and Obtained Sample of Vietnamese Respondents	34
2.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Male-Female Vietnamese Comparison: Terminal Values	37
3.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Male-Female Vietnamese Comparison: Instrumental Values	38
4.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Different Vietnamese Religious Groups: Terminal Values	41
5.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Different Vietnamese Religious Groups: Instrumental Values	42
6.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Different Vietnamese Educational Groups: Terminal Values	44
7.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Different Vietnamese Educational Groups: Instrumental Values	45
8.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Different Vietnamese Age Groups: Terminal Values	47
9.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Different Vietnamese Age Groups: Instrumental Values	48
10.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Different Vietnamese Occupational Groups: Terminal Values	50
11.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Different Vietnamese Occupational Groups: Instrumental Values	51

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

List of Tables (Cont.)

Table		Page
12.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Vietnamese From Rural and Urban Areas: Terminal Values	53
13.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Vietnamese From Rural and Urban Areas: Instrumental Values	54
14.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Different Vietnamese Income Groups: Terminal Values	56
15.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Different Vietnamese Income Groups: Instrumental Values	57
16.	Results of Discriminant Analysis for Vietnamese-American Comparison: Terminal Values	60
17.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese-American Comparison: Instrumental Values	61
18.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese-American Males Comparison: Terminal Values	63
19.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese-American Males Comparison: Instrumental Values	64
20.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese-American Females Comparison: Terminal Value	65
21.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese-American Females Comparison: Instrumental Values	66
22.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese-American Elementary Educated Comparison: Terminal Values	69

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

List of Tables (Cont.)

Table		Page
23.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese-American High School Educated Comparison: Terminal Values	70
24.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese College Educated Comparison: Terminal Values	71
25.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese-American Elementary Educated Comparisons: Instrumental Values	72
26.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese-American High School Educated Comparison: Instrumental Values	73
27.	Results of Discriminant Analyses for Vietnamese-American College Educated Comparison: Instrumental Values	74
28.	Summary of Significant Differences in Terminal Values Between Vietnamese Sub-Groups	79
29.	Summary of Significant Differences in Instrumental Values Between Vietnamese Sub-Groups	80

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Value Survey - Part I	4
2.	Value Survey - Part II	5
3.	Median Terminal Value Rankings and Rank Orders for American, Australian, Israeli, and Canadian College Men	23
4.	Median Instrumental Value Rankings and Rank Orders for American, Australian, Israeli, and Canadian College Men	24

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF VIETNAMESE AND AMERICAN VALUE SYSTEMS

by

Tran nhu Chuong

An Abstract

Of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Psychology in
The University of South Florida

June, 1976

Thesis supervisor: Associate Professor Louis A. Penner

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the similarities and differences in value systems among Vietnamese subgroups, and between Americans and Vietnamese. A national sample of 1427 Americans was given Rokeach's value survey (Rokeach, 1967). The scale was then translated into Vietnamese and given to a randomly selected group of 349 Vietnamese living in South Vietnam shortly before the fall of the Saigon government.

Differences between Vietnamese respondents as a function of the following demographic variables were examined: 1) gender, 2) religion, 3) education, 4) age, 5) occupation, 6) place of residence, and 7) income. Relative to Vietnamese women, Vietnamese men were more concerned with their personal freedom and personal accomplishment. Vietnamese women were more concerned with family-oriented values than men and gave evidence of having internalized a subservient role in society. College-educated Vietnamese, young Vietnamese, civil servants and Vietnamese living in cities showed more Western-oriented value systems than their counterparts. Religion and income did not produce any comparable differences.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Three cross-cultural comparisons of value systems were also conducted: 1) overall differences between Americans and Vietnamese, 2) differences between males and females in the two countries, and 3) differences between individuals with comparable amounts of education in the two countries. In terms of overall differences, Vietnamese were more concerned about their security and less concerned about their individual freedom than were Americans. This difference was even more pronounced when Vietnamese women were compared with American women. Finally, it was found that the college-educated Vietnamese respondents were more like their American counterparts than were less educated Vietnamese. Further, in many respects, the values of college-educated Vietnamese were more similar to Americans' values than to other Vietnamese.

Further research on the effects of a) the new political system in Vietnam and b) the effects of living in America on the Vietnamese' value systems was proposed.

Abstract approved: Louis A Penner

Louis A. Penner, Ph.D.
Thesis supervisor

Associate Professor of Psychology

May 20, 1976

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to a) examine the value systems of various subgroups within Vietnam and b) compare the value systems of Vietnamese and Americans. Values were chosen for study because values are considered to reflect the dominant world view or ethos in a culture (De Vos & Hippler, 1969). Although values have been widely studied by anthropologists and social psychologists, there exists considerable ambiguity as to how they should be measured and, more importantly, what they are. Therefore, this introduction will begin with the presentation of some definitions of the term, value.

Definitions of Values

According to Perry (1954) values are: "anything that has value or is valuable, in the original and genuine sense when it is the subject of an interest -- any interest". (P.3).

Morris and Dewey viewed values as a more dynamic entity. Morris (1956) stated values are "tendencies or dispositions of living to prefer one kind of object rather than another, preferential behavior directed by an anticipation of the outcome of such behavior," (P.60). Dewey claimed that: "value is more than mere preference; it is limited to those

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

types of preferential behavior based upon concept of the desirable." (P.68).

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) considered value orientations as complex "but definitely patterned (rank ordered) principles, resulting from the transactional interplay of three analytically distinguishable elements of the evaluative process - the cognitive, the affective, and the directive elements - which give order and direction to the ever-flowing stream of human acts and thoughts as these relate to the solution of "common human problems" (P.4).

Olsen (1968) viewed the concept value somewhat different and provided a more concise sociological definition of values. According to Olsen (1968) values are: "shared agreements among the members of a social organization as to what is desirable or undesirable in social life." (P.57).

Rokeach (1968, 1973) has presented a rather comprehensive theory of values which embodies many of the previous conceptions of values. Because Rokeach's conceptualization and operationalization of values was employed in this study, special consideration will be given to it here. Rokeach (1968) has suggested that the concept of value may be used as the central basis for social psychological theory and research. To fully understand this statement, it is necessary to look at the definitions given by Rokeach for the concepts of belief, attitude, and value, and his theory of the structure of value systems.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A belief, according to Rokeach is:

> if any simple proposition conscious or unconscious inferred from what a person says or does, capable of being preceded by the phrase: "I believe that" (1968, p.113).

He defined an attitude as:

> "...a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation pre-disposing one to act in some preferential manner." (1968, p. 112).

Rokeach defined values in these following words:

> "To say that a person has a value is to say that a certain mode of conduct or end state of existence is personally or socially preferable to alternative modes of conduct or end state of existence." (1968, p.124).

Values, according to Rokeach, are single beliefs which are centrally located within this total belief system. These values are organized into two separate yet related systems - terminal values (beliefs about end states of existence) and instrumental values (beliefs about modes of conduct). The values in these systems are organized into a continuum of importance. Rokeach has proposed an instrument, the Value Survey (Rokeach, 1967) to measure the importance of value systems. This instrument is presented in Figures 1 and 2. It requires the respondent to rank order his terminal and then his instrumental values in order of importance to himself.

Values have traditionally aroused less interest among social psychologists than attitudes. Rokeach (1968, 1973), however, has proposed that values should replace attitudes as the central concept in social psychological theory and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FIGURE 1

VALUE SURVEY - PART I

Name_____Sex: Male _____ Female _____

Birthdate _____City and State of Birth_____

This is a scientific study of value systems. There are no right or wrong answers in this study. The best answer is your own personal opinion.

This questionnaire is intended not only to gather new scientific facts, but also as a teaching device. In return for your cooperation, we hope to provide you with some interesting insights into yourself.

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

Study the list carefully. Then place a 1 next to the value which is most important to you, place a 2 next to the value which is second most important, etc. The value which is least important should be ranked 18.

When you have completed ranking all values, go back and check over your list. Feel free to make changes. Please take all the time you need to think about this, so that the end result truly represents your values.

___A COMFORTABLE LIFE (a prosperous life)
___AN EXCITING LIFE (a stimulating, active life)
___A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT (lasting contribution)
___A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
___A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
___EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)
___FAMILY SECURITY (taking care of loved ones)
___FREEDOM (independence, free choice)
___HAPPINESS (contentedness)
___INNER HARMONY (freedom from inner conflict)
___MATURE LOVE (sexual and spiritual intimacy)
___NATIONAL SECURITY (protection from attack)
___PLEASURE (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
___SALVATION (saved, eternal life)
___SELF-RESPECT (self-esteem)
___SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, admiration)
___TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close companionship)
___WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)

When you finish this page, go right on to the next page.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FIGURE 2

VALUE SURVEY - PART II

Name_____ Sex: Male_____ Female_____

Birthdate_____City and State of Birth_____

Study the list carefully. Then place a 1 next to the value which is important to you, place a 2 next to the value which is the second most important...The value which is least important should be ranked 18.

___AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)
___BROADMINDED (open-minded)
___CAPABLE (competent, effective)
___CHEERFUL (lighthearted, joyful)
___CLEAN (neat, tidy)
___COURAGEOUS (standing up for your beliefs)
___FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
___HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)
___HONEST (sincere, truthful)
___IMAGINATIVE (daring, creative)
___INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
___INTELLECTUAL (intelligent, reflective)
___LOGICAL (consistent, rational)
___LOVING (affectionate, tender)
___OBEDIENT (dutiful, respectful)
___POLITE (courteous, well-mannered)
___RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
___SELF-CONTROLLED (restrained, self-disciplined)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

research. Rokeach presented three reasons for his proposal. First, value is a more dynamic concept than attitude because of its motivational components. According to Rokeach, "Values have a strong motivational component as well as cognitive, affective and behavioral components. Instrumental values are motivating because the idealized modes of behavior they are concerned with are perceived to be instrumental to the attainment of desired end-goals...Terminal values are motivating because they represent the supergoals beyond immediate, biologically urgent goals. Unlike the more immediate goals, these supergoals do not seem to be periodic in nature; neither do they seem to satiate - we seem to be forever doomed to strive for these ultimate goals without quite ever reaching them." (Rokeach, 1973, p.14).

The second reason that Rokeach gave is that values may determine attitudes and behaviors. With regard to the causal relationship between values and attitudes, Rokeach (1973) and Hopkins (1973) have shown that systematically induced changes in values yield long-term attitude change that was consistent with the changed values. Conroy, Katkin, and Barnette (1973), Penner (1971) and Rokeach (1971, 1973) have all demonstrated long-term behavioral changes as the result of the systematic inducement of changes in selected value's importance. For example, Rokeach (1971) was able to induce positive changes in the importance assigned to the terminal value, Equality, among a group of college students. These changes resulted in positive behaviors toward civil

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

rights for blacks as long as 21 months after the experimental treatment.

The third reason that Rokeach gave was based on the supposition that each person possesses significantly fewer values than attitudes, and if this is true, then "the value concept provides us with a more economical, analytical tool for describing and explaining the differences between persons, groups and nations." (1968, p.158). In the present study Rokeach's value survey was employed in this cross-cultural manner. In order to understand the rationale behind the specific hypotheses made about differences in values between subgroups in Vietnam, it is necessary to present a brief overview of the history of Vietnam and its dominant cultural traditions.

A History of Vietnam

South Vietnam is situated in South East Asia, bordered by Laos and Cambodia on the West, by the North Vietnam on the North on the 17th parallel, and by the South and the East by the South China Sea. Vietnam's geographical position is the one which places it at the cross-roads of different civilizations in the world.

The earliest history of Vietnam is shrouded in legend. Several distinct states existed in what is now Vietnam as early as 111 B.C., and continued under Chinese political domination for a thousand years.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Throughout the thousand-year Chinese rule, there was a continued evolution toward national identity in what became Vietnam. In 939 A.D. Ngo Quyen, a Vietnamese commander, defeated the Chinese and became the first head of the new state of Vietnam.

The new state established after the defeat of the Chinese became a monarchy, and for four centuries the new nation was periodically engaged in attempts to rebuff Chinese efforts to regain control.

Western influence reached Vietnam in 1516, with the arrival of Portuguese adventurers and missionaries. The Portuguese were followed by Spanish and French, and French missionaries began work in the late 16th Century.

French invasion of Vietnam took place under Napoleon III, in 1858. It took the French 16 years to complete their conquest of Vietnam. Following World War I, a growing national resistance effort was directed against the French rule.

During World War II, Vietnam was a French-administered territory of Japan. Although the French administration cooperated with Japanese occupation, toward the end of the war the French were ousted by the Japanese, and Bao Dai, the last French-appointed emperor, proclaimed the independence of the country.

Throughout the Second World War, however, the Vietnamese resistance effort, through the communist-dominated VietMinh, cooperated with the Allies, and prepared itself to establish

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a national government after the war. Ho Chi Minh, leader of the VietMinh, took power in Hanoi when the Japanese withdrew and the Emperor himself abdicated in favor of Ho Chi Minh's government in 1945.

Although Ho Chi Minh now headed a national government in Vietnam, the Pottsdam Conference of the victorious allies supported France's claim to reoccupy Vietnam. Thus began a long period of conflict and negotiation as the French attempted to reassert their rule. Unable to assert control in the Northern part of Vietnam, the French negotiated with Ho Chi Minh. The basic conflict continued, however, with Ho Chi Minh and the Hanoi government supporting continued efforts of the VietMinh to force the French out of Vietnam.

The French abandoned efforts to retake all of Vietnam and the country was partitioned by an agreement concluded at Geneva in 1954. This agreement left the Hanoi government in control only of the Northern portion of the country, and established an anti-communist Western-supported government in the South. When elections, which North Vietnam was confident of winning, were not held in the South, guerrilla warfare continued against the government of South Vietnam.

The United States became involved in the Vietnamese conflict gradually during the period of declining French influence following the Geneva Agreement in 1954. Although the U.S. involvement reached massive proportions, guerrilla warfare was continued by the Viet Cong, successors of the VietMinh in South Vietnam, supported by the Hanoi government

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in North Vietnam. Following gradual withdrawal of military support, the government of South Vietnam collapsed in April, 1975, with the Provisional Revolutionary Government in the South and Hanoi government asserting their intention to unify the country.

These political fluxes have brought into Vietnam many influences which could be identified with different ethics or religions having impact on the value system of the natives. Such religions or ethics are Taoism, Buddhism, Christianity, and Confucianism. Taoism was introduced to Vietnam during the early period of the Chinese domination. It emphasizes contemplation and primitive simplicity. Its ideal is to return to the Tao - the essence of all things. But, "because of its unusually abstract character, Tao passed into the daily life of the Vietnamese peasant primarily as a collection of superstitions and animistic beliefs". (Hammer, 1966, p.43).

The origins of Buddhism can be traced to the Second Century. In its early stages, during the period of Chinese domination, Buddhism did not receive any official support since the Chinese were mainly concerned with the doctrine of Confucianism. But Buddhism enjoyed prosperity with at least some dynasties in the independence period. The essence of Buddhist teachings is contained in the concept of Kharma, the law of causality: the present existence is conditioned by earlier existences, and will condition those to follow. There are two branches of Buddhism in Vietnam. One is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

called Mahayana, the Great Vehicle. The second is named Hinayana, the Lesser Vehicle. The Mahayana is primarily practiced by the people living in the Northern and Central part of South Vietnam. This division of Buddhism holds that "man must save others before he can be saved himself and that love must be expressed through compassion and good words" (Crawford, 1966). The Hinayana branch is mostly practiced by the Vietnamese living in the southern delta of South Vietnam. They keep closer to Buddhist orthodoxy than the other branch. The adherents of this branch concentrate more on the religious life than on the social activities. Among the precepts of Orthodox Buddhism are: "Moderation and the middle path were emphasized. Self-denial is as bad as over-indulgence. Four 'noble truths' were taught: life is a succession of suffering; ignorance of true reality is the cause of suffering; by eliminating selfish desires man can eliminate suffering; man must strive to perfect himself through right concentration, speech, action and living" (Crawford, 1966). Buddhism was practiced by about 80 percent of the population of South Vietnam.

In comparison with other religions, Christianity was introduced recently. In fact, it was not until the 16th Century that Christian missionaries began preaching the Bible to the Vietnamese. Thus, Christianity was considered as a result of the contact made between Vietnam and the West. It teaches the rules of love and charity and was practiced by

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

about 10 percent of the Vietnamese population. Almost all Christians in Vietnam were Catholic.

Hammer (1966) remarked that "despite the multiplicity of religious practices, the average Vietnamese is not an especially religious man. The rites he observes have lost much of their original meaning" (p.40). This characteristic may be regarded as "derived in great part from Confucianism, a philosophy, which has far so outdistanced both Buddhism and Taoism that it dominates every phase of Vietnamese life" (Thompson, 1968, p.54).

Confucianism reached Vietnam under the aegis of the Chinese who governed the country until the 10th Century. According to Hammer (1966), it was "used or abused by individual sovereigns, its hold over Vietnam was tenacious, it was rooted in the country's educational system. Education was expected to be primarily moral and was almost entirely limited in the study of the Confucianist classics. As a result, the Confucianist classics were taught, if only at the most elementary level, in villages throughout the country".

The Confucian ideal on which the mandarinate was based stressed a single hierarchy of values that the mandarins had a vested interest in maintaining. The main task of the mandarins was the perpetuation of the established norm in order to set up a guide for conventional behavior.

Confucianism deeply influenced the Vietnamese with its filial piety and cult of ancestors, and those norms may be regarded as traditions in old time as well as today.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Even though the Confucianist system of education was abolished officially in 1915, the Colonialist system of education did not have a large influence on the population because there were not enough educational institutions in the country to replace the old ones. Gentleman (1966) stated: "during French rule there were only 14 secondary schools; a single University of Hanoi was founded in 1917 but was subsequently closed on several occasions because of student political agitation" (p.31). So the Confucianist values were still taught in French-modeled schools, because they did not conflict with the ruler's policy. In reality, during the period of French rule, "Vietnamese society remained surprisingly unaltered. Social and cultural contact between the two peoples were kept to a bare minimum. Although the displacement of political into French hands inevitably disrupted certain aspects of Vietnamese life, the political tradition of old Vietnam managed to survive through the family which, voluntarily or involuntarily, became the guardian of the national tradition" (Lindhom, 1958, p.38).

Since Confucianism is not an organized religion, there are no figures as to the number of followers it has in Vietnam. However, "Confucianism has a tremendous influence on the life of the Vietnamese people. Many practice it and belong to other religions. It is considered practical for the rich and the poor alike" (Crawford, 1966, p.34).

Confucianism viewed men as primarily social beings formed by society, and in turn capable of shaping the society.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"It drew up an ethical code grounded on social virtue to guide the individual through the maze of his social and political relations. This code laid down man's specific duties to his family, to society, to the state" (Hammer, 1966, p.40). Thus, the individual exists only in and for the society. Besides, Confucianism dictated a moral code for the man of virtue, "quan tu", who should be a living example of the five cardinal virtues: generosity, politeness, steadfastness, reason and trust (Lindhom, 1959, p.33). The man of virtue should also follow a path of moderation - exaggeration in any direction is to be avoided, and equanimity is to be cultivated. Thus, one would expect that this Confucian ideology should be reflected in the value systems of the citizens of Vietnam.

Finally, it should be noted that Vietnam is a predominantly agrarian, rural society. Approximately 60 percent of the citizens lived in the rural areas and 65 percent give farming as their occupation (Annoted Atlas of Vietnam, 1969).

Due to the Confucian influence and the different historical events mentioned previously, traditional Vietnamese respondents should have more concern with these values: Family Security, National Security, A World at Peace, Obedient, Loving, and Helpful and less concerned with Equality, Freedom, Independent, Intellectual Freedom, Imaginative, Broadminded and Logical.

Despite the tendency of Westerners to view Vietnam as a relatively homogeneous culture, it seems reasonable to expect

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

systematic differences within the Vietnamese population as a function of differing demographic characteristics. Differences as a function of gender, religion, education, age, occupation, place of residence, and income were examined. These variables were chosen because of their assumed impace on a persons value systems (Rokeach, 1973). Predictions concerning value differences follow.

Hypotheses About Value Differences Within Vietnamese Sample

Gender

It was expected that Vietnamese women would place more importance on values reflecting subservience (e.g., Obedient, Polite) and less importance on values reflecting personal accomplishments (e.g., Equality, Freedom) than Vietnamese men. Further, Vietnamese women should evidence their family oriented role in considering Family Security more important than Vietnamese men. The Gia Long code which was deeply influenced by Confucianist ethics, gave women few rights. Women in Vietnam were "subjected to their father's authority when children, and as wives they were placed under the control of their husbands, and as widows under that of their sons" (Hammer, 1966, p.234). And the old system which relegated women to a position of inferiority usually condemned them to an inferior education as well, because Confucianist academic training was reserved exclusively for men. Western civilization has exerted much influence on Vietnam in some

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of these areas (education is a prime example), but the complex of inferiority is still deeply ingrained in Vietnamese women because the Confucianist shadow is present in the Vietnamese culture.

Religion. (Buddhists versus Catholics)

A difference can logically be expected between value patterns of Catholics and value patterns of Buddhists, because of the fundamental differences in these religions. For instance, it is likely that the Catholics would rank "Salvation" higher than the Buddhists would, because the notion of salvation is an important concept in their religion. Also, it seems intuitively logical to expect that Buddhists will reflect more Confucianist value patterns than will Catholics, due to greater exposure to the influence of this philosophy. Filial piety, or the notion of family is considered important in the traditional Confucianist way, thus, the Buddhists should rank the value "Family Security" higher than the Catholics would. Catholicism, relative to Buddhism is dogmatic in its nature and its organization is well structured in Vietnam because of the long efforts of the missionaries during the last three encturies (Crawford, 1966), thus, the Catholics should rank the value "Obedient" higher than the Buddhists would.

Education. (College Level Versus Elementary Level)

It is likely that the college-educated people have been more exposed to Western thoughts and values, and less influenced

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

by Confucianist values than the people who had elementary school education. Because of this, the college-educated group should rank the values "Equality and Freedom" higher than the latter group. (These values are not highly recognized in Confucian ethics.) For instrumental values, the elementary group should rank the values "Obedient, Helpful, and Loving" higher than the university-educated group.

Age

It is likely that younger Vietnamese would be more exposed to Western influences and, as a result, possess value systems less in accord with traditional Vietnamese culture than older Vietnamese. More specifically, younger Vietnamese should be more concerned about Equality and Freedom and less concerned about Family Security than older Vietnamese. With regard to instrumental values, the younger Vietnamese should be more concerned with values such as Independent and Intellectual and less concerned with Obedient and Helpful than older Vietnamese.

Occupation. (Farmers versus Civil Servants)

It is likely that the farmers have been more influenced by Confucianism than the civil servants, because the farmers have been exposed more to the traditional values and less influenced by the Western civilization than have the civil servants. Thus, the farmers would likely rank Family Security, Happiness and Wisdom higher than their counterparts, while

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the civil servants should rank Freedom and Equality higher than the former group. For instrumental values, the farmers should rank the values "Obedient, Forgiving, Helpful, and Loving higher than the civil servants, while the latter group should rank the values Independent and Intelligent higher than the former group.

Place of Residence. (Rural versus Urban)

It is likely that the rural people have been more influenced by the Confucian ethics than the urban ones, because the former have been exposed more to the traditional value systems and less influenced by the new outside norms. Thus, the rural group should rank the terminal values "Family Security, Happiness and Wisdom higher than the urban group. For instrumental values, the people in urban areas should rank higher on "Broadminded, Capable, Independent, Intellectual, and Responsible" than their rural counterparts.

Income

As a Vietnamese's income level increases the less traditional value system he should hold. In fact, wealthy Vietnamese tend to be more educated and involved with the Western civilization, so they should tend to rank the values "Freedom and Equality" higher than people with less income. For instrumental values, the people with lower income should rank the values "Obedient, Polite, and Helpful" higher than the people who had high income.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

American-Vietnamese Comparison

As noted previously, this study will also examine the differences and similarities between Vietnamese and American value systems. One would expect certain differences to emerge as a function of two factors - the relative degree of industrialization of the countries and the historical philosophical orientations (Confucian values versus the Protestant ethic).

In the United States, Protestant values occupy a predominant position in the American life. In fact, American colonies were English colonies which meant, first of all, that the colonists' backgrounds - if not active affiliation - would be predominantly Protestant. The overwhelmingly Protestant religious orientation was equally true of the new nation as its borders pushed westward. It was not until the 19th Century, when the numbers began to be augmented by large-scale immigration, that Roman Catholics became sufficiently numerous to constitute a minority in American life; and it was not until the end of the 19th Century that major Jewish and Eastern Orthodox communities came into existence. Hudson (1965) stated that: "As a consequence of Protestant predominance, even non-Protestant groups tended to take on a Protestant coloration in the American environment" (p.6).

Indeed this environment was largely influenced by the Protestant ethic which, as Kemper Fullerton (1959) stated: "is the life of strict discipline, lived in a secular sphere with the sole intent of golorfying God and with the blessed

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sense of assurance of election as its rewards...all of this led to moral activities of (1) a rationalized theory of life, (2) intensified mood for work, and (3) the quasi-ascetic discipline (p.15). In other words, this ethic can be seen through the main themes expressed by Robin (1961):

> 1) American life is organized around the attempt at active mastery rather than passive acceptance. Into this dimension fall the low tolerance of frustration; the refusal to accept ascetic renunciation; the positive encouragement of desire; the stress on power; the approval of ego-assertion...
>
> 2) It tends to be interested in the external world of things and events of the palpable and immediate, rather than in the inner experience of meaning and affect. Its genius is manipulative rather than contemplative.
>
> 3) Its world tends to be open rather than closed; it emphasizes change, flux, movement; its central personality types are adaptive, accessible, outgoing and assimilative.
>
> 4) In wide historical and comparative perspective, the culture places its primary faith in rationalism as opposed to traditionalism; it de-emphasizes the past, orients strongly to the future, does not accept things just because they have done before.
>
> 5) Closely related to the above, is the dimension of orderliness rather than unsystematic ad hoc acceptance of transitory experience.
>
> 6) In interpersonal relations, the weight of the value-system is on the side of "horizontal" rather than vertical emphases: peer-relations, not super-ordinate-subordinate relations; equality rather than hierarchy.
>
> 7) Subject to increased strains and modifications, the received culture emphasized individual personality, rather than group identity and responsibility," (p.65-66).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Accompanying the dominant Protestant ethic in America is the country's high level of prosperity. This relatively affluent standard of living's impact on values can be inferred from Maslow's (1959) data on the extent to which Americans have satisfied the five needs in his hierarchy. According to Maslow, 90 percent of Americans have satisfied their physiological needs; 75 percent safety, 55 percent belongingness needs; 30-35 percent self-esteem needs, and 5 percent have self-actualized. These percentages suggest that Americans, as a group, should be more concerned with values that relate to personal accomplishment and relatively unconcerned about values which are related to lower order needs. There is prior research which does show differences in value importance between Americans and other nationalities which is in accord with these general predictions.

Gordon and Kakkar (1966) studied the interpersonal values of Indian and American high school and college students. In this study, they used the survey of interpersonal values scale (Gordon, 1960). They found that Indian students generally scored lower than Americans on Support, Recognition and Independence, and higher than Americans on Conformity and Benevolence.

Peck (1967) employed the value hierarchy to compare the value systems of Mexican and American youths. He found highly significant differences between the value patterns of Mexican and American students. The American pattern portrays life as a relatively secure place economically, with emphasis on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

egalitarian friendship and shows characteristics of being close-knit, emotional, reciprocally dependent, and dutiful, within a firmly authoritarian framework. There is substantial agreement within each culture on a common array of values. This might be termed a "core culture" pattern.

Thiagarajan, Lukas and Andre (1971) employed the personal values inventory (Bass, 1960) and found that Indian college students valued family, religion, past-orientation, and charismatic leadership higher than did Americans. Change, competition, and money were valued higher by the Americans than by Indian respondents. While these findings were consistent with expectations, the outcome regarding independence and work were found to be contrary to expectations, with work valued more highly by Indians than Americans.

The Rokeach Value Survey has been given to college students in America (Rokeach, 1968, 1973), Australia (Feather, 1971), Canada (Rokeach, 1973) and Israel (Rim, 1970). A comparison of the four groups terminal and instrumental value systems is presented in Figures 3 and 4.

The pattern of differences can be summarized as follows. Relative to the other nationalities, Americans are more oriented toward "materialism, competition and achievement" (Rokeach, 1973, p.91). This can be seen in the relative rankings assigned Ambitious and Helpful by Americans and the other groups. It should also be noted that Israelis who face a situation similar to that confronted by the Vietnamese at the time this study was conducted considered the values

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FIGURE 3

MEDIAN TERMINAL VALUE RANKINGS AND RANK ORDERS FOR AMERICAN, AUSTRALIAN, ISRAELI, AND CANADIAN COLLEGE MEN

	United States	Australia	Israel	Canada
N =	169	279	71	125
A comfortable life	10.3(11)	12.6(13)	12.8(15)	11.6(13)
An exciting life	10.8(12)	9.2(11)	8.7(9)	9.8(11)
A sense of accomplishment	7.1(5)	6.3(4)	7.5(7)	9.2(9)
A world at peace	9.3(10)	8.2(9)	4.7(1)	10.0(12)
A world of beauty	14.4(18)	13.0(15)	14.5(17)	12.3(15)
Equality	12.3(13)	9.0(10)	9.3(10)	9.7(10)
Family Security	8.1(7)	9.5(12)	7.9(8)	7.5(7)
Freedom	4.7(1)	4.9(3)	6.5(4)	4.5(1)
Happiness	6.2(2)	7.5(7)	6.0(3)	4.7(2)
Inner Harmony	8.8(9)	7.7(8)	10.9(13)	7.5(6)
Mature Love	7.4(6)	6.6(5)	6.5(5)	5.6(3)
National Security	13.8(17)	13.9(17)	5.6(2)	16.6(17)
Pleasure	13.1(15)	12.7(14)	11.2(14)	12.3(14)
Salvation (Nirvana)	13.4(16)	15.9(18)	15.9(18)	17.6(18)
Salf Respect	7.0(4)	7.5(6)	9.7(11)	6.9(4)
Social Recognition	12.9(14)	13.7(16)	13.5(16)	13.9(16)
True Friendship	8.7(8)	4.9(2)	10.1(12)	7.3(5)
Wisdom	6.8(3)	4.7(1)	7.3(6)	8.3(8)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FIGURE 4

MEDIAN INSTRUMENTAL VALUE RANKINGS AND RANK ORDERS
FOR AMERICAN, AUSTRALIAN, ISRAELI, AND CANADIAN MEN

	United States	Australia	Israel	Canada
N =	169	279	71	125
Ambitious	6.4(3)	7.8(6)	8.7(7)	9.4(11)
Broadminded	6.7(4)	4.6(2)	9.2(9)	6.4(4)
Capable	7.5(5)	8.2(8)	6.5(4)	9.9(12)
Cheerful	12.0(15)	8.5(9)	12.2(14)	8.8(6)
Clean	14.1(17)	13.9(17)	12.6(15)	15.4(17)
Courageous	8.4(8)	8.7(10)	9.8(12)	9.1(8)
Forgiving	10.5(12)	9.3(11)	14.3(18)	9.1(10)
Helpful	11.9(14)	10.2(13)	9.3(10)	9.1(9)
Honest	5.2(1)	4.0(1)	5.1(1)	3.0(1)
Imaginative	10.8(13)	11.5(15)	13.1(16)	10.6(15)
Independent	7.7(6)	7.9(7)	9.9(13)	6.9(5)
Intellectual	8.5(9)	10.6(14)	7.7(6)	8.9(7)
Logical	8.3(7)	9.9(12)	5.9(3)	10.5(14)
Loving	9.1(11)	7.5(4)	9.1(8)	6.4(3)
Obedient	15.0(18)	15.3(18)	13.6(17)	16.6(18)
Polite	13.2(16)	12.1(16)	9.7(11)	14.6(16)
Responsible	5.9(2)	5.2(3)	5.2(2)	5.6(2)
Self-controlled	8.6(10)	7.7(5)	7.6(5)	10.2(13)

[1]Data From Rokeach (1973)

A World at Peace and National Security much more important than did the Americans.

Hypotheses About Cross-cultural Differences in Value Systems

Three comparisons between American and Vietnamese were made. These were: (1) differences in value systems between the entire American and Vietnamese samples, (2) differences between Vietnamese and Americans of the same sex, and (3) differences between Vietnamese and Americans with comparable amounts of education.

With regard to similarities and differences between the value systems of Americans and Vietnamese, it was hypothesized that the differences between the two groups instrumental values would be much greater than the differences in their terminal values. This prediction was based on the premise that what differentiates cultures is not so much their goals in life (terminal values) but rather the means by which they attain these goals (instrumental values). It was also predicted that the Confucian tradition, in combination with the autocratic form of government Vietnam has had for at least a thousand years would result in Vietnamese being less concerned about Freedom (a terminal value) and more concerned about being Obedient (an instrumental value) than would Americans. Also, it was thought that the war fought in Vietnam for at least 30 years would result in the Vietnamese considering values concerned with Security (e.g., National

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Security) and Peace (e.g., A World at Peace) as important more than Americans.

In addition to overall comparisons of Vietnamese and American value systems, similarities and differences between the two countries as a function of selected demographic characteristics were examined. These demographic characteristics were chosen on the basis of three factors: (1) data existed on these variables in both countries, (2) people in both countries could be classified on these variables in a comparable manner, and (3) these variables were believed to exert an influence on value systems.

It was predicted that the value systems of women in the two countries would differ more than the value systems of men. This prediction was based on the role assigned women in a Confucian culture. Although women in the United States have been deprived of their civil rights by both law and tradition, the relative status of women in American is probably much higher than it is for Vietnamese women. This difference in status between the countries should yield greater differences between women in the two countries than between men. With regard to specific values, Vietnamese women should differ most dramatically from the American women on values concerned with equal rights and the role of women in the society (e.g., Ambitious, Equality, Obedient).

It was predicted that Vietnamese with a university degree would be most like their American counterparts and Vietnamese with an elementary school education would be least

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

like Americans with an elementary school education. The prediction was based on the fact that as an individual progressed through the Vietnamese educational system he (or she) would be increasingly exposed to Western thought and values. This increased exposure should result in the highly educated segment of the Vietnamese sample being more Western-like in their values. This Western orientation should be expressed more in the terminal values of the college-educated Vietnamese than the instrumental values. More specifically, college-educated Vietnamese should consider values such as Freedom and Equality as important as do Americans; less educated Vietnamese should differ from the Americans on these values.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

METHOD

Subjects

Vietnamese Sample

The Vietnamese respondents were 349 individuals 17 years of age and older and were interviewed between November 1, 1974 and January 15, 1975. All respondents resided in a province 250 miles northeast of Saigon. The province contained 200,000 residents, 40 percent of whom lived in a city and 60 percent of whom lived in small villages. This province was chosen for three reasons. First and foremost, the author had contacts with a large number of university students in the province and, thus, provided a number of trained, unpaid volunteers. Second, the province used contained a fairly representative cross-section of Vietnamese. The representativeness of the population of the province was due to the fact that until 1945, the province was considered the property of the royal vamily in Vietnam and was sparsely populated. Following the deposing of the king, the extremely fertile soil and the excellent climate in the area attracted large numbers of persons from all over Vietnam. Finally, in contrast to other provinces in Vietnam this province was, until the days immediately preceding the fall of the Saigon government, free of major attacks by the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

National Liberation Front. For example, at the time Hue was under siege, high-ranking province officials were able to travel, unprotected, in the countryside. Thus, the interviewers would be able to travel to the rural areas in relatively safety and all geographical locations in the province could be sampled.[1]

Sampling Technique

A quota sampling technique was used. The demographic characteristics upon which quotas were set were gender, occupation (farmer, civil servants, other), religion (Buddhist, Catholic, other) and place of residence (rural, urban). The rationale behind the setting of quota percentages was not that they match the population percentages on these characteristics. Rather, the goal was to ensure that the various subgroups have sufficient representation to allow statistical analyses of them. Although the author desired to obtain 550 interviews, the quota percentages were based on the assumption that only 275 interviews might be conducted. Within the rural areas, two villages in each province district were randomly selected. Since all areas of the province were secure at the time of the study, all districts were included in the pool from which the fillages were drawn. Within the large city, two of the ten precincts were randomly selected.

American Sample

The American respondents were 1428 adults interviewed in a national survey conducted for Milton Rokeach by the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

National Opinion Research Center in 1971. An area probability sampling technique was used.[2]

Procedure

Interviewers

Thirty university students served as interviewers as part of their academic training. All interviewers had had previous field experience in conducting interviews. Interviewers were supervised by an individual with a graduate degree in sociology who "spot checked" the interviewers.

Each interviewer was given a quota to fill and a geographic location in which to fill it. Once in this geographic location, an interviewer was to employ the following procedure. A house from a row of houses was to be selected by chance and the first person in that household to fit the characteristics prescribed by the interviewer's quota was given the interview. Thereafter, every third house in that row was to be approached and the same procedure followed until the interviewer's quota was filled. In order to minimize the reactive effects of the interviewers, they left the household while the value survey was filled out. Although these procedures did not eliminate all the basic problems in quota sampling (cf., Kish, 1962, p.562), they did eliminate potential bias in the results due to the manner in which the interviewers selected respondents. It should also be noted that despite its many drawbacks, quota sampling is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a widely used technique which according to Kish (1962) produces "good results".

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. In the first part, respondents gave their age, sex, marital status, number of times moved in the last year, religion, occupation, years of education, income, ethnic origin (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodian, Chinese...) and other types of information. Names were not asked for.

The second part of the questionnaire was a Vietnamese translation of Form E of Rokeach's Value Survey (Rokeach, 1967). In Form E, respondents are presented with alphabetized lists of 18 terminal values (along with defining phrases) and then 18 instrumental values, also with defining phrases. Respondents rank order the terminal and then the instrumental values in order of importance to themselves. The five-week test-retest reliability for the terminal values is +.74 and +.70 for the instrumental values (Feather, 1972). In the Vietnamese version of the value survey, the values were presented in the order they appeared in the Vietnamese alphabet. A complete copy of the questionnaire is presented as Appendix A.

In order to arrive at a suitable Vietnamese translation of Rokeach's Value Survey, the following procedure was used. Two bilingual Vietnamese nationals respondents translated the survey into Vietnamese. They then met with the author and resolved any inconsistencies in translation. The scale

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in Vietnamese was then given to two other Vietnamese nationals who independently translated it back into English. These English translations were compared by an American student to Rokeach's original scale. The only departure from Rokeach's original scale was that the word "Nirvana" was persented along with Salvation in the Vietnamese version. Although the Buddhist concept of Nirvana and the Christian concept of salvation are not strictly speaking equivalent, it was felt that the large number of Buddhist respondents necessitated its inclusion.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

RESULTS

Response Rate

Five hundred and ten interviews were attempted; 349 usable questionnaires (68.4%) were obtained. Approximately 13 percent of the people contacted refused to fill out the questionnaire. Another 19 percent of the potential respondents were functionally illiterate and/or filled out the value survey incorrectly. Table 1 presents the quota percentages desired and obtained in the Vietnamese sample.

As can be seen from Table 1, the percentages obtained matched the desired percentages quite well. At the same time it must be noted that the respondents in the Vietnamese sample were probably of a higher social economic level than the general Vietnamese population at the time the survey was conducted. This was due to two factors. First, the types of persons who did not fill out the questionnaire and second, the deliberate over-representation of certain sub-groups (e.g., civil servants comprised 25 percent of the Vietnamese population but 33 percent of the sample).

Mode of Analyses

In order to determine univariate and multivariate differences between the rankings of the individual values

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 1

PROPOSED AND OBTAINED SAMPLE OF VIETNAMESE RESPONDENTS

Demographic Characteristic	Proposed Sample			Obtained Sample	
	Percentage	Lower limit	Upper limit	Percentage	Number of Respondents
A. Occupation					
1. Farmer	36.5	(100 -	200)	34.3	(120)
2. Civil Servant	36.5	(100 -	200)	33.0	(115)
3. Other	27.0	(75 -	150)	32.6	(114)
		275	550		349
B. Religion					
1. Buddhist	45.0	(125 -	250)	41.5	(145)
2. Catholic	27.0	(75 -	150)	31.5	(110)
3. Other	27.0	(75 -	150)	26.9	(94)
		275 -	550)		349
C. Gender					
1. Males	50.0	(137 -	275)	51.5	(186)
2. Females	50.0	(137 -	275)	48.4	(169)
		275 -	550		349
D. Place of Residence					
1. Rural	60.0	(165 -	330)	57.5	(199)
	40.0	(110 -	220)	43.4	(150)
		275	550		349

stepwise discriminant analyses (Kerlinger & Pedha zer, 1973) were used.

Although Rokeach has used median tests to compare groups' value systems, means were compared here. The S.P.S.S. stepwise discriminant analysis (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975) program provided the following information: (1) Univariate F ratios for the difference between the groups on each value, (2) Wilke's Lambda (Λ), an estimate of the variance unaccounted for by the Univariate F ratios, (3) covariate F ratios for the difference between the groups on values with their intercorrelation with the other values partialled out (measured obtained via a rank order technique are by definition intercorrelated), (4) a multivariate F ratio for the difference between the groups on a linear combination of values, (5) Wilke's Lambda (Λ) for the multivariate F ratio, and (6) Rao's V, an indication of the amount additional variance accounted for by the inclusion of a variable in the discriminant function. For all univariate and covariate F ratios the level was set at .025. The multivariate F ratios reported are those obtained at the last step in the discriminant analyses where the covariate F ratios for the values loading on the discriminant function were 2.0 or greater.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Comparisons of Vietnamese Subgroup's Value Systems

Differences as a Function of Gender

The comparisons between Vietnamese males and Vietnamese females systems are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

Significant differences were found between the mean rankings of 5 of 18 terminal values. Significant univariate F ratios were obtained for the values: Freedom, Equality, A Sense of Accomplishment, National Security (the Vietnamese males considered these values more important than the Vietnamese females), and Family Security (the Vietnamese females considered it more important). There were significant covariate F ratios in the comparison between the two subgroups for three of the 18 terminal values: A Sense of Accomplishment, Freedom, and National Security. The linear combination of 7 values significantly discriminated between the Vietnamese males and females (multivariate F = 5.90, df: 7/341, $p < .025$, percentage of variance accounted for $(1-\Lambda)$: 10.9%).

There were significant differences between the two subgroups in 11 of the 18 instrumental values. The largest univariate F ratios were for Loving (the Vietnamese females considered it more important than the Vietnamese males), Responsible, Self-Controlled, Capable (the Vietnamese males ranked these more important). There were significant covariate F ratios for the two groups on four of the 18 instrumental values: Loving, Obedient (Vietnamese females

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 2

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR MALE-FEMALE VIETNAMESE COMPARISON: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	MALES ($\bar{x}$ = 180)		FEMALES ($\bar{x}$ = 196)		F_{univ} df:1/347	F_{cov}[2] df:1/341	$1-\Lambda$[3]
	$\bar{x}$	Rank	$\bar{x}$	Rank			
A comfortable life	7.33	5	7.05	5	.32	< 2	-
An exciting life	13.04	16	13.65	18	1.90	2.03	.6
A sense of accomplishment	10.07	9	11.26	14	6.92*	8.30*	1.7*
A world at peace	4.97	2	5.01	2	.007	< 2	-
A world of beauty	13.90	18	13.07	17	3.12	< 2	-
Equality	8.85	8	10.52	10	11.46*	3.91	2.1
Family security	5.82	3	4.74	1	5.73	< 2	-
Freedom	9.12	6	10.13	9	17.18*	7.27*	4.48*
Happiness	6.04	4	5.32	3	2.67	< 2	-
Inner harmony	11.31	13	11.08	13	.24	< 2	-
Mature love	12.31	15	11.62	15	2.18	< 2	-
National security	4.98	1	6.08	4	6.77	5.57*	1.6*
Pleasure	13.05	17	12.40	16	1.64	< 2	-
Salvation (Nirvana)	10.18	11	10.62	11	.52	2.39	.3
Self respect	10.13	10	9.84	8	.42	< 2	-
Social recognition	11.72	14	10.9	12	3.45	2.77	.6
True friendship	10.37	12	9.6	7	3.02	< 2	-
Wisdom	8.80	7	8.07	6	2.48	< 2	-

*$p < .025$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 3

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR MALE-FEMALE VIETNAMESE COMPARISON: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Males ($\underline{n}$ = 180) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Females ($\underline{n}$ = 169) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/347	F_{cov}[2] df:1/341	$1-\Lambda$[3]
Ambitions	11.93	16	12.63	17	1.23	< 2	-
Broadminded	11.33	14	10.55	12	2.67	< 2	-
Capable	7.32	3	10.05	11	28.00*	11.79	2.8*
Cheerful	11.38	15	9.58	10	113.30	< 2	-
Clean	9.27	8	7.94	5	5.93*	2.48	.5
Courageous	7.87	5	8.56	6	1.84	< 2	-
Forgiving	8.42	7	6.05	3	23.70*	4.02	1.7*
Helpfulq	10.53	12	9.17	8	7.48*	< 2	.3
Honest	5.76	1	5.35	2	.82	< 2	.4
Imaginative	12.31	18	13.40	18	4.80	< 2	-
Independent	6.96	2	9.16	7	16.01*	4.34	.7
Intellectual	9.58	10	11.31	14	10.81*	< 2	.3
Logical	11.22	13	12.13	15	4.33	< 2	-
Loving	12.20	17	7.72	4	78.85*	33.46*	18.6*
Obedient	7.46	4	4.87	1	20.35*	14.33*	4.0*
Polite	9.61	11	9.46	9	.09	< 2	-
Responsible	8.22	6	10.92	13	31.75*	7.22*	1.0*
Self-controlled	9.54	9	12.43	18	31.79*	< 2	.7

*$p < .025$

Table Footnotes

(1) The lower the mean rank assigned a value, the more important that value to the group.

(2) The covariate F ratios in this column are the stepwise covariate F ratios at the step where those variables which had not yet entered the discriminant function had a covariate F ratio of less than 2.00.

(3) Percentages in this column indicate the amount of additional variance accounted for by the discriminant function, when this value was entered. Asterisked percentages indicate that the addition of this variable added significantly to the separation of the groups (by Rao's V).

These footnotes apply to all subsequent tables unless specified otherwise.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

co:.sidered it more important) Responsible, and Capable. The linear combination of 7 instrumental values significantly discriminated between the two subgroups (multivariate $F = 20,173$, df 7/341, $p < .025$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 29.3%).

Differences as a Function of Religion

The respondents were classified as being Buddhist, Catholic or other (e.g., Caodaism, Cult of ancesters...). Since the comparison of interest here was the Buddhists and Catholics, only differences between these two groups will be described. It should be noted, however, that the Buddhists were much more similar to the "other" group than were the Catholics. The comparisons relevant to the similarities and the differences between the Vietnamese Catholics and Buddhists are presented in Tables 4 and 5.

The Vietnamese Catholics and Buddhists differed significantly in four of the 18 individual value rankings: Salvation (the Vietnamese Catholics considered it more important), A World at Peace, A Comfortable Life, and Pleasure (the Buddhists considered these three values more important). There were two significant F covariate ratios for the values: Salvation and A World at Peace. The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 7 values was 24.580 (df: 7/341, $p < .025$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 33.6%).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR DIFFERENT VIETNAMESE RELIGIOUS GROUPS: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Religion: Catholic ($\underline{n}$ = 110) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Buddhist ($\underline{n}$ = 145) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Other ($\underline{n}$ = 94) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:2/347	F_{cov}[2] df:2/341	$1-\Lambda$[3]
A comfortable life	8.2	7	6.44	5	7.2	5	4.7	< 2	-
An exciting life	14.1	18	13.1	17	13.77	17	3.06	< 2	3.0*
A sense of accomplishment	10.35	11	10.84	11	10.69	11	.42	< 2	1.8*
A world at peace	6.12	4	4.42	1	4.53	1	5.95*	4.26*	2.1*
A world of beauty	13.85	17	13.63	18	12.88	18	1.34	< 2	-
Equality	10.13	10	9.85	9	8.81	7	2.23	< 2	1.0*
Family security	6	3	4.71	2	5.4	3	2.98	< 2	2.8*
Freedom	8.93	8	9.51	7	8.63	6	1.10	< 2	-
Happiness	5.37	1	5.9	4	5.75	2	.53	< 2	-
Inner harmony	11.2	14	11.54	13	10.7	12	1.05	< 2	-
Mature love	11.84	15	12.04	14	12.03	15	.07	< 2	-
National security	5.46	2	5.08	3	6.1	4	1.67	2.40	-
Pleasure	13.77	16	12.45	16	11.94	14	4.07*	< 2	-
Salvation (Nirvana)	6.2	5	12.2	15	12.54	16	60.31*	19.77*	25.9*
Self-respect	9.71	9	10.18	10	10.02	9	.40	< 2	-
Social recognition	11.16	13	11.07	12	11.90	13	1.24	< 2	-
True friendship	10.38	12	9.6	8	10.14	10	1.16	< 2	-
Wisdom	8.18	6	8.35	6	8.91	8	.77	< 2	-

*p < .025

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 5

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR DIFFERENT VIETNAMESE RELIGIOUS GROUPS: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Religion: Catholic (n = 110) x	Rank	Buddhist (n = 145) x	Rank	Other (n = 94) x	Rank	F_{univ} df:2/347	F_{cov}[2] df:2/341	$1-\Lambda^3$
Ambitions	12.7	18	11.88	17	11.75	17	1.13	< 2	-
Broadminded	11.18	16	10.86	14	10.82	14	.20	< 2	-
Capable	9.55	7	8.44	7	7.91	3	2.97	< 2	1.7*
Cheerful	9.85	11	10.85	13	10.76	13	1.60	< 2	-
Clean	8.65	6	8.31	6	9.09	8	.67	< 2	-
Courageous	7.8	4	8.09	5	8.85	6	1.31	2.01	-
Forgiving	7.41	3	6.68	2	8.01	5	2.34	2.13	1.4
Helpful	9.46	9	9.9	10	10.34	12	.88	< 2	-
Honest	5.09	1	5.97	1	5.48	1	1.41	< 2	-
Imaginative	10.53	14	12.44	18	12.61	18	1.90	< 2	1.8
Independent	8.31	5	7.80	4	8.03	4	.29	< 2	-
Intellectual	10.82	15	10.41	12	9.95	11	.77	< 2	-
Logical	12.12	17	11.44	16	11.46	16	1.01	< 2	-
Loving	9.85	12	10.3	11	9.84	10	.32	< 2	-
Obedient	5.32	2	6.76	3	6.38	2	2.22	2.55	-
Polite	9.54	10	9.83	9	9.08	7	.69	< 2	-
Responsible	9.42	8	9.72	8	9.36	9	.21	< 2	-
Self-controlled	10.32	13	11.24	15	11.2	15	1.22	2.84	-

*$p < .025$

None of the 18 univariate and covariate F ratios in instrumental values comparison were significant. The multivariate F ratios based on the linear combination of 5 values was 2.906 (df:: 5/343, $P < .025$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 5.8%).

Differences as a Function of Education

Respondents in the Vietnamese sample were classified as having completed elementary school, high school or college and compared via discriminant analysis. These analyses are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

In describing the differences among the three groups, only the elementary school - college educated differences will be presented. Four of the 18 means value rankings were significantly different: Freedom (the college educated respondents considered it more important than the elementary educated individuals), Family Security (the elementary educated persons considered it more important), National Security, and Mature Love (the university educated respondents ranked these higher than the elementary educated persons). There were significant differences between the three subgroups in four of the F covariate ratios: Freedom, Mature Love, Family Security, and National Security. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of five values was 6.658 (df = 10/684, $p < .025$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 17.0%).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 6

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR DIFFERENT VIETNAMESE EDUCATIONAL GROUPS: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Education Level: Elementary (n = 165) x	Rank	High School (n = 141) x	Rank	College (n = 43) x	Rank	F_{univ} df:2/346	F_{cov}[2] df:2/684	$1-\Lambda$[3]
A comfortable life	6.85	5	7.16	5	8.58	8	2.45	< 2	-
An exciting life	13.7	17	13.07	17	12.83	16	1.26	< 2	1.0
A sense of accomplishment	11.02	13	10.5	11	9.74	10	1.7	< 2	-
A world at peace	4.51	2	5.17	1	6.18	1	2.9	< 2	.6
A world of beauty	13.76	18	13.31	18	13.09	17	.6	< 2	-
Equality	10.13	10	9.46	7	8.53	7	2.22	< 2	-
Family security	4.38	1	5.7	4	7.53	4	10.95*	5.78*	2.3*
Freedom	10.13	9	8.61	8	6.7	5	11.30*	8.54*	6.4*
Happiness	5.37	4	5.6	2	7.25	3	3.67	< 2	.7
Innter harmony	11.15	14	11.52	13	10.34	13	1.17	< 2	-
Mature love	12.7	15	11.64	14	10.3	12	6.0*	6.33*	4.9*
National security	4.94	3	5.6	3	7.06	2	4/5*	4.65*	2.2*
Pleasure	12.81	16	12.5	16	13.23	18	.42	< 2	.7
Salvation (Nirvana)	9.68	7	11.03	12	11.02	14	2.5	2.44	1.2
Self-respect	9.83	8	10.18	10	9.97	11	.27	< 2	-
Social recognition	10.95	12	11.77	15	11.27	15	1.48	< 2	.05
True friendship	10.31	11	9.86	9	9.23	9	1.26	< 2	-
Wisdom	8.7	6	8.27	6	8.06	5	.54	< 2	-

*$p < .025$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 7

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR DIFFERENT VIETNAMESE EDUCATIONAL GROUPS: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Educational Level: Elementary ($\underline{n}$ = 165) $\bar{x}$	Rank	High School ($\underline{n}$ = 141) $\bar{x}$	Rank	College ($\underline{n}$ = 43) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:2/346	F_{cov}[2] df:2/682	$1-\Lambda^3$
Ambitions	12.22	16	11.97	18	12.06	18	.09	< 2	-
Broadminded	11.4	13	10.09	15	9.48	10	3.07	< 2	-
Capable	8.09	5	9.06	8	9.40	9	1.97	< 2	.8
Cheerful	10.31	11	11.11	16	9.30	8	2.75	2.50	1.1
Clean	7.67	4	8.84	7	11.55	16	10.55**	3.54	1.6
Courageous	8.13	6	8.17	5	8.58	6	.15	< 2	.6
Forgiving	6.9	3	7.64	3	7.46	2	.96	< 2	-
Helpful	9.12	8	10.57	13	10.48	14	4.08**	< 2	-
Honest	4.68	2	6.32	1	6.41	1	7.12**	< 2	.9
Imaginative	13.52	18	12.5	17	11.3	15	4.65**	< 2	-
Independent	8.34	7	7.7	4	7.9	4	.57	5.78**	-
Intellectual	11.80	15	9.64	10	7.76	3	15.2**	< 2	2.9*
Logical	12.33	17	10.87	14	11.74	17	4.98**	4.73**	1.9*
Loving	9.8	9	10.25	12	10.2	13	.30	< 2	-
Obedient	4.24	1	7.27	2	10.18	12	23.22**	11.36**	14.0*
Polite	10.32	12	8.54	6	9.81	11	5.42**	4.75**	1.3*
Responsible	10.28	10	9.08	9	8.13	5	4.83**	< 2	-
Self-controlled	11.78	14	10.5	11	9.16	7	5.78**	< 2	-

*$p < .025$

Although a comparison of the three groups instrumental values produced ten significant univariate F ratios, for two of these (Logical and Polite) the cause of the significant F ratio was different between high school educated Vietnamese and the other two groups. The largest of the remaining univariate F ratios were for the values: Obedient (the elementary school educated respondents considered it more important), Clean, Honest (these values were less important to the elementary educated group than to the university educated group) and Intellectual (the college educated respondents considered it more important). There were three F covariate ratios which were significant: Obedient, Independent, and Logical. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of six values was 8.244 (df: 12/862, $p < .025$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 23.8%).

Differences as a Function of Age

Respondents in the Vietnamese sample were classified into four groups of different ages: (1) from 17 to 29, (2) from 30 to 39, (3) from 40 to 49, and (4) above 50 years old; and compared via discriminant analyses. These analyses were presented in Tables 8 and 9. Only the differences between two extreme age groups will be described.

Four univariate F ratios were significant for the following values: Family Security (the older group considered it more important), Freedom, Equality (both of these were ranked as more important by the younger group), and Self-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 8

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR DIFFERENT VIETNAMESE AGE GROUPS: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Age (17 - 29) (n = 154) x	Rank	(30 - 39) (n = 92) x	Rank	(40 - 49) (n = 82) x	Rank	(50+) (n = 21) x	Rank	F_{univ} df:3/345	F_{cov}[2] df:3/942	$1-\Lambda$[3]
A comfortable life	7.64	8	7.13	5	6.51	5	6.76	5	1.17	< 2	.6
An exciting life	13.05	17	12.92	17	14.04	18	14.52	18	1.97	< 2	1.6
A sense of accomplishment	10.87	11	10.36	11	10.65	11	10.28	11	.32	< 2	1.0
A world at peace	4.8	1	4.95	1	5.23	4	5.60	2	.38	< 2	-
A world of beauty	13.12	18	13.86	18	14	17	12.71	16	1.13	< 2	.8
Equality	8.56	5	10.22	10	10.7	12	11.20	12	5.61*	< 2	1.3
Family security	6.67	4	5.2	4	3.43	1	2.85	1	14.42*	10.06*	11.1*
Freedom	8.07	5	8.9	7	10.43	10	12.28	14	8.66*	3.45*	2.9*
Happiness	6.08	3	6.01	3	4.56	2	5.8	3	2.71	< 2	.8
Inner harmony	11.1	12	10.97	13	12.17	14	9.23	8	2.81	3.08	2.2*
Mature love	12.01	15	11.47	15	12.4	15	12.33	15	.70	< 2	-
National security	5.22	2	6.13	2	5.01	3	6.23	4	1.50	< 2	1.0
Pleasure	12.66	16	12.31	16	12.95	16	14.28	17	1.01	< 2	-
Salvation (Nirvana)	11.15	14	10.1	9	9.5	8	9.61	9	.57	2.82	2.0*
Self respect	10.38	10	10.48	12	9.07	7	8.52	6	3.20*	3.96*	2.6*
Social recognition	11.14	13	11.36	14	11.92	13	10.2	10	1.17	< 2	.9
True friendship	9.83	9	9.92	8	10.04	9	11.28	13	.75	< 2	-
Wisdom	8.6	7	8.62	6	8.3	6	7.2	7	.71	< 2	.9

*$p < .025$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 9

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR
DIFFERENT VIETNAMESE AGE GROUPS: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental[1] Values	Age: 17 - 29 (n = 154) $\bar{x}$	Rank	30 - 39 (n = 92) $\bar{x}$	Rank	40 - 49 (n = 82) $\bar{x}$	Rank	50+ (n = 21) x	Rank	F_{univ} df:3/345	F_{cov}[2] df:3/835	$1-\Lambda^3$
Ambitions	12	17	12.15	17	11.9	17	13.42	17	.55	< 2	-
Broadminded	10.53	13	11.2	15	11.44	13	11.04	12	.87	< 2	-
Capable	8.66	6	8.95	7	8.16	5	9.04	9	.41	< 2	-
Cheerful	10.4	12	10.68	12	10.75	12	9.61	11	.39	< 2	-
Clean	9.5	10	8.03	6	7.61	4	8.85	7	3.0	< 2	1.1
Courageous	8.16	5	7.8	5	8.9	7	7.61	4	.90	< 2	-
Forgiving	7.63	3	7.03	3	7.13	3	6.23	3	.75	< 2	-
Helpful	10.75	15	9.62	9	8.97	8	8.04	5	4.04*	< 2	1.
Honest	6.0	1	5.92	1	4.82	2	3.66	1	3.1	< 2	.9
Imaginative	12.07	18	12.97	18	13.64	18	14.66	18	3.42*	< 2	-
Independent	7.82	4	7.08	4	8.88	6	10.38	13	3.26*	2.82	2.4
Intellectual	9.27	7	10.95	13	11.44	14	12.47	16	5.6**	3.21*	4.7*
Logical	11.29	16	12.0	16	11.91	16	12	15	.77	< 2	-
Loving	10.58	14	9.48	8	9.77	10	9.47	10	1.06	< 2	-
Obedient	7.36	2	6.94	2	4.5	1	5.46	2	5.23*	2.72	2.2
Polite	9.38	9	10.07	11	9.45	9	8.66	6	.67	< 2	-
Responsible	9.3	8	9.86	10	9.77	11	8.85	8	.50	< 2	-
Self-controlled	10.24	11	11.18	14	11.86	15	11.42	14	2.07	< 2	-

*$p < .025$

Respect (the older group considered it more important). There were three significant F covariate ratios: Family Security, Self-Respect, and Freedom. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of five values was 5.522 (df: 15/942, $p < .025$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 20.8%).

Turning to the instrumental values for these two Vietnamese subgroups mentioned above, five univariate F ratios were significant for the values: Obedient (the mean of this value was significantly less in the older group than in the younger ones), Helpful (the older group also considered it more important), Intellectual, Imaginative and Independent (the means of these values were significantly less (i.e., it was more important) in the younger group than in the old ones). There was only one significant covariate F ratio for the value Intellectual. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of three values was 3.75 (df: 9/835, $p < .025$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 9.7%).

Differences as a Function of Occupation

Respondents in the Vietnamese sample were classified into three different categories in occupation: (1) farmer, (2) civil servants, and (3) other occupations. Because of the hetereogeneity of the "other" classification, it was dropped from the analysis. The analyses relevant to the farmer - civil servant comparison are presented in Tables 10 and 11.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 10

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR DIFFERENT VIETNAMESE OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Occupation: Farmer (n = 121) x	Rank	Civil Servant (n = 114) x	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/233	F^{2}_{cov} df:1/227	$1-\Lambda^{3}$
A comfortable life	6.7	5	7.61	5	1.26	<2	-
An exciting life	13.96	18	13.04	17	2.16	2.80	.8
A sense of accomplishment	11.24	14	10.44	10	1.82	2.55	.8
A world at peace	4.67	2	5.22	2	.53	<2	-
A world of beauty	13.57	17	13.12	18	.71	<2	.4
Equality	11.17	13	8.35	7	11.62*	9.53*	2.0*
Family security	4.25	1	6.0	3	5.81	<2	-
Freedom	10.7	10	7.66	6	13.76*	17.11*	11.4*
Happiness	4.95	3	6.3	4	3.34	<2	-
Inner harmony	11.12	11	11.23	12	.02	<2	.6
Mature love	12.21	15	11.30	13	2.10	9.68	2.4
National security	5.5	4	4.94	1	1.77	<2	-
Pleasure	12.91	16	12.81	16	.13	<2	-
Salvation (Nirvana)	9.47	8	11.37	14	3.38	3.01	2.7*
Self-respect	9.12	7	10.8	11	5.0	7.22*	4.5*
Social recognition	11.15	12	12.08	15	3.17	<2	-
True friendship	10	9	9.52	9	1.46	<2	.6
Wisdom	8.25	6	9.37	8	4.38	<2	-

*$p < .025$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 11

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR DIFFERENT VIETNAMESE OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Occupation: Farmer ($n = 121$) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Civil Servant ($n = 114$) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/233	F_{cov}[2] df:1/227	$1-\Lambda$[3]
Ambitions	12.32	15	12.26	17	.51	< 2	-
Broadminded	10.85	13	10.74	14	.42	< 2	-
Capable	8.80	6	8,86	8	.44	< 2	-
Cheerful	10.05	11	10.96	15	1.09	< 2	-
Clean	7.0	4	10.33	12	13.32*	< 2	4.2*
Courageous	7.8	5	7.86	5	2.34	2.38	.5
Forgiving	5.97	3	7.64	4	7.84*	< 2	-
Helpful	8.95	7	10.27	11	3.60	< 2	-
Honest	4.84	2	6.37	1	4.02	<2	-
Imaginative	13.73	18	12.7	18	4.16	<2	-
Independent	9.23	8	7.56	2	5.04*	2.68	.9
Intellectual	12.0	14	10.03	10	10.52*	<2	1.0
Logical	12.77	17	11	11	6.97*	4.35	.9
Loving	9.57	9	10.83	13	1.25	9.03*	.7
Obedient	4.2	1	7.61	3	13.62*	7.31*	2.8*
Polite	9.62	10	8.71	7	3.13	<2	-
Responsible	10.7	12	8.22	6	8.67*	<2	.7
Self-controlled	12.56	16	9.15	9	14.84*	7.16*	11.5*

*$p < .025$

There were three significant univariate F ratios for the values: Freedom, Equality (the civil servants considered these more important, and Family Security (the farmer group considered it more important). There were four significant covariate F ratios for the values: Equality, Freedom, Mature Love (the civil servants considered them more important) and Self-Respect (farmers considered it more important). The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of seven values was 10.57 (df: 7/227, $p < .025$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 24.5%).

Eight of the 18 univariate F ratios for the instrumental values were significant. The four largest F ratios were for Self Controlled (the civil servants considered it more important), Obedient, Clean (farmers considered them more important), and Intellectual (civil servants considered it more important). There were three significant F covariate ratios for the values: Loving (the farmer group considered it more important), Obedient, and Self-Controlled. The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of seven values was 9.465 (df: 7/227, $p < .025$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 22.6%).

Differences as a Function of Residence

The Vietnamese were classified into two subgroups: rural and urban, and compared via discriminant analysis. These analyses are presented in Tables 12 and 13.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 12

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR VIETNAMESE FROM RURAL AND URBAN AREAS: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Place of Residence: Urban ($\bar{x}$ = 150) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Rural ($\bar{x}$ = 194) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{uni} df:1/347	F_{cov}[2] df:1/333	$1-\Lambda$[3]
A comfortable life	6.82	5	7.48	5	1.81	7.53*	
An exciting life	13.10	16	13.52	18	.88	<2	
A sense of accomplishment	10.73	12	10.59	12	.08	<2	.6
A world at peace	4.83	1	5.11	3	.40	<2	
A world of beauty	14.05	18	13.1	17	4.04	2.79	2.0*
Equality	10.33	10.5	10.45	10.5	9.07*	<2	
Family security	5.67	3	5.02	2	1.99	<2	
Freedom	8.16	6	9.80	7	11.05*	3.53	.8
Happiness	6.7	4	4.94	1	16.10*	10.58*	4.5*
Inner harmony	11.24	13	11.17	14	.01	<2	
Mature love	11.80	14	12.11	16	.47	2.30	
National security	5.25	2	5.65	4	.78	<2	
Pleasure	13.67	17	12.03	15	10.14*	5.94*	2.9*
Salvation (Nirvana)	10.33	10.5	10.45	10.5	.03	<2	
Self-respect	4.63	8	10.27	9	4.01	2.18	
Social recognition	11.84	15	10.93	13	2.11	3.13	2.0*
True friendship	9.75	9	10.2	8	.95	<2	
Wisdom	8.65	7	8.3	6	.53	<2	

*p <.025

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 13

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR VIETNAMESE FROM RURAL AND URBAN AREAS: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Place of Residence: Urban (n = 150) x	Rank	Rural (n = 199) x	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/347	F_{cov}[2] df:1/333	$1-\Lambda^3$
Ambitions	12.64	18	11.70	17	3.04	<2	1.0
Broadminded	10.32	12	11.43	16	5.18*	3.62	-
Capable	8.56	6	8.71	7	.07	<2	-
Cheerful	10.33	13	10.65	13	.39	<2	-
Clean	9.34	8	8.09	4	5.21	<2	1.1
Courageous	7.97	5	8.36	6	.63	<2	-
Forgiving	7.16	3	7.36	3	.15	<2	-
Helpful	10.44	14	9.45	9	3.76	<2	-
Honest	5.57	1	5.55	1	.001	<2	-
Imaginative	12.40	17	13.16	18	2.39	<2	-
Independent	7.57	4	8.37	5	1.98	<2	-
Intellectual	10.19	10	10.59	12	.54	<2	-
Logical	11.96	16	11.44	15	1.34	<2	-
Loving	10.26	11	9.86	10	.48	<2	-
Obedient	6.98	2	5.62	2	5.23*	<2	1.5*
Polite	9.66	9	9.44	8	.17	<2	-
Responsible	8.87	7	9.95	11	3.82	3.64	-
Self-controlled	10.64	15	11.17	14	.96	<2	-

*p <.025

Four of the 18 mean terminal value rankings were significantly different. They were for the values: Happiness, Freedom, Pleasure, and Equality (the urban respondents considered these more important). There were three significant covariate F ratios for the values: Happiness, A Comfortable Life (the urban group considered it more important) and Pleasure. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of values was 8.075 (df: 71341, $p < .025$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 14/3%).

Turning to the instrumental values for the urban and rural respondents, there were three significant univariate F ratios for the values: Obedient (the mean of this value was less in the rural group than in the urban group), Clean (the rural respondents considered it more important), and Broad-minded (the urban respondents considered it more important). None of the covariate F ratios were significant. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of 3 values was 4.272 (df: 3/345, $p < .025$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 3/6%).

Differences as a Function of Income

The Vietnamese were classified into three income categories: (1) lower group, (2) middle group, and (3) upper group, and compared via discriminant analysis. These analyses are presented in Tables 14 and 15.

In describing the differences among the three groups, only the lower-upper group differences will be presented.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 14

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR DIFFERENT VIETNAMESE INCOME GROUPS: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Income: Low (n = 109) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Middle (n = 181) $\bar{x}$	Rank	High (n = 59) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:2/346	F_{cov}[2] d/672	$1-\Lambda$[3]
A comfortable life	7.05	5	7.50	5	6.52	5	1.10	2.48	.9
An exciting life	13.40	18	13.32	17	13.25	16	.02	<2	.6
A sense of accomplishment	11.2	12	10.72	13	9.40	7	3.48	6.00*	2.2*
A world at peace	3.81	1	5.49	2	5.62	2	6.30*	2.89	3.2*
A world of beauty	13.22	17	13.33	18	14.54	18	2.00	<2	
Equality	8.94	8	9.83	9	10.47	10	2.31	<2	
Family security	6.03	3	5.33	1	3.84	1	5.21*	6.79*	2.4*
Freedom	8.46	7	9.19	7	9.94	8	2.06	<2	
Happiness	6.11	4	5.45	3	5.64	3	.88	2.06	1.0
Inner harmony	11.95	14	10.67	12	11.42	15	2.92	2.27	1.0
Mature love	12.08	15	12.14	14	11.23	14	1.03	3.04	.9
National security	4.64	2	5.90	4	5.72	4	3.16	<2	
Pleasure	12.44	16	12.62	16	13.59	17	1.16	<2	
Salvation (Nirvana)	10.46	10	10.23	11	10.77	12	.21	<2	
Self-respect	11.11	11	9.30	8	10.03	9	6.74*	6.46*	3.8*
Social recognition	11.87	13	11.15	14	10.84	13	1.47	3.43	1.3
True friendship	9.73	9	9.98	10	10.50	11	.66	<2	
Wisdom	8.43	6	8.74	6	7.57	6	1.60	2.49	1.2

*$p < .025$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 15

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR DIFFERENT VIETNAMESE INCOME GROUPS: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Income: Low ($\bar{x}$ = 109) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Middle ($\bar{x}$ = 181) $\bar{x}$	Rank	High ($\bar{x}$ = 59) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:2/346	F_{cov}[2] 2/672	$1-\Lambda^3$
Ambitions	13.04	18	11.79	17	12.35	17	1.55	< 2	
Broadminded	11.16	15	10.88	15	10.79	12	.17	< 2	
Capable	8.95	7	8.55	6	8.37	6	.32	< 2	
Cheerful	10.23	11	10.54	12	10.93	13	.42	< 2	
Clean	8.19	5	8.81	7	8.88	7	.58	< 2	
Courageous	8.64	6	8.03	4	7.93	5	.67	< 2	
Forgiving	6.65	3	7.70	3	7.11	2	1.75	2.97	1.4
Helpful	10.23	11	9.69	10	9.77	11	.46	< 2	
Honest	5.28	1	5.69	1	5.67	1	.35	< 2	
Imaginative	12.38	17	13.02	18	13.06	18	.74	< 2	
Independent	7.77	4	8.40	5	7.33	4	1.11	< 2	
Intellectual	9.61	8	10.59	13	11.37	15	2.64	3.40	
Logical	11.61	16	11.61	16	11.91	16	.12	< 2	
Loving	10.15	10	10.13	11	9.50	9	.36	< 2	
Obedient	6.46	2	6.15	2	5.89	2	.22	< 2	
Polite	10.30	13	9.18	8	9.23	8	1.99	2.19	
Responsible	9.69	9	9.37	9	9.72	10	.22	< 2	
Self-controlled	11.12	14	10.78	14	11.08	14	.18	< 2	

*$p < .025$

Three of the 18 means value rankings were significantly different: Self Respect, Family Security (the upper group considered these as more important) and A World at Peace (the lower group considered it more important). There were three significant F covariate ratios for the values: Family Security, Self Respect, and A Sense of Accomplishment (the upper group considered it more important). The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of six values was 4.396 (df: 12/682, $p < .025$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 13.9%).

Turning to the instrumental value systems, no significant mean ranking differences were found. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of 2 values was 2.52 (df: 4/690, $p < .025$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 3%).

Comparisons Between American and Vietnamese Value Systems

The American and Vietnamese value systems were compared via the discriminant analyses described previously. In addition to the discriminant analyses, Spearman rank order correlations (Hays, 1963) were computed between the order of importance of the values in the two countries. These correlations provided an estimate of the relative similarity of the value systems in America and Vietnam.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Overall Comparison

The overall comparison between the American and Vietnamese value systems are presented in Tables 16 and 17. The rank order correlation between the relative importance of the groups' terminal value system was +.91. Despite the high correlation, significant differences were found between the mean rankings of 14 of the 18 values. The largest univariate F ratios were for the values: National Security (Vietnamese, on the average, considered it more important than Americans), Freedom (Vietnamese considered it more important) and Social Recognition (Vietnamese ranked it more important). There were significant covariate F ratios in the comparison between the two groups for 11 of the 18 terminal values: the largest covariate F ratios were for the values: National Security, Happiness, and Social Recognition (Vietnamese ranked it more important). There were significant covariate F ratios in the comparison between the two groups for 11 of the 18 terminal values: the largest covariate F ratios were for the values: National Security, Happiness, Social Recognition and Wisdom. The linear combination of the 12 values significantly discriminated between the Vietnamese and American samples (multivariate F = 61.046, df = 12/1762, $p < .001$, percent of variance accounted for (L - Λ): 29.4%).

The rank order correlation between the two groups' instrumental value systems was +.29. Although statistical tests for differences between the two correlations could not

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 16

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR
VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN COMPARISON: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Vietnamese ($\underline{n}$ = 349) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Americans ($\underline{n}$ = 1428) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/1775	F_{cov}[2] df:1/1762	$1-\Lambda^3$
A comfortable life	7.19	5	9.95	5	82.92*	82.92*	41.14*
An exciting life	13.33	17	13.94	18	6.16*	6.16*	26.59*
A sense of accomplishment	10.65	12	9.44	11	21.94*	21.94*	<2
A world at peace	4.99	1	4.56	1	2.91	2.91	<2
A world of beauty	13.5	18	11.83	15	41.33*	41.33*	<2
Equality	9.66	8	8.45	7	17.54*	17.54*	16.37*
Family security	5.30	2	5.23	2	.09	<2	<2
Freedom	9.1	7	6.25	3	130.24*	130.24*	38.04*
Happiness	5.7	4	7.95	4	83.14*	83.14*	132.27*
Inner harmony	11.2	13	10.07	13	18.52*	18.52*	9.82*
Mature love	11.97	15	11.44	14	3.72	3.72	18.41*
National security	5.47	3	9.15	9	168.75*	168.75*	253.75*
Pleasure	12.73	16	13.7	16	16.34*	16.34*	9.69*
Salvation (Nirvana)	10.4	11	9.15	10	11.36*	11.36*	2.93*
Self-respect	10	9	7.97	6	.9	66.89*	6.56*
Social recognition	11.36	14	13.82	17	112.02*	112.02*	108.30*
True friendship	10	10	9.52	12	3.77	3.77	4.41
Wisdom	8.45	6	8.51	8	.056	<2	54.21*

*$p < .025$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 17

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR
VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN COMPARISON: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Vietnamese ($\underline{n}$ = 349) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Americans ($\underline{n}$ = 1428) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/1775	F_{cov}[2] df:1/1761	$1-\Lambda$[3]
Ambitions	12.1	17	7.70	3	196.22*	196.23*	201.14*
Broadminded	10.95	15	7.97	5	100*	99.99*	39.60*
Capable	8.65	7	9.48	11	9.44*	9.44*	11.32*
Cheerful	10.51	13	10.12	13	1.84	<2	2.17
Clean	8.63	6	9.55	10	8.90*	8.89*	6.23*
Courageous	8.2	5	8.53	6	1.34	<2	<2
Forgiving	7.27	3	7.77	4	3.27	3.27	<2
Helpful	9.87	10	8.83	7	14.84*	14.84*	21.30*
Honest	5.56	1	4.47	1	22.21*	22.12*	27.59*
Imaginative	12.83	18	13.84	18	15.42*	15.42*	3.27
Independent	8.02	4	9.92	12	40.74*	40.75*	8.10*
Intellectual	10.42	12	11.67	15	18.11*	18.11*	2.24
Logical	11.66	16	12.41	17	7.87*	7.87*	<2
Loving	10.03	11	8.93	8	13.13*	13.13*	48.24*
Obedient	6.20	2	12.32	16	454.17*	454.18*	188.98*
Polite	9.54	9	10.18	14	21.23*	21.23*	<2
Responsible	9.53	8	7.07	2	86.95*	86.95*	68.59*
Self-controlled	10.94	14	9.54	9	21.97*	21.97*	16.12*

*$p < .025$

be conducted (cf. Hays, 1963, p.532), the difference in rank order correlations was clearly in the predicted direction (i.e., greater similarity between terminal value systems). There were significant differences between the two groups on 15 of the 18 instrumental values. The largest univariate F ratios were for Obedient (Vietnamese considered it more important than Americans) Ambitious and Broadminded (Vietnamese considered them less important). The largest significant F covariate ratios for the values: Ambitious, Obedient, Responsible and Broadminded. The linear combination of 14 instrumental values significantly discriminated between the two groups (multivariate F = 78.77, df: 14/1762; $p < .001$; variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 39.5%).

Same Sex Comparisons

It was hypothesized that the difference in value systems between women in Vietnam and America would be greater than the difference between men in the two countries. The comparisons relevant to this hypothesis are presented in Tables 18, 19, 20 and 21.

The rank order correlation between the Vietnamese and American males terminal values was +.83. Ten of the 18 individual value rankings were significantly different. The largest univariate F ratios were for National Security, Freedom, and Self Respect (Vietnamese considered less important). There were ten significant F covariate ratios for the values: An Exciting Life (Vietnamese considered it more important), A World of Beauty, Equality (Americans

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 18

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR
VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN MALES COMPARISON: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Vietnamese (n = 180) x	Rank	Americans (n = 685) x	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/863	F_{cov}[2] df:1/853	$1-\Lambda$[3]
A comfortable life	7.33	5	9.23	8	20.10*	3.80	23
An exciting life	13.04	16	13.34	17	.71	7.90*	-
A sense of accomplishment	10.07	9	9.11	10	6.51*	< 2	.8
A world at peace	4.97	2	4.83	1	.13	< 2	-
A world of beauty	13.9	18	12.06	15	25.52	6.02*	2.9*
Equality	8.85	8	8.69	6	.15	7.63*	-
Family security	5.82	3	5.16	2	3.72	8.42*	.5
Freedom	8.1?	6	5.94	3	41.09*	32.72*	4.5*
Happiness	6.04	4	7.90	4	27.66*	57.40*	3.2*
Inner harmony	11.31	13	10.7	13	3.0	< 2	.4
Mature love	12.31	15	11.1	14	10.52*	< 2	1.2
National security	4.91	1	9.24	9	117.42*	135.09*	12.0*
Pleasure	13.05	17	13.26	16	.35	< 2	-
Salvation (Nirvana)	10.18	11	10.14	12	.009	< 2	-
Self-respect	10.13	10	8.2		29.95*	11.16*	3.4*
Social recognition	11.72	14	13.55	18	28.54*	15.91*	3.2*
True friendship	10.37	12	9.44	10	7.54*	< 2	.9
Wisdom	8.80	7	9.07	7	.46	11.65*	-

*p < .025

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 19

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR
VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN MALES COMPARISON: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Vietnamese (n = 180) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Americans (n = 685) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/863	F_{cov}[2] df:1/852	$1-\Lambda$[3]
Ambitions	11.93	16	6.87	2	132.26*	142.62*	13.3*
Broadminded	11.33	14	7.85	4	72.46*	36.06*	7.8*
Capable	7.32	3	8.85	7	16.82*	13.14*	2.0*
Cheerful	11.38	15	10.65	13	3.36	<2	.4
Clean	9.27	8	9.92	11	2.30	3.00	.3
Courageous	2.87	5	8.50	5	2.40	<2	.3
Forgiving	8.42	7	8.84	6	1.12	<2	-
Helpful	10.53	12	9.38	9	9.11*	8.99*	1.1*
Honest	5.76	1	4.60	1	1.76*	8.06*	1.4*
Imaginative	12.31	18	13.12	18	4.31	<2	.5
Independent	6.96	2	9.68	10	44.18*	11.59*	4.9*
Intellectual	9.58	10	11.47	15	20.83*	6.20*	3.4*
Logical	11.22	13	11.83	16	2.40	3.62	.3
Loving	12.20	17	10.02	12	29.43*	40.72*	3.3*
Obedient	7.46	4	12.28	17	133.76*	49.94*	13.5*
Polite	9.61	11	10.83	14	10.24*	<2	1.2*
Responsible	8.22	6	7.0	3	10.63*	28.95*	1.3*
Self-controlled	9.54	9	9.24	8	.50	<2	-

*p <.025

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 20

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR
VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN FEMALES COMPARISON: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Vietnamese (n = 169) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Americans (n = 743) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/910	F_{cov}[2] df:1/899	$1-\Lambda^3$
A comfortable life	705	5	10.61	13	69.76*	29.29*	7.2*
An exciting life	13.65	18	14.48	18	6.777*	10.43*q	.8
A sense of accomplishment	11.26	16	9.75	12	18.57*	< 2	2.0*
A world at peace	5.01	2	4.30	1	4.16	< 2	.5
A world of beauty	13.07	17	11.63	14	15.42*	< 2	1.7*
Equality	10.52	10	8.22	7	31.77*	< 2	3.4*
Family security	4.74	1	5.30	2	3.06	< 2	1.4*
Freedom	10.13	9	6.53	3	99.77*	21.41*	9.9*
Happiness	5.32	3	8.0	6	59.11*	57.10*	6.1*
Inner harmony	11.08	13	9.50	10	17.57*	5.20(	1.9*
Mature love	11.62	15	11.76	15	.13	16.00*	-
National security	6.08	4	9.06	9	55.78*	114.68*	5.8*
Pleasure	12.40	16	14.1	17	27.91*	9.48*	3.0*
Salvation (Nirvana)	10.62	11	8.24	8	21.12*	< 2	2.3*
Self-respect	9.84	8	7.78	4	36.31*	4.51	3.9*
Social recognition	10.90	12	14.06	16	95.75*	85.31*	9.6*
True friendship	9.597	7	9.60	11	.003	4.99	-
Wisdom	8.07	6	7.99	5	.007	28.39*	-

*p < .025

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 21

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR
VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN FEMALES COMPARISON: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Vietnamese (n = 169) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Americans (n = 743) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/910	F_{cov}[2] 1/899	$1-\Lambda^3$
Ambitions	12.63	17	8.46	7	78.34*	31.21*	8.0*
Broadminded	10.55	12	8.09	5	32.19*	< 2	3.5*
Capable	10.05	11	10.06	12	.002	11.96*	-
Cheerful	9.58	10	9.64	10	.01	< 2	-
Clean	7.94	5	9.21	9	8.14*	< 2	1.0
Courageous	8.56	6	8.57	8	.003	3.5	-
Forgiving	6.05	3	6.7	2	4.15	< 2	.5
Helpful	9.17	8	8.33	6	5.0	< 2	.6
Honest	5.35	2	4.37	1	9.96*	15.79*	1.1
Imaginative	13.40	18	14.51	18	11.61*	24.19*	1.3*
Independent	9.16	7	10.14	13	5.26*	16.81*	.6
Intellectual	11.31	14	11.85	15	1.68	7.79	-
Logical	12.13	15	12.95	17q	5.22*	19.51*	.6
Loving	7.72	4	7.91	4	.19	< 2	-
Obedient	4.87	11	12.36	16	368.91*	334.34*	28.9*
Polite	9.46	9	10.72	14	11.11*	10.69*	1.3*
Responsible	10.92	13	7.14	3	108.86*	28.55*	10.7*
Self-controlled	12.43	16	9.81	11	40.12*	6.93*	4.3*

*$p < .025$

considered it more important), Family Security, Freedom, Happiness, National Security, Self-Respect, Social Recognition, and Wisdom (Vietnamese considered it more important). The linear combination of 11 values significantly discriminated between the two groups (multivariate F = 30.87, df = 11/853, $p < .001$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 28.5%).

For women the rank order correlation between terminal values was +.77. There were significant differences in the mean rankings of 13 of the 18 values. The largest univariate F ratios were for the values: Freedom, Social Recognition and Happiness (Vietnamese considered it more important). There were 11 significant F covariate ratios for the values: A Comfortable Life, An Exciting Life, Freedom, Happiness, Inner Harmony, Mature Love, National Security, Pleasure, Social Recognition, True Friendship (the ietnamese considered it more important) and Wisdom, (American women considered it more important). The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 12 values was 38.33 (df = 12/899, $p < .001$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 34%).

Turning to the instrumental values, the rank order corrleation for men was +.32. Eleven of the 18 univariate F ratios were significant. The largest of these were for the values: Obedient, Ambitious, and Broadminded. There were 9 significant F covariate ratios. The largest of these were for the values: Ambitious, Obedient, Loving and Broadminded. The multivariate F, based on the linear combination of 11

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

values ratio was 43.91 (df: 12/852, $p < .001$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 38.2%).

The rank order correlation between Vietnamese and American women's instrumental value system was +.39. Eleven of the 18 mean rankings for the instrumental values were significantly different. The largest F ratios were for the values: Obedient, Responsible (Vietnamese considered it less important) and Ambitious. There were 9 significant F covariate ratios. The largest F covariate ratios were for the values: Obedient, Ambitious and Responsible. The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 12 variables was 57.74, (df: 12/897, $p < .001$, variance accounted for ($1 - \Lambda$): 43.5%).

Differences in Value Systems Among Educational Groups

Respondents in both samples were classified as having completed elementary school, high school or college and compared via discriminant analyses. These analyses are presented in Tables 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27.

For individuals with an elementary school education (47.2% of the Vietnamese sample, 21.5% of the American sample) the rank order correlation between their terminal values was +.83. Eleven of the 18 mean value rankings were significantly different. As before, the largest univariate F ratios were for the values: Freedom, Happiness, and Social Recognition. There were six significant F covariate ratios. The largest F covariate ratios were for the values: National Security

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 22

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN ELEMENTARY EDUCATED COMPARISONS: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Vietnamese (n = 165) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Americans (n = 308) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/471	F_{cov}[2] df:1/462	$1-\Lambda$[3]
A comfortable life	6.89	5	7.90	5	5.39*	< 2	1.2*
An exciting life	13.7	17	13.85	18	.14	< 2	-
A sense of accomplishment	11.05	13	10.74	12	.57	< 2	-
A world at peace	4.50	2	4.14	1	.94	< 2	-
A world of beauty	13.80	18	12.05	14	17.26*	3.24	3.6*
Equality	10.15	9	8.96	10	6.41*	< 2	1.4*
Family security	4.40	1	5.32	2	6.37*	< 2	1.4*
Freedom	10.16	10	6.31	3	92.64*	49.51*	16.5*
Happiness	5.40	4	7.56	4	29.31*	55.30*	5.9*
Inner harmony	11.15	14	11.77	13	2.31	5.13*	.5
Mature love	12.64	15	12.61	15	.01	< 2	-
National security	4.95	3	8.67	9	.45	81.11*	16.2*
Pleasure	12.83	16	12.88	16	.01	4.30	-
Salvation (Nirvana)	9.66	7	8.33	6	5.33*	< 2	1.2*
Self-respect	9.80	8	8.48	7	10.45*	8.33*	2.2*
Social recognition	10.93	12	13.13	17	31.06*	11.54*	7.2*
True friendship	10.30	11	8.50	8	21.07*	11.09*	4.3*
Wisdom	8.65	6	9.64	11	5.08	7.39*	1.1*

*$p < .025$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 23

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATED COMPARISON: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Vietnamese (n = 165) $\bar{x}$	Rank	American (n = 308) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/872	F_{cov}[2] df:1/858	$1-\Lambda^3$
A comfortable life	7.13	5	9.80	11	32.51*	14.92*	1.3*
An exciting life	13.06	17	14.38	18	13.93*	19.85*	2.7*
A sense of accomplishment	10.45	11	9.7	10	3.76	-	-
A world at peace	5.20	1	4.4	1	4.09	2.44	.2
A world of beauty	13.28	18	11.93	15	11.45*	-	-
Equality	9.43	8	8.43	6	5.23*	9.48*	.6*
Family security	5.68	4	4.80	2	6.93*	3.09	.2
Freedom	8.57	7	6.13	3	41.55*	20.08*	4.1*
Happiness	5.56	2	7.86	4	36.34*	54.37*	6.4*
Inner harmony	11.52	13	10.15	13	12.90*	-	-
Mature love	11.70	14	11.57	14	.09	7.36*	.8*
National security	5.60	3	8.72	9	50.78*	122.43*	5.6*
Pleasure	12.46	16	13.88	17	15.80*	4.85	1.6*
Salvation (Nirvana)	11.07	12	8.70	8	18.65*	-	-
Self-respect	10.23	10	8.09	5	32.82*	2.85	.2
Social recognition	11.80	15	13.76	16	29.08*	26.17*	2.10*
True friendship	9.86	7	10.04	12	.23	6.05*	.6*
Wisdom	8.32	6	8.58	7	.37	22.56*	1.3*

*$p < .025$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 24

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN COLLEGE EDUCATED COMPARISON: TERMINAL VALUES

Terminal Values[1]	Vietnamese ($\underline{n}$ = 43) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Americans ($\underline{n}$ = 385) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/426	F_{cov}[2] df:1/418	$1-\Lambda$[3]
A comfortable life	8.58	8	11.83	15	18.96*	13.92*	4.3*
An exciting life	12.83	16	13.18	16	.24	< 2	-
A sense of accomplishment	9.74	10	7.89	6	7.27*	< 2	1.7*
A world at peace	6.18	1	5.20	1	1.84	4.13	-
A world of beauty	13.09	18	11.46	14	5.49*	< 2	1.3*
Equality	8.53	7	8.06	7	.35	3.97	-
Family security	7.53	5	6	2	5.18*	10.17*	1.2*
Freedom	6.7	2	6.43	3	.14	< 2	-
Happiness	7.25	4	8.42	8	3.11	4.20	.8
Inner harmony	10.39	13	8.55	9	6.11*	4. 2	1.5*
Mature love	10.30	12	10.77	11	.002	3.40	-
National security	7.06	3	10.34	12	15.68*	32.13*	3.6*
Pleasure	13.23	17	14	17	1.61	< 2	-
Salvation (Nirvana)	11.02	14	10.66	13	.11	< 2	-
Self-respect	9.97	11	7.36	4	15.45*	11.09*	3.5*
Social recognition	11.27	15	14.45	18	29.43*	32.89*	6.5*
True friendship	9.23	9	9.35	10	.03	< 2	-
Wisdom	8.06	6	7.47	5	.71	< 2	-

*p < .025

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 25

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN ELEMENTARY EDUCATED COMPARISON: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Vietnamese (n = 165) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Americans (n = 308) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/471	F_{cov}[2] df:1/462	$1-\Lambda$[3]
Ambitions	12.60	17	7.44	3	84.7*	38.09	16.3*
Broadminded	11.33	13	8.35	8	43.3*	6.54	9.5*
Capable	8.15	6	9.81	13	12.82*	21.95	2.7*
Cheerful	10.3	12	9.06	9	7.23*	< 2	1.6*
Clean	7.68	4	7.71	4	.005	< 2	-
Courageous	8.10	5	8.08	6	.003	5.71	-
Forgiving	6.97	3	6.47	2	1.47	< 2	-
Helpful	9.07	8	8.02	5	5.93*	< 2	1.3*
Honest	4.73	2	4.69	1	.012	< 2	-
Imaginative	13.51	18	14.63	18	9.38*	5.91	2.0*
Independent	8.32	7	9.67	12	8.33*	6.60	1.9*
Intellectual	11.78	15	13.22	17	11.77*	5.74	2.5*
Logical	12.35	16	14.26	11	31.80*	22.21	7.4*
Loving	9.82	9	9.22	10	1.48	< 2	-
Obedient	4.26	1	10.94	15	212.32*	126.44	31.2*
Polite	10.27	10	10.20	14	.02	< 2	-
Responsible	10.28	11	8.15	7	25.56*	19.52	5.2*
Self-controlled	11.76	14	10.98	16	2.89	< 2	.7

*$p < .025$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 26

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATED COMPARISON: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Vietnamese ($\underline{n}$ = 141) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Americans ($\underline{n}$ = 733) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/872	F_{cov}[2] df:1/858	$1-\Lambda$[3]
Ambitions	11.95	17	7.44	3	85.32*	10.22*	5.7*
Broadminded	10.98	15	8.33	5	29.87*	2.87	.2
Capable	9.	8	9.56	11	1.80	48.12*	2.2*
Cheerful	11.14	16	10.11	12	5.52*	9.48*	.4
Clean	8.84	7	9.01	9	.12	11.78*	.5
Courageous	8.10	5	8.57	6	.68	20.71	.7
Forgiving	7.56	3	7.74	4	.16	26.82*	1.2*
Helpful	10.63	13	8.81	8	19.67*	< 2	
Honest	6.26	1	4.40	1	27.20*	< 2	
Imaginative	12.50	18	14.44	18	27.30*	55.97*	3.8*
Independent	7.72	4	10.37	13	33.72*	75.40*	2.4*
Intellectual	9.63	10	12.0	16	28.28*	34.53*	1.4*
Logical	10.83	14	12.68	17	20.28*	32.17*	1.0*
Loving	10.23	11	8.80	7	9.20*		
Obedient	7.27	2	11.91	15	118.79*	150.14*	12.0*
Polite	8.60	6	10.40	14	19.81*	44.92*	1.6*
Responsible	9.07	9	6.95	2	27.70*		
Self-controlled	10.52	12	9.40	10	6.10*	4.43	.2

*$p < .025$

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 27

RESULTS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSES FOR VIETNAMESE-AMERICAN COLLEGE EDUCATED COMPARISON: INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

Instrumental Values[1]	Vietnamese ($\underline{n}$ = 43) $\bar{x}$	Rank	Americans ($\underline{n}$ = 385) $\bar{x}$	Rank	F_{univ} df:1/426	F_{cov}[2] df:1/417	$1-\Lambda^3$
Ambitions	12.06	18	8.38	3	18.77*	6.35*	5.3*
Broadminded	9.48	10	7.02	8	10.75*	2	2.5*
Capable	9.39	9	9.04	9	.27	< 2	-
Cheerful	9.3	8	10.97	14	4.85	11.09*	1.0
Clean	11.55	16	12.08	17	.43	< 2	-
Courageous	8.58	6	8.83	5	.10	< 2	-
Forgiving	7.46	2	8.89	6	3.34	11.11*	.8
Helpful	10.48	14	9.5	11	1.76	< 2	-
Honest	6.41	1	4.42	1	10.64*	5.04*	2.5*
Imaginative	11.30	15	12.07	16	.93	6.97*	-
Independent	7.9	4	9.27	10	2.83	8.23*	.7
Intellectual	7.76	3	9.8	12	6.48*	26.30*	1.5*
Logical	11.74	17	10.4	13	3.09	< 2	.8
Loving	10.20	13	8.94	7	2.33	3.80	.6
Obedient	10.18	12	14.2	18	32.97*	43.28*	7.2*
Polite	9.81	11	11.95	15	9.52*	12.34*	2.2*
Responsible	8.13	5	6.45	2	5.80*	< 2	1.4*
Self-controlled	9.16	7	8.71	4	.30	< 2	-

*p < 025

(Vietnamese considered it more important), Happiness, and Freedom. The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 10 values was 34.942 (df: 10/462, $p < .001$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 43.1%).

The rank order correlation between the high school educated respondents (51.3% of the Americans, 40.7% of the Vietnamese) terminal value systems was +.84. Of the 13 significant univariate F ratios, the three largest were for the values: National Security, Freedom, and Happiness. There were 10 significant F covariate ratios for the values: A Comfortable Life, An Exciting Life, Equality, Freedom, Happiness, Mature Love (Americans considered it more important), National Security, Self Respect, True Friendship and Wisdom (Vietnamese considered these last two values more important). The multivariate F ratio based on 12 values was 25.594, (df: 12/850, $p. < .001$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 26.3%).

The rank order correlation between college educated respondents' terminal value systems was +.73. Eight univariate F ratios were significant. The largest of these were for the values: Social Recognition, A Comfortable Life (Vietnamese considered it more important than Americans), and National Security. There were five significant F covariate ratios. The largest of these were for the values: National Security, Social Recognition and A Comfortable Life. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of nine values was

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

12.478 (df: 9/418, $p < .001$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 21.20%).

Turning to the instrumental values for the elementary educated groups, the rank order correlation was +.42. Of the 11 significant F ratios, the largest were for: Obedient, Ambitious, and Broadminded. There were 10 significant F covariate ratios for the values: Ambitious, Broadminded, Capable, Courageous (Vietnamese considered it less important) Imaginative, Independent, Intellectual, Logical, Obedient and Responsible. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of 10 values was 46.31 (df: 10/462, $p < .001$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 50.1%).

For respondents with a high school education, the rank order correlation was +.21. Fourteen univariate F ratios were significant. The largest F ratios were for Obedient, Ambitious, and Independent (Vietnamese considered it more important). There were 12 significant F covariate ratios for the values: Ambitious. Cheerful, Imaginative, Independent, Intellectual, Logical, Obedient, Polite, Capable, Clean, Courageous and Forgiving (Vietnamese considered the last four values more important). The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 13 values was 35.725 (df: 13/858, $p < .001$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 35.1%).

The rank order correlation between the instrumental value systems of college educated Americans and Vietnamese was +.45. Seven univariate F ratios were significant. The largest of these were for the values: Obedient, Ambitious, and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Broadminded. There were nine significant F covariate ratios for the values: Ambitious, Honest, Intellectual, Obedient, Polite, Cheerful (Vietnamese considered it more important), Forgiving (Americans considered it less important), Independent (Vietnamese considered it more important), and Imaginative (Vietnamese considered it more important). The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 10 values was 12.796 (df: 10/417, $p < .001$, variance accounted for $(1 - \Lambda)$: 23.5%).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

DISCUSSION

The discussion of the results of this study will be divided into two sections. First, the differences between the demographically defined subgroups within the Vietnamese sample will be considered and then differences between American and Vietnamese value systems will be discussed.

Value System Differences Within the Vietnamese Sample

In discussing the differences between the value systems of demographically defined subgroups of Vietnamese, certain points of introduction must be made. First, the intent of the author is not to discuss each statistically significant difference between the mean rankings assigned values. Rather, the goal of this discussion is to attempt to identify general causes which might be responsible for the obtained differences.

A second point which must be made is the speculative nature of the explanations of the differences offered. There is, as noted earlier, a dearth of social-psychological data on Eastern cultures in general and the country of Vietnam in particular. Therefore, the author must rely primarily on his knowledge of the customs and culture of Vietnam in attempting to explain the obtained differences.

In Tables 28 and 29, summaries of the significant univariate F ratios obtained for the terminal value comparisons

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 28

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN TERMINAL VALUES BETWEEN VIETNAMESE SUB-GROUPS

Terminal Values[1]	Male Female	Catholic Buddhist	Education	Age	Occupation	Residence	Income
A comfortable life		B > C					
An exciting life							
A sense of accomplishment	M > F						
A world at peace		B > C					P > R
A world of beauty							
Equality	M > F		C > E	Y > O	C > F	U > R	
Family security	W > M		E > C	O > Y	F > C		R > P
Freedom	M > F		C > E	Y > O	C > F	U > R	
Happiness							
Inner harmony							
Mature love			C > E				
National security	M > F		E > C				
Pleasure						R > U	
Salvation (Nirvana)		C > B					
Self-respect				O > Y			
Social recognition							
True friendship							
Wisdom							

Legend:
M = Male
F = Female
E = Elementary schooling
C = College schooling
O = Old persons
Y = Young persons
F = Farmers
C = Civil Servants
R = Rural respondents
U = Urban

[1] The sign > indicates that the former group ranked this value as more important than the latter.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE 29

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN INSTRUMENTAL VALUES BETWEEN VIETNAMESE SUB-GROUPS

Instrumental[1] Values	Male Female	Catholic Buddhist	Education	Age	Occupation	Residence	Income
Ambitious							
Broadminded							
Capable	$M > F_1$						
Cheerful	$F_1 > M$						
Clean	$F_1 > M$		$E > C_1$		$F_2 > C$	$R > U$	
Courageous							
Forgiving	$F_1 > M$				$F_2 > C_2$		
Helpful	$F_1 > M$		$E > C_1$	$O > Y$			
Honest			$E > C_1$				
Imaginative			$C_1 > E$	$Y > O$			
Independent	$M > F_1$			$Y > O$	$C_2 > F_2$		
Logical			N. T		$C_2 > F_2$		
Loving	$F_1 > M$						
Obedient	$F_1 > M$		$E > C_1$	$O > Y$	$C_2 > F_2$	$R > U$	
Polite			N. T				
Responsible	$M > F_1$		$C_1 > E$		$C_2 > F_2$		
Self-controlled							

Legend: M = Male; F = Female; E = Elementary schooling; C = College schooling; O = Old persons; Y = Young persons; F = Farmers; C = Civil Servants; R = Rural respondents; U = Urban

[1]The sign > indicates that the former group ranked this value as more important than the latter.

and instrumental value comparisons are presented. As can be seen from Table 28, three terminal values: Equality, Family Security and Freedom were the most consistent discriminators of the demographically defined subgroups. For the instrumental values, Clean, Helpful, Independent, Obedient, and Responsible were the most consistent discriminators. The discussion will focus on these values.

Differences as a Function of Gender

As predicted, the female Vietnamese respondents expressed less concern for the values Equality and Freedom and more concern for the value Family Security than male Vietnamese. In terms of instrumental values, the values Clean, Helpful, and Obedient were considered more important by Vietnamese women than Vietnamese men. The Vietnamese males considered the values Independent and Responsible more important than Vietnamese females.

The most parsimonous explanation of this pattern of differences would seem to lie in the subservient, family-oriented role assigned to women within the Vietnamese culture. In the Vietnamese society there is a hierarchy of authority in the following form: in society, king over subjects, in the family, husband over wife, parents over sons. The Vietnamese woman's primary role was in the family. Education was discouraged among Vietnamese women. According to Trai (1942), "towards the age of fifteen, girls ceased to go to school and stayed at home to be trained in the art of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

womanhood" (p.26). These virtues stem from Confucian ideals, and include the "tam tung" or submission to the father while a girl, respect towards the husband while a wife, and dependence on the son while a widow; and the "tu duc" or propriety in matters of "cong" (work), "dung" (appearance), "ngon" (speech) and "hanh" (behavior) (Trai, 1942).

This socialization pattern resulted in Vietnamese women placing primary emphasis on values concerned with the family (e.g., Family Security) and a subservient role (e.g., Obedient) and relatively little concern with personal freedom (e.g., Equality, Freedom).

Although Vietnamese men did not express a great deal of concern with values such as Equality and Freedom, their more dominant society-oriented role resulted in their considering Equality, Freedom, Independent, and Responsible as more important than Vietnamese women.

Differences as a Function of Religion

Contrary to the predictions made, there were relatively few differences in the importance assigned values as a function of religion. Three explanations of this can be offered. First, Catholics and Buddhists in Vietnam shared the common groups of the same culture, that is, even though they had different belief practices, they still held something in common with the Vietnamese tradition which was a combination of Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism (Anh, 1961). Second, the position of the Vietnamese towards religion was specific:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

instead of saying one religion was right and all others wrong, the average Vietnamese was apt to take the position that one religion was right but another was not wrong either. For instance, a man who made offerings in a Buddhist Temple probably also payed reverence to the ancestral altar in his home in keeping with the teachings of Confucius. One might even find Christ, Confucius, Mohammed and Buddha all honored in the same temple.

Finally, with the exception of the terminal value, Salvation (which did discriminate between the two groups), and the instrumental value Obedient (which did not discriminate between the two groups), there are no readily identifiable terminal or instrumental values which would be differentially emphasized by the two religions. It should be noted that even if there were differences in emphasis on these values, these influences would be secondary to the dominant Confucian influence.

Differences as a Function of Education

In discussing differences as a function of education, only differences between the two extreme groups will be considered (i.e., elementary school and college educated). An inspection of Tables 6 and 7 shows that for most of the values, the ranking of the high school educated group was intermediate between the two extreme groups. The pattern of terminal value differences and, to a lesser extent, the instrumental value differences were in the predicted direction.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

That is, college educated Vietnamese showed more concern with Equality and Freedom and less concern with Family Security than did Vietnamese with an elementary school education. With respect to instrumental values, Vietnamese with an elementary school education considered the values Clean, Helpful, Honest and Obedient more important and the values Imaginative and Responsible less important than did Vietnamese with a college education. It should also be noted that, in general, the same values which discriminated between Vietnamese men and women discriminated between Vietnamese with differing amounts of education (cf., Tables 28 and 29).

Three interrelated reasons can be offered for the differenced in value systems as a function of education among the Vietnamese respondents. First, the hypothesized influence of Western culture which produced "contact change". Contact change has been seen by Rogers (1969) as "introduced from sources external to the social system under analysis. It may be of two types: (1) selective or (2) directed."

There may have been two types of contact change. First, that brought about by sources external to the Vietnamese traditional system (e.g., French, American) who in the course of their day-to-day interactions with the college educated Vietnamese unintentionally or spontaneously communicated new ideas to this group which they chose to adopt. This selective form of contact might have occurred via the educational process or in the course of this elite group's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

less formal contact with Americans and French who were present in Vietnam in large numbers.

Also, directed contact change may have been operative. Directed contact change involves outsiders who on their own or as representatives of programs of planned change seek to achieve definite goals in terms of the values of an indigeneous group. For example, it would seem to have been in the vested interest of the representatives of the American government to indoctrinate the college educated Vietnamese with the import of values such as Freedom and Equality.

The elementary school educated group, on the other hand, probably had little contact with the representatives of Western ideologies either via education or informal day-to-day social intercourse.

A second reason for the obtained differences would seem to lie in the fact that elementary school educated Vietnamese constituted a lower socio-economic class than the college educated Vietnamese.

There are data from Rokeach's (1973, 1974) national surveys of American values that suggest the obtained value differences may reflect the effect of social status across cultures. For example, if one equates low income Americans and elementary school educated Vietnamese, then the pattern of value differences between rich and poor Americans from Rokeach's national survey of American values (Rokeach, 1973) is comparable to the differences obtained for Vietnamese with differing amounts of education. That is, poorer

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Americans considered the values Family Security and Clean more important and Freedom, Independent and Responsible less important than wealthy Americans. Rokeach (1973) describes the difference between Americans of differing social status as follows: "the poor are more religious than the rich, more other-directed and conforming to traditional values, less concerned with taking responsibility and with the security of the family the poor differ from the rich by placing a lower value on competence, intellectual and self-actualization values" (p.62-63). Rokeach's description of Americans from lower socio-economic groups seems applicable to Vietnamese from lower socio-economic groups as well.

Rogers (1969) has enumerated the central elements of a peasant subculture as follows: (1) mutual distrust in interpersonal relations, (2) perceived limited good, (3) dependence and hostility toward government and authority, (4) familism (subordinate individual goals to those of the family), (5) lack of innovativeness, (6) fatalism (degree to which an individual perceives a lack of ability to control his future), (7) limited aspiration, (8) lack of deferred gratification, (9) limited view of the world, and (10) low empathy. Roger's description seems to be consistent with the obtained pattern of value differences in the Vietnamese respondents. Thus, although elementary school educated Vietnamese display a more traditional Vietnamese value system than college educated Vietnamese, the emphasis they place on certain values may be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

shared by persons from similar socio-economic levels in other countries.

Finally, it must be noted that the Confucian ideology probably had a greater impact on elementary educated than college educated Vietnamese. The Confucian emphasis on the family and de-emphasis of personal freedom would seem in large measure responsible for the obtained value differences.

Differences as a Function of Age

As with education, only the differences between the extreme groups will be discussed. In general, younger Vietnamese showed more of a concern with "modern" Western values and less of a concern with "traditional" Vietnamese values than older Vietnamese. As previously mentioned, the tendency of the young group was due: (1) possibly to the increased exposure of the Western civilization, (2) to the increased education in the new generation, and (3) to the social dynamics of modern youth. Eisenstadt (1966) has offered a general description of the "generation gap" which might serve as a post-hoc explanation of the difference in values. "It is in the young people that dreams of a new life, a new society, freedom and spontaneity, a new humanity and aspirations to social and cultural change, to new cultural symbols and symbols of collective identity, have found utterance" (p.27).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Differences as a Function of Occupation

In discussing differences as a function of occupation, only differences between civil servants and farmers will be considered. The pattern of terminal and instrumental value differences was in the predicted direction. That is, Vietnamese farmers displayed more traditional value patterns than Vietnamese civil servants. Those differences could be explained by the "contact change" mentioned earlier.

It is also possible (but speculative) that as a product of this contact the Vietnamese civil servants became sensitized to the lack of Equality and Freedom that existed in the country at the time of the study. The fact was that the Vietnamese society, at the time of this study, did not provide enough equal opportunity of employment. With the daily contact, civil servants might have realized that Equality was not in existence under the autocratic reign of warlords. For example, biased criteria were used to select employees: the most important determinants of employment were bribery and kinship. Such things can be seen in other newly independent countries too, but the consequences of these social phenomena might create social change through radical revolution, such as that which happened in Vietnam.

Differences as a Function of Residence

The pattern of difference between Vietnamese living in rural and urban area was in accord with the predictions made and consistent with the pattern of results described previously.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

That is, Vietnamese from rural areas gave evidence of more traditional Vietnamese value systems than Vietnamese from urban areas. Those differences might be explained by their contact change as previously mentioned and the effects of urbanization. According to Eisenstadt (1966, p.11): "The process of urbanization has usually been very closely related to the breakdown of at least some of the more traditional ascriptive criteria of status, whether tribal, estate, or regional ones, and to the development of somewhat more flexible and variegated social strate; to the upsurge of social mobility through occupational, educational, and political channels...". Similarly, Lerner (1958, p.46) stated: "Everywhere...increasing urbanization has tended to raise literacy, rising literacy has tended to increase media exposure...". Thus, the urban respondents would be more apt to be exposed to and influenced by Western ideas.

Differences as a Function of Income

Income differences, even among the extreme groups, had relatively little effect on value importance. Logically, income should have had an impact on the values Freedom, Equality and Family Security, but it did not nor were there any differences on the previously noted instrumental values. Two reasons can be given. First, usually the heads of the household had some income, but their dependents who were over 18 years and older people living in the same family did not often work. Thus, respondents who were dependents of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

heads of household might have classified themselves as poor, but in fact lived quite well. Regarding the farmers, their responses on income might not be valid, because they did not get monthly pay, and furthermore their income per month varied according to what they got from their crops during the year. It should be noted, however, that education which could be validly assessed and according to sociologists is a more appropriate index of social class (Rokeach, 1973) yield the predicted value differences.

In summary, dramatic differences between Vietnamese could be seen as a function of social class which was the combination of at least these factors: gender, religion, education, age, occupations and place of residence. Furthermore, these differences seem best explained by the impact of Western civilization on Vietnamese values through contact change as mentioned previously.

Differences Between American and Vietnamese Value Systems

Not surprisingly, the discriminant analyses disclosed a large number of differences between the value systems of the Vietnamese and American samples. In the interest of avoiding redundancy, only those differences that were predicted in the introduction to this paper and/or were especially dramatic (in terms of the size of the *F* ratios and variance accounted for) will be discussed. The reader is encouraged to examine the tables on his or her own.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Overall Differences in Value Systems

In accord with the prediction made regarding the relative similarity of terminal and instrumental value systems in the two countries, the difference between instrumental value systems was much greater than the differences between terminal value systems. This was true in terms of: a) the relative size of the rank order correlations, b) the number of significant univariate F ratios, and c) the variance accounted for by the linear combinations of values. Thus, although Vietnamese and Americans differed in terms of their goals in life, this difference was not as great as the differences in their beliefs about how to reach these goals.

Although the two groups did not differ significantly in their ranking of A World at Peace, the Vietnamese did rank National Security significantly higher than did Americans. Clearly, this value was the best discriminator between the two groups' terminal values. This was true both in terms of the variance accounted for by the univariate F ratio ($1 - \Lambda$: 8.-7%) and the covariate F ratio for this value. The fact that Vietnamese considered National Security much more important than did Americans, probably reflected the average Vietnamese's concern about security. The defining phrase that accompanies National Security on the value survey is "protection from attach". The civil war that continued in Vietnam for 30 years seems to be the logical cause for this greater concern with security among the Vietnamese. Indirect

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

support for this conclusion is provided by Rim's (1970) study of the values of Israeli college students. Israelis find themselves in a situation similar to that confronted by the Vietnamese at the time these data were collected. That is, the threat of terrorist activity and/or outright war is constant in Israel. Relative to Canadian, American, and Australian students, Israelis sampled in Rim's study considered National Security as much more important.

It is the author's opinion that for most Vietnamese the high ranking given National Security did not reflect a sense of allegiance to the government in power or a sense of nationhood as it seems to for Americans (Rokeach, 1973). White (1970) and Halberstam (1972) both reported little of these concerns among the average Vietnamese.

The Vietnamese sample's ranking of Freedom was not only lower than the American sample, but also much lower than any other group of nationals on which there are value data (e.g., Australians, Canadians, Israelis). This relative lack of concern for Freedom was interesting in two respects. First, it suggested that Vietnamese were not terribly concerned with the value that the American government gave as one of its major reasons for its military involvement in Vietnam - Freedom. The "freedom" which American troops were sent to protect did not seem to be very important to the average Vietnamese. Second, Rokeach (1973) has proposed that one can differentiate people's receptivity to various political ideologies on the basis of the importance assigned to values

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Freedom and Equality. For example, Rokeach (1973) has shown that people who rank Freedom high (ranks 1 - 6) and Equality low (ranks 12 - 18) are receptive to a Capitalistic ideology, whereas people with the reverse pattern are receptive to a communist ideology. If the data from American college students can be generalized to Vietnamese, the relative importance placed on Freedom and Equality by the Vietnamese suggests that they would have been more receptive to a "left-wing" political ideology than would the American sample. This is not to propose that, in fact, the Vietnamese sampled had a well-defined political "point of view". White (1970) reported that in terms of specific ideology most Vietnamese were neutral. Rather, the point is that if the average Vietnamese were offered a choice, he (or she) would probably have opted for a left-wing ideology, certainly more so than the average American.

The failure of the ranking of A World at Peace to discriminate between American and Vietnamese respondents (as it did for American and Israeli college men) was probably due to the impact of the American involvement in Vietnam on Americans. That is, the war may have served to increase American's concern for A World at Peace to a level comparable with the Vietnamese.

Finally, the fact that Vietnamese considered Social Recognition as more important than Americans must be considered. The most parsimonious explanation of this somewhat unexpected finding is the emphasis that a Confucian ideology places on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the defining terms that accompany this value, "respect, admiration". For a Vietnamese, the respect and admiration of his or her peers is of utmost importance. This greater concern with Social Recognition among Vietnamese than Americans was evident in all the subsequent comparisons.

The best discriminator among the instrumental values was the value, Obedient. Vietnamese ranked it first, Americans sixteenth. The difference in the ranking of Obedient contributed over half to the total variance accounted for by the multivariate F ratio. It should be noted that this difference in the importance assigned Obedient was evident in all subsequent comparisons that were made, and that Vietnamese considered Obedient as more important than any demographically defined subgroup in America.

The other strong discriminator between the two cultures was the value Ambitious. It was ranked lower by the Vietnamese than by Americans. When the correlation with the rankings of other values was "partialed out", Ambitious emerged as the best discriminator between the two samples. The lack of concern with Ambitious probably reflected a) the Confucian ideology and b) the realities of the social system in Vietnam. To expand on the second point, in Vietnam the probability of a "Horatio Alger" success story was small. A Vietnamese's ultimate status in society was, at the time this study was conducted, determined primarily by the family he was born into. Although there are both de jure and de facto barriers to upward social mobility in America, these are not

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

as strong as they were in Vietnam. Thus, in a society where ambition yielded few changes in a person's life, it is not surprising that it was not considered important.

Same Sex Comparisons

The value systems of males in the two countries tended to be more similar than the value systems of women. Although there was no significant difference in the rank order correlations, the number of significant univariate F ratios and the variance accounted for by the multivariate F ratio were both greater in the female comparison than the male comparison.

In accord with the hypothesis regarding differences in specific values, Vietnamese women considered Equality significantly less important than American women, but Vietnamese men did not differ from American men. This difference was most reasonably due to: a) the role assigned to women in a Confucian society, and b) the increasing concern among American women with their equal rights over the past few years (Rokeach, 1974). Thus, it would seem that Vietnamese women had internalized the subservient role assigned to them in the Vietnamese culture.

Additional support of this proposal is provided by an examination of the importance assigned to the instrumental value, Obedient, by the respondents. Although both male and female Vietnamese considered Obedient more important than Americans, Vietnamese women considered Obedient significantly more important than Vietnamese men ($F = 20.36$, $df = 1/347$,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

$p < .001$). In contrast, American women considered it non-significantly less important than American men. This resulted in Obedient's mean ranking being an enormously powerful discriminator between women in the two cultures.

In accord with the hypothesis, Vietnamese women considered Ambitious much less important than American women. But it must be added that Vietnamese men also ranked Ambitious as less important than their American counterparts. Within the Vietnamese sample there was no significant difference between males and females in the rank assigned Ambitious. Whereas the rank assigned Responsible ("reliable, dependable") was not a very powerful discriminator between males, it was for females. Within the Vietnamese sample, women considered Responsible significantly less important than did males ($F = 19.35$, $df = 1/347$, $p < .01$). This difference seemed to be due to the family-oriented role assigned Vietnamese women. In the American sample, there was no significant difference between men and women in the importance assigned Responsible.

Educational Comparisons

There were no significant differences in the rank order correlations computed for the terminal values. However, when the number of significant univariate F ratios and the amount of variance accounted for by the multivariate F ratios were considered, it appeared that college-educated individuals in the two countried possessed much more similar value systems than did individuals in the two countries with less education.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Perhaps the most interesting divergence between the college education comparison and the elementary education comparison was in the importance assigned the values Equality and Freedom. There was no significant difference in the importance assigned these two values between college-educated individuals in the two countries. But Vietnamese with an elementary school education considered these values significantly less important than did their American counterparts. Further, college-educated Vietnamese considered these two values significantly more important than their less educated fellow Vietnamese.

As noted previously, Rokeach (1973) has posited that the importance assigned Equality and Freedom is related to a person's receptiveity to a political ideology. If the proposal is valid, then two observations seem appropriate. First, college-educated Vietnamese were receptive to an American political ideology and to a certain degree had internalized the values Americans were supposedly "fighting for" in Vietnam. Second, the fact that college-educated Vietnamese considered Equality and Freedom significantly more important than other Vietnamese would suggest that in terms of ideology they may have been more similar to their American counterparts than they were to other, less educated Vietnamese.

College-educated Vietnamese were more similar to their American counterparts in terms of their instrumental values than were less educated Vietnamese. However, the instrumental value systems of college-educated persons in the two countries

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

were much less similar than were the terminal values of college-educated persons in both countries. It should also be noted that in all educational comparisons, the same three instrumental values - Ambitious, Broadminded, and Obedient received significantly different mean ranks from Americans and Vietnamese respondents. It would thus seem that while education had a strong influence on terminal values, it had a much less powerful impact on the instrumental values basic to Vietnamese culture.

It was possible that this greater similarity between the value systems of college-educated individuals than between less educated persons in the two countries was simply a function of the effect of higher education in the two countries. In order to determine the tenability of this alternative explanation, subsequent analyses were conducted in which each of the Vietnamese educational subgroups were compared to the entire American sample. College-educated Vietnamese differed significantly from the entire American sample on only five of the 18 terminal values. The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 9 values only accounted for 5.4% of the variance. By contrast, Vietnamese with an elementary school education had significantly different mean ranking from the entire American sample on 14 of the 18 values and the multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of 11 values, accounted for 25.4% of the variance. Essentially the same pattern of results were obtained when instrumental values were compared. Thus,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

college-educated Vietnamese were not simply more like their American counterparts than were elementary school educated Vietnamese, but rather college-educated Vietnamese were more like Americans in general than the other Vietnamese educational groups.

On the basis of the results obtained in this study, the following conclusions seem warranted. First, what primarily differentiated the respondents in the two countries was not their goals in life (i.e., terminal values), but rather the means by which these goals are reached (i.e., instrumental values). These instrumental value differences seemed to be primarily due to the presence of a Confucian influence in Vietnam and may be less modifiable by experiential factors (e.g., education) than terminal values. This second conclusion is based on the finding that, although college-educated Vietnamese had become "American-like" in their terminal values, their instrumental values tended to remain Vietnamese (e.g., the importance assigned Ambitious, Broad-minded and Obedient). With regard to the impact of the American presence in Vietnam on the values of the Vietnamese, it seemed to primarily affect the terminal values of a small (15% of the present sample), elite group of Vietnamese.

Implications of Research Findings

Given the presence of over 100,000 Vietnamese in this country, it would seem appropriate to discuss the implications of the findings obtained on the acculturation process for these people.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Before doing so, a word of caution must be sounded. Although the data on the attitudinal and behavioral correlates of values are impressive (cf., Rokeach, 1973), one must not overestimate the validity of the value survey. The survey was designed by Americans, validated on an American sample and as such may not have validly assessed the value systems of Vietnamese. Were a Vietnamese social psychologist to have constructed this instrument, it may have been quite different! The fact that the differences between Vietnamese and Americans were logical and interpretable does not in and of itself demonstrate the cross-cultural validity of the value survey. Perhaps, for example, there is a value not presented in the value survey that Vietnamese consider more important than National Security. Rokeach (1968, 1973) has acknowledged that the values presented in the survey should not be considered a totally exhaustive listing of all terminal and instrumental values.

A second caution involves the relative importance of values as a determinant of behavior. To be sure, there is evidence that values are causally related to attitudes and behavior (Penner, 1971; Rokeach, 1968, 1973), but they are not the sole determinant of a person's behavior. Habits, the demands of the situation, and environmental exigencies may all override values as determinants of behavior. Thus, for example, a Vietnamese who values Obedient may act disobediently (e.g., steal) in order to obtain money for food.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Finally, it is difficult to say which is a more important determinant of behavior, terminal or instrumental values. Thus, it would be difficult to predict the behavior of a person when his (her) terminal and instrumental values are in conflict. For example, what would be the response of a Vietnamese woman who is placed in a situation where the values, Family Security and Obedient conflict.

With these cautions in mind, the relationship between the results obtained and the acculturation process for Vietnamese will be discussed.

Gender

On the basis of the data obtained, it would seem reasonable to predict that female Vietnamese will not assimilate into American society as easily as men. The Vietnamese/Confucian tradition places the woman in a subservient family-oriented role. She is trained to be Obedient and has a lack of concern with Equality. Women's individual achievement is discouraged and she is primarily intended to be a wife and mother. The acculturation process will demand some educational experiences and the "striking out on one's own". The value patterns of Vietnamese women would suggest that they are ill-equipped for such an endeavor.

Given the necessity of such experiences for Vietnamese women, a reasonable strategy would seem to be to use the values of Family Security and Obedient to achieve these goals. That is, to use the husband as the vehicle whereby a Vietnamese

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

woman is encouraged to engage in the training needed to successfully exist in American society. Of course, such a recommendation's success is contingent on the husband's willingness to encourage his wife to abandon her traditional Vietnamese role.

Alternatively, such behaviors as described above might be obtained by presenting them as a means to some end. For example, education which is discouraged among Vietnamese women might be prevented within the framework of leading to Family Security.

Education

It seems reasonable to propose that those individuals with the least education among the Vietnamese immigrants will experience the greatest difficulty in assimilating in America. Three interrelated factors would be responsible for these difficulties: (1) lack of language skills and job skills which are marketable in a modern industrial society, (2) a lack of familarity with American culture, and (3) the disparity between their value system and that of the Americans. For these people, it would seem advisable to include cultural as well as language training in governmental programs directed at them. Special attention should be payed to those instrumental values (e.g., Ambitious, Obedient) which might interfere with successful functioning in the American culture.

With regard to college-educated Vietnamese, the process of acculturation should be much easier. They probably speak

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

English, have had extensive contact with Westerners, and at least their terminal values seem Western-like. However, the danger of feelings of alienation among these individuals exists. For most of them, their status in America is appreciably lower than it was in Vietnam. Doctors, for example, have taken relatively menial jobs. One must consider the effect of working as a manual laborer on an individual from a group that considers Intellectual the third most important instrumental value and Independent the next most important instrumental value. One can see these difficulties in the fact that large numbers of college-educated Vietnamese are quitting their low-level jobs and attempting to enter American universities.

These individuals have adequate training in certain disciplines but lack the necessary certification to practice their profession in the United States. Consideration should be given to employing these people as para or sub professionals in their chosen fields.

Age

The value data clearly suggest that older Vietnamese will have a more difficult time in assimilating into American culture. The value pattern of older Vietnamese, especially those without education and from rural areas, suggest something akin to cultural shock for them as they attempt to enter American society. These cultural and value differences will obviously be compounded by language and occupational deficiencies among these people.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In attempting to assimilate these older Vietnamese into American society special attention should be payed to the emphasis they put on traditional Vietnamese values such as Family Security and Obedient. As with women, these values may be used as ends and means to assimilate older Vietnamese into American society.

The Vietnamese in the 17 to 29 year old bracket seemed somewhat "American" in their terminal and instrumental value systems. Note should be taken of the importance younger Vietnamese placed on Equality and Freedom and their tendency to respect some of the more traditional Vietnamese instrumental values (e.g., Helpful, Polite). This suggests that the cultural retraining that seems necessary for older Vietnamese may not be as necessary for the younger Vietnamese.

Other Variables of Importance

Given the value differences as a function of occupation and place of residence, attention should be payed to these variables in decisions as to placement of Vietnamese. Clearly, a civil servant from an urban area in Vietnam should be treated separately from a farmer.

It would be of considerable practical, as well as theoretical, value if some of the predictions and suggestions made in this section could be empirically tested. This would provide data as to the efficacy of the current program of resettlement the United States government has chosen. It might also speak to the utility of the value survey as a cross-cultural instrument and the predictive validity of values.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

REFERENCES

Anh, D.D. Vietnam Van Hoa Su Cuong, (Vietnamese cultural history). Saigon: 1961.

Aronoff, J. Psychological needs and cultural systems: A case study. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1967.

Buttinger, J. The smaller dragon, a political history of Vietnam. New York: Praeger, 1958.

Cameron, P., & Robertson, D. Comparison of the cultural values of Scot and U.S. children. International Journal of Psychology, 1970, 5(2), 135-139.

Crawford, A.C. Customs and culture of Vietnam. Rutland: Turtle, 1966.

Devos, G.A., & Hippler, A.A. Cultural psychology: Comparative studies of human behavior. In G. Lindzey and Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (Vol. 4). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Dewey, J. Theory of valuation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Eisenstadt, S.N. Modernization: Protest and change. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Feather, N.T. Value change among university students, Australian Journal of Psychology, 1973, 25, 57-50.

Gentleman. Vietnam: History, documents and opinions on a major world crisis. New York: Penguin Books, 1966.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Gordon, Leonard, V., & Kakkar. A cross-cultural study of Indian and American interpersonal values, Journal of Psychology, 1966, 69(2), 339-340.

Hammer, E.J. Vietnam yesterday and today. New York: Holt and Winston, 1966.

Hickey, G.C. Village in Vietnam. New Yaven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Hudson, W.S. American Protestantism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Kempa, F. Calvinism and capitalism, In R. Green (Ed.), Protestanism and capitalism. Boston: Heath and Co., 1959.

Kikuchi, Akio, & Gordon & Leonard, F. Evaluation and cross-cultural application of a Japanese form of survey of interpersonal values, Journal of Social Psychology, 1966, 69(2), 185-195.

Kluckhon, F.G., & Stodtbeck, F.L. Variations in value orientations. New York: Row, Peterson and Co., 1961.

Lindhom, R.W. Vietnam: The first five years; An international symposium. Michigan: Michigan University Press, 1959.

Maslow, A.H. New knowledge in human values. New York: Harper, 1959.

Morris, C.W. Varieties of human value. Chicago: Univeristy of Chicago Press, 1966.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D.A. Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd Ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Olsen, M.E. The process of social organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Peck, R.F. A comparison of the value systems of Mexican and American youth, Revista interamericana de psicologia, 1967, 1(1), 41-50.

Penner, L.A. The Functional Relationship Between Values and Interpersonal Behavior. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Michigan State University Library, 1969.

Penner, L.A. Interpersonal attraction toward a black person as a function of value importance. Personality, 1971, 2, 175-187.

Penner, L.A., Homant, & Rokeach, M. Comparison of rank-order and paired-comparison methods for measuring value systems, Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 27, 417-418.

Perry, R.B. Realms of value. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Rim, Y. Values and attitudes, Personality, 1970, 1, 243-250.

Robin, M.W. Values and modern education, In D.N. Barrett (Ed.), Values in America. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.

Rogers, E.V. Modernization among peasants: The impact of communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes, and values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Rokeach, M. The nature of human values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Rokeach, M., Homant, R., & Penner, L. A value analysis of the disputed federalist papers, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 245-250.

Thiagarajan, Lukas, & Andre, P. Personal values across cultures: A study of managers and students in India and in the United States, Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 10, 139-140.

Thompson, V. French Indochina. New York: Octagon Books, 1968.

Trai, T.V. La Famille Patriarcale Annamite. Paris: Lapagresse, 1942.

Weber, M. The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism, translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Scribner, 1958.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FOOTNOTES

1) The relative tranquility of this province was not due to the presence of large numbers of soldiers representing the Saigon government. It is the author's opinion that there were large numbers of North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front sympathizers and soldiers in the province. Thus, these parties to the civil war saw little point in attacking areas of the province.

2) The author would like to thank Dr. Milton Rokeach for supplying these data.

3) Americans from low socio-economic class considered Equality more important than those from a high socio-economic class. However, this difference was probably due to the disproportionate number of Blacks in this socio-economic class.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE AND VALUE SURVEY

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE AND VALUE SURVEY

1. Phai tinh
   (Sex (male, female)

2. Sinh ngay
   (Date of birth)

3. Hien ngu tai (Current address) tu nam (from)

4. Da xuat tinh bao nhieu lan trong hai nam qua?
   (How many times did you leave your province or city in the last two years?)

5. Tinh trang gia-dinh (co gia-dinh, ...con)
   Family status (single, married with 1, 2, 3...children)

6. Trinh-do hoc luc (tieu-hoc, trung-hoc, dai-hoc)
   Level of education (elementary, secondary, university level)

7. Nghe-nghiep
   (Occupation)

8. So tien loi tuc hang thang
   (Income per month)

9. Nguoi Viet (goc Khmer, Thuong, Trung-hoa)
   Vietnamese with (Khmer, Highlander, Chinese, ... origin)

10. Ton-giao (Phat-giao, Cong-giao)
    Religion (Catholic, Buddhist)

11. Ngoai Qui-vi va con cai trong nha (neu co), xin ke-khai nhung nguoi song chung trong gia-dinh trong 06 thang qua:
    (Besides you and your children (if any), please list the people who actually have been living with you in the last six months:

    vo
    wife

    chong
    husband

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

cha me ben vo
wife's father or mother

cha me ben chong
husband's father and/or mother

anh-chi-em ben vo
wife's brother,....sister

anh-chi-em ben chong
husband's brother,...sister

Cac nguoi khac
others

12. Nha o:
Dwelling

nha gach, mai ngoi, nen gach bong, nen xi-mang
masonry, tile roof, tile floor, cement floor

nha gach, mai tole, nen gach bong, nen xi-mang
masonry, tin roof, tile floor, cement floor

nha ton, nen xi-mang, nen dat
wood wall house with tin roof, cement floor, dirt floor

nha tranh
thatch house

Bi chu:

Xin gach bo nhung chu khong can thiet, vi du: neu la nam, gach chu nu, neu co gia-dinh ma chua co con, gach chu doc-than va nhung con so 1, 2, 3, 4, 5...va chu con.

Please cross out unnucessary words, e.g., if you are male, cross the word female; if you are married and do not have children yet, cross the word single, and the numbers 1, 2, 3,...and the word children.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Duoi day la mot ban gom 18 gia tri duoc sap xep theo van (a,b,c...). Cong viec cua guy vi la sap xep chung theo thu tu co tinh cach quan trong doi voi quy vi, va xem do nhu la nhung nguyen tac huong dao trong cuoc song cua quy vi. Hay nghien cuu ban nay mot cach can than. Sau do ghi so 1 vao gia tri nao ma quy vi cho la quan trong nhat, ke do la so 2 vao gia tri it quan trong hon...Gia tri it quan trong nhat doi voi cac gia tri khac se duoc xep vao hang thu 18. Nen suy nghi can than va cham rai. Neu quy vi thay doi y kien, quy vi co the doi cau tra loi, ket qua cuoi cung se cho quy vi thay su nhan thuc dung dan ve chinh minh.

___An ninh quoc gia (bao ve chong nhung tan cong tu ben ngoai)
(National Security)

___Binh dang (tinh huynh de, co hoi dong deu cho tat ca)
(Equality)

___Cuu roi, cuu do (duoc cuu roi, doi song vinh cuu)
(Salvation, Nirvana)

___Doi song khich dong (mot doi song co dong co thuc day, hoat dont)
(An Exciting Life)

___Doi song thoai mai (cuoc song thinh vuong, sung tuc)
(A Comfortable Life)

___Duoc xa hoi nhan biet (kinh trong, kinh phuc)
(Social Recognition)

___Gia dinh an toan (bao boc nhung ghuoi than thuoc)
(Family Security)

___Hanh phuc (hai lɔng)
(Happiness)

___Hoa hop noi tam (thoat khoi xung dot noi tam)
(Inner Harmony)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

___Khon ngoan (hieu biet ve cuoc song mot cach chinh chan)
(Wisdom))

___Lac thu (cuoc song vui thu, nhan ha)
(Pleasure)

___The gioi hoa binh (khong chien tranh va xung dot)
(A World at Peace)

___The gioi my le (ve dep thien nhien va nghe thuat)
(A World of Beauty)

___Tinh ban chan thuc (tinh than huu)
(True Friendship)

___Tinh yeu truong than (vua vat chat vua thinh than)
(Mature Love)

___Tu do (doc lap, tu do lua chon)
(Freedom)

___Tu kinh (tu trong)
(Self-Respect)

___Y niem hoan tat nhiem vu (co su dong gop lau dai)
(A Sense of Accomplishment)

Duoi day la mot ban gom 18 gia tri khac. Hay sap xep chung theo thu tu co tinh cach quan trong doi voi quy vi.

___Bao dung (co y muon tha thu nguoi khac)
(Forgiving)

___Can dam (bao ve niem tin tuong cua minh)
(Courageous)

___Co kha nang (co hieu qua, hieu luc)
(Capable)

___Coi mo (phong khoang)
(Broadminded)

___Hop ly (nhut tri, co ly)
(Logical)

___Lich su (lich duyet, xu su khon kheo)
(Polite)

___Luong thien (thanh thuc, tin can)
(Honest)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

___Sach se (gon gang, thu tu)
(Clean)

___Sang tao (ca dam, co oc tuong tuong)
(Imaginative)

___Tham vong (lam viec hang hai, co hung khoi)
(Ambitious)

___Thong minh (tri thuc, suy tu)
(Intellectual)

___Tin yeu (dang men diu dang)
(Loving)

___Tinh than ky luat (Kiem ham, ky luat tu giac)
(Self Controlled)

___Tinh than trach nhiem (dang tin cay, dung dan)
(Responsible)

___Tu lap (tin tuong noi minh, khong nho cay ai)
(Independent)

___Ua giuh do (lam viec vi hanh phuc cua nguoi khac)
(Helpful)

___Vang loi (lam day du bon phan, hay kieng ne)
(Obedient)

___Vui tuoi (tam hon khoan khoai, tuoi vui)
(Cheerful)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.