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Abstract

Do people with more altruistic values actually help others? This study examines whether people with postmaterialist values tend to do more community service. This research will show whether or not there is a relationship between postmaterialist values and the amount of community service that someone actively does. Postmaterialists are those that place others and community welfare above personal welfare with more traditional values about right, wrong, and helping others. Materialists are those that value personal welfare and gain above the welfare of others, having more personal economic motivations associated with scarcity. Current research shows that there are particular value sets that tend towards service and that postmaterialists are more service-minded. In order to test the hypothesis that students with stronger postmaterialist values tend to do more service, I surveyed a sample of Wittenberg college students to assess their values on a scale from materialist to postmaterialist and the amount of community service done. It is helpful to know if values can indicate or help to interpret who does service and to what degree. This study is important because there have not been many research projects linking specific value sets to community service and with the recent steady rise in the number of individuals who volunteer in the United States, there are more people doing service. The results show no clear correlations between the amount of service completed by a student and the materialist to postmaterialist value score. However, Wittenberg students who have completed the service requirement tend to have more postmaterialist values than those who have not completed the service requirement.
Introduction

Is our nation in a craze of caring? Do we have better values today than we did years ago? Does our nation care differently and have different priorities than earlier in time? Last January, *The Chronicle on Philanthropy* reported, “The number of Americans who volunteered last year rose 6 percent, to 63.8 million, according to a new government study of people age 16 and older” (Wilhelm 43). This means more people are volunteering now than before.

As more people volunteer, our society may have shifted its values and priorities in addition to its activities. People do service for others in many direct and indirect ways. There does not appear to be a general unifying grasp to the activities nor a motivation. Instead, people choose to do service, but is there an underlying theme that could be responsible for such change over time in habits to have so many more people serving? People may do service because they feel that others serve and they should (a social responsibility), to appear more socially minded to others, for personal reasons, to benefit their own community, or for a multitude of other reasons.

Since there are so many possible factors in a choice of why to serve, I want to know if people who do service really have more postmaterialist values. Postmodernization is a larger, more enveloping term for postmaterialist ideas, used by Ronald Inglehart. Ronald Inglehart defines this concept, “In Postmodernization, the core project is to maximize individual well-being which is increasingly subjective on individual factors. Human behavior shifts from being dominated by the economic imperatives of providing food, clothing, and shelter toward the pursuit of quality of life concerns” (1997: 76). This quotation explains the individual’s life status not in relation to a level of past money or possession, but rather that of the status of the world and the life around a
person, a postmaterialist level. My research question is whether people who have postmaterialist values do more service; these are the people with the “quality of life” concerns over economic desires (Inglehart 1997:76). In my research, I am investigating into the possibility of a relationship between postmaterialist values and an amount of service done that increases with the tendency toward postmaterialist values.

While value change has occurred in advanced industrial societies, Ronald Inglehart has tracked a worldwide trend in these same countries toward postmaterialist values since 1970 (1997:131). This value change had begun to occur in generations as time has passed. The only data that exist about service, altruism, and value change tends to be incomplete. Researchers analyze motivations of a person to do specific types of service that a person does, but this does not characterize their whole experiences of doing differing types of service. Altruism has been theorized about with its ideals, while those studies do not link to facts or numbers. Value change has been examined but not directly in relation to service. Surveys, such as “Volunteering in the United States” (2003), exist about the number of hours of service done, but these surveys usually come in the form of unanalyzed data which have no true implications.

While the studies in this area tend to be lacking, there are ways to incorporate these studies into my research. I surveyed Wittenberg University students randomly to see if they do service and where their values are from in the scale of materialist to postmaterialist values. This data set allows a general assessment of whether the students are motivated for economic or “quality of life” gain (Inglehart 1997: 76). I will compare these data to Inglehart’s (1999-2000) World Values Survey (WVS) of the United States to see if my data set is fairly equivalent with the findings of these values on a national
level. This comparison will use current data to examine my own survey’s results and assess its validity or accuracy. Similar comparisons can be made with the number of service hours performed by students versus the number of hours of service performed on a national basis by students. These two comparisons can help me to assess whether my results are typical upon several levels within the basic characteristics of the sample population. If my results are typical results, then my findings can be seen as more valid.

Wittenberg students are required to do community service and come to this university for many reasons. The requirement and emphasis on service at the university, through values reflected so deeply as the school’s slogan, “Having light we pass it onto others,” may draw a different type of student. While the students may differ in comparison to national samples, these comparisons will help to gauge how my sample differs in representation from a national sample. This is reflected in the analysis. This study will show how values influence service done by students at Wittenberg and schools similar to Wittenberg, such as other small Lutheran colleges or sister schools in Ohio like Denison.

As a student interested in service, I was drawn to Wittenberg University. I have done a lot of service at Wittenberg and throughout my life. I was raised with a certain set of ideals that taught me I could do anything I set my heart to, while this value was paired with a need to help others. My parents taught me the importance of helping others and incorporating this into my daily life from a very young age. I was taught through service the values that I hold about myself and how to view others. In order to learn about what I could accomplish my mom wanted me to learn women’s history and what extraordinary women have achieved. At Wittenberg University, I am a coordinator for the community
service requirement; this means I help guide students through their experiences and act as a support. I lead students through a reflection experience where they start to think about their service, its impact, and what service other students are doing. This lets me observe students while they discuss their values in relation to the community.

Value change and motivations explain the reasoning of actions. Last year, I did research based on Ronald Inglehart’s work and people’s views over time in several countries on whether in times of struggle, women or men had more of a right to a job. When I read an article in *The Chronicle on Philanthropy* (Wilhelm:2004), I wondered about the values that accompany service and whether these same values are identified more strongly with people that do service.

My study is important because it assesses the existence of a relationship between values and service. It answers the question of whether individual postmaterialist values do have an effect on volunteerism. It will allow me to examine if people still have socially-considerate values and do not do service. This is essential to understand before one does service or attempts to motivate others to help one another. This total understanding, to which I will only attempt to contribute, could help non-profits change the way they appeal to volunteers and service programs in the manner they teach and train. Students, volunteers, service leaders, and professionals could learn that value change is either needed or will only work for some service learning. Once people understand a value set, I think they could examine motivations more easily. Pinpointing whether there is a correlation between service and values can change the way that service is examined.
In my research, I begin with defining my study through my purpose statement, research question, and hypothesis. My actual review of current material relating to my topic begins with a theory review and a literature review. The theory review is an analysis of recent social theory regarding my topic. This theory section describes the theoretical basis and grounds for research. This section explains altruism, materialism and postmaterialism, related ideas to these two theories that arise through others’ research on these topics and community service, and ideas that are considered in my own research. The literature review section deals with specific studies and research that has more applied use of theories than ethnographic research. This section contains a general overview of the quantitative studies that do not have any actual analysis of the data. The methodology section of my thesis describes in more detail the specific care taken in designing the survey, administering the survey, to whom the survey was administered, and the processing of the data. This section also contains a review of the specific methodology of the surveys utilized to execute this survey. These sections preclude the actual analysis of the data collected. This research is divided very purposely in order to examine altruism, materialism, and postmaterialism separately in reference to theory and applied theory in literature or research. This helps to differentiate between the areas of the topic of this study- the values of altruism, materialism, and postmaterialism- from the actual altruistic actions.
Purpose Statement

The purpose of this experiment is to test for whether there is a relationship between materialist to postmaterialist value sets and the amount of service that an individual completes. Wittenberg University is an interesting environment because of its requirement to do 30 hours of mandatory service in 1 semester. This semester can occur at any point. My study seeks to find a trend in the score in the range of values from materialist to postmaterialist to the variable of the number of service done. The dependent variable will be defined as the range on this values test. This will be seen by the amount of questions answered with a postmaterialist value versus those answered materialist. The independent variables are an ordinal category with hours of service completed a month and the status of the service requirement. The variables that should be controlled for intervention are class year and service requirement completion because freshmen have not had the time to complete the requirement and the actual service requirement may show a difference if controlled. However, those who have completed the service requirement might be more likely to do service because of the interaction in the community and at community organizations through the requirement.
Research Question

My study compares the relationship between values and service done using a survey of Wittenberg students. This survey explores whether people who have postmaterialist values tend to actually help others. The main questions of this study are:

(a) What viewpoints do Wittenberg students have about helping others?

(b) How much service do Wittenberg students actually do?

(c) How does the opinion of the population, Wittenberg students, compare with their actions, meaning how does the amount of service completed by students with more materialist values compare with the amount completed by students with more postmaterialist values?
Hypotheses

Null hypothesis: There is not a significant relationship between the amount of service done by people and their score on the materialist to postmaterialist value scale.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a relationship between the amount of service people do and their scores on the materialist to postmaterialist value scale. My hypothesis is that people who do more service will tend to be more postmaterialist.
Theory

The theories that accompany the ideas of materialism, postmaterialism, and altruism or service are varied. All of the theories are not completely connected, while they contain several themes. The theories used in this study center around altruism, the rationality or economic personal benefit of altruism, postmaterialism and materialism, and social capital. The rational or economic benefit of altruism is important to analyze in my research. In my study, I seek to find if people with these postmaterialist values do indeed act upon their values and do more service. Rational or economic values of service can show why people make decisions to serve or alternate reasons besides one’s own value system for service. The components to actions and parts to the decision to act are critical to examine before even looking at the concept of community service. Altruism and postmaterialism can describe underlying larger value systems while rational action and economic systems of analyzing service show an alternate value system being applied to a desire to do service.

Altruism

The general idea of altruism, the theory behind it, and its motivations are important to this study. Because this study examines values, searching for a value of goodwill or altruism, the general idea of giving through altruism or service is central. Altruism is defined by Kristen Renwick Monroe (1994) “as behavior intended to benefit another, even when doing so may risk or entail some sacrifice to the welfare of the actor” (862). This definition continues to explain a need for “action,” a goal of helping, and “intentions count more than consequences” (Monroe 1994: 862). Aristotle wrote this
same idea as, “But he will take from the right source, from his own possessions, for example, not because it is noble to do so, but because it is necessary in order to have (something) to give” (Kass 2002: 17).

Thomas Janoski and John Wilson wrote two theories about voluntary goodwill trying to explain altruism using sociological theorists, Emile Durkheim and Max Weber (1995: 272-273). Durkheim’s “normativist perspective” is used to explain the idea of social relationships as a learning experience for volunteering and to imply that people with more social relationships, including even marriage or a job, would do more service (Janoski and Wilson, 1995: 272). Weber is used by these authors to explain the concept of volunteering and joining voluntary associations for social gain; this is tied with socioeconomic status (Janoski and Wilson, 1995: 273). This concept of altruism is not applicable to the chosen population for this study of college students because college students do not usually have significant permanent social ties or a high, personal socioeconomic status.

“*The Unit Act of Action Systems*” (*Parsons: 1937*):

*The Rational Actor*

Talcott Parsons (1937) was the first to clarify the rational actor theory or the action frame of reference. This idea lays out all of the decisions involved in an action and explains that a decision must be made. The behavior must have the following things: an “actor, an “end,” a “situation,” and a “choice” to do this action above another action possible at that time (Parsons 1937). There are conditions for these four components in order to make them an action. They are that the act has a certain time when it occurs, has a range of ends and means, is “subjective” or “from the view of the actor,” and has a
“schema of action” (Parsons 1937). There is also an essential normative orientation. This means that the act itself occurs within the above factors of time and viewpoint which cause an independent decision to be made by the actor to do the action. These criteria all imply a choice to do an action, given an economic rational action theory with the alternative being the opportunity cost or what is missed by doing the action. In reference to this study, the person can in most cases choose to or not to do service and what to do in that time period as a result of their normative orientation. Even the service requirement has a choice of where and when to do the service. The altruistic action must be chosen, knowing that it does not have an end with an economic or a material award. This is related to my study and will be seen when the survey students are asked if they have completed the requirement in addition to whether or not they do service. If the only service students have done is the requirement, this can be considered compulsory service in light of Parsons’ work because the action is a behavior but there is not a normative orientation, an independent choice to do the action, making the behavior an act. Instead, in cases of requirements, the decision is not completely independent but more suggested or required for another goal. Each step in the decision-making process of deciding to do service relates back to Parsons’ critical breakdown. This theory applies to whether or not the situation exists for the decision to do the service to be capable of being reached and the normative orientation of the actor. The materialist and postmaterialist values can be seen as two different normative orientation sets of which the actor possesses parts of each set or one complete set. These normative orientations help the actor make the behavior with the normative orientation of utility as the assumption of rational choice.
Altruism and Rational Choice

Altruism is debated by many theorists as to whether it is needed or rational. Gary Becker worked with sociobiology, “rely[ing] on what Becker calls the ‘rationality’ of genetic selection,” explaining that rationalism is needed to continue life and can be essential (Monroe 1994: 871). Altruism and community service are typically seen as irrational by rational choice theory; these actions do not benefit oneself and may cause oneself to lose time or another critical advantage. This time when someone could be paid or getting their own work done is not rational to give away for free. This idea is explained by John Scott:

What distinguishes rational choice theory from these other forms of theory is that it denies the existence of any kinds of action other than purely rational and calculative. All social action, it is argued, can be seen as rationally motivated, as instrumental action, however much it may appear to be irrational or non-rational. (2000: 1)

Scott continues to explain this idea using theorists showing the idea that when one reaps no financial or economic profit, giving of one’s time to do action to help another is not rational because there is no profit (2000: 4-5). The truth of the situation is that people do join voluntary organizations and do service; this presents a dilemma for rational choice and economic theorists concerning altruism because if it wasn’t in any way rational, would people do it? (Scott, 2000: 6) Rational choice theorists would understand a service requirement but not non-compulsory service. Rational choice theorists would, however, question the value of a service requirement and ask about the opportunity cost of the implemented requirement.
Rational Choice and Service

Talcott Parsons (1968) extended the concepts of the rational actor to service and rationality. Parsons discussed Alfred Marshall’s viewpoints on rationality. The key points center on an irrationality of service or action. This irrationality stems from an economic, Keynesian perspective of the opportunity cost of the time spent doing service; service has no gains so in fact any time spent doing service is seen in this opportunity cost analysis as being spent to one’s personal advantage (Parsons, 1968:131). Marshall has a unique “positive theory” on service using the “standard of life” to contrast with “comfort,” “afford[ed] strength,” and “wants” (Parsons, 1968:139-140). “Indeed the formula of the rational pursuit of self-interest has been so widely applied that egoism has seemed to be the very essence of the economists’ outlook on human action” (Parsons 1968: 161). Parsons also discusses Marshall’s writing regarding an “ethical obligation to be rational” (1968:164). Marshall’s writing attempts to argue rationality in some manner to do action. While this critique exists, Parsons also discusses a similar theory relating to wants and actions as a result of a value system; this idea explains that wants and action are no longer random actions or wants because they do have some influences (1968: 167-171). This theory, taken separately from the economic theories, also seems to agree with Scott (2000) about his suggestion of some type of rationality relating to service. This proposal justifies service through some type of motivation or some leaning towards what is done, making service almost rational. Service has to be seen as rational for some either through values or through a rational choice perspective because people do actively engage in community service. The concept of an influence or want toward service
stemming from one’s own values relates very well to the theory and research question of my study.

**Materialism and Postmaterialism**

Modernization and postmodernization are two main theories of Ronald Inglehart’s that envelop the ideas of materialism and postmaterialism, respectively. Modernization, the first of the two movements, is centered on ideas of a personal-center for achievement and economic personal well-being. In order to better understand the difference between materialism and postmaterialism, the larger movements of modernization and postmodernization within which the smaller movements were created must first be considered.

Modernization is the process of putting money, personal economic benefit, and material desires above relationships (Inglehart 1997: 24). Modernization places emphasis on money and economic status received to some degree from Westernization (Inglehart 1997: 24). Modernization is defined by Inglehart as:

A syndrome of changes closely linked with industrialization: this syndrome includes urbanizations, the application of science and technology, rapidly increasing occupation specialization, rising bureaucratization, and rising education levels. It also includes one more thing, which was the motivating force behind the process: industrialization was a way to get rich. (1997:24)

The value in the process is with making money and not preserving relationships or a caring for others. While modernization is associated with the ideals of capitalism, postmodernization is defined by Inglehart as being associated with a revival of traditional values and roles (Inglehart 1997: 25). The theory of postmodernization used by
Inglehart is a different theory than the typical trend of postmodern thought; this must be considered separately and differently when defining Inglehart’s Postmodernization. While postmodern traditional values can highlight a woman’s place or other traditional roles, they mainly define right and wrong in very simple terms. This postmodern concept is illustrated by Inglehart: “The main source of wealth was land, which is in fixed supply: the only way to become rich was by seizing someone else’s land—which probably required killing the owner” (Inglehart 1997: 30-31). Here, the Biblical commandments or basic traditional ideas of killing as wrong are the traditional values highlighted over force and fraud. Inglehart’s theory of postmodernism can be explained as growing up in a society where society is more definite and not in constant jeopardy (Inglehart 1997: 31).

Materialism and postmaterialism are the specific parts of these larger theory and value sets considered within this study to assess the values of the participants. Materialism and postmaterialism are defined by the viewpoint on two main hypotheses. These hypotheses explain the values and their change to postmaterialism from materialism. These two hypotheses are:

1. **A Scarcity Hypothesis.** An individual’s priorities reflect the socioeconomic environment: one places the greatest subjective value on those things that are relatively in short supply.

2. **A Socialization Hypothesis.** The relationship between socioeconomic environment and value priorities is not one of immediate adjustment: a substantial time lag is involved because to a large extent, one’s basic values
reflect the conditions that prevailed during one’s preadult years. (Inglehart 1997: 33)

Inglehart discusses war in reference to the first criteria in that when someone grows up during a war there may be shortages which makes them be socialized, the second hypothesis, to be more materialist even later in adult life (1997: 33-36). With a more economically secure society, one is more likely to need fewer rules and stringent laws because there is more economic stability and less need to pillage to survive (Inglehart 1997: 40). The other reason associated with more postmodern values is the function of “societal and religious norms;” the example used by Inglehart is the idea “Thou shalt not kill” and all of the other commandments that encourage an environment with more care about the welfare of others (Inglehart 1997: 40). There are four realms of society associated with the change from materialism to postmaterialism. These realms are: “political,” “economic,” “sexual/ family norms,” and “religion” (1997: 43). Inglehart cites deterioration within each realm as aiding a less restrictive and more postmaterialist society (1997: 43). These ideas merely imply more political action at a grassroots level and less of a need for the law merely to keep force and fraud in line to check materialist wants.

Postmaterialist values and materialist values are defined by Inglehart in the above manners. For the purpose of this study, it should be understood that postmaterialists value helping others because of their security and desire to move towards a more equal world. This can be seen in this study by examining service and whether or not the person seeks to actively change the world for the common good. This action and value system would be seen as the rational choice made to decide to serve. In Inglehart’s surveys, he
uses the definition of people with postmaterialist values as those who want things for the common good of society and not merely for the good one person (Inglehart 1997: 109). This can be seen as wanting basic needs and care for all and not just for oneself. This is the goal that is seen through postmaterialism by this study and emphasized in terms of the need for active service in attempts to realize this goal.

Social Capital

Robert Putnam, a pioneer in the ideas of social capital, discusses service, altruism, and organized groups with reference to his own work (2000). This work is not to be discredited for its indirect correlation, but considered as a related opinion. Putnam uses membership in voluntary organizations as a “barometer” of the service people are doing, dividing this service into community, church, and “work based” (2000:49). Putnam writes, “Social capital refers to networks of social connection—doing with. Doing good for other people however laudable, is not part of the definition of social capital” (2000:116-117). This stands to show social capital as only related then through networks formed by altruism. This may show a rational benefit to service, networking. Putnam explains that connections with friends, family, and community can show a stronger inclination to do service (2000: 120-121). This is only a theory on the behalf of social capital because of how the relationship between service and social capital is defined. However, Putnam explains, “giving, volunteering, and joining are mutually reinforcing and habit-forming—as Tocqueville put it, ‘the habits of the heart’” (2000: 122). Putnam (2000) explains a rise in volunteering that occurred when he wrote his text, before the more recent rise that has been growing over several years; he contrasts this with the decline in social capital (132). I don’t understand how Putnam can say that
doing good is not related to his area and write a whole chapter on its relation; at the same
time, the ideas of social capital are a strong opposition to Inglehart’s work because social
capital is an older theory and not a new trend. Social capital also would, if related to
actual action to aid others and not merely networking results, support some rationality to
service. The networks gained by service can support the rationality of altruism, while
social capital concentrates on the networks made as the primary outcome. The only
negative point to using networks as a motivation is the fact that networks do give
someone a reward for service or altruism. The idea of a social network as a reward
implies a reward for service, which is not then within the definition of altruism used thus
far in this study. The definition of altruism I am using for my study implies a motivation
to help others and not for the primary purpose of personal gain, which could be
economically motivated.

Inglehart sees service as a result of values, while Putnam sees helping as
rationally and egotistically motivated. Inglehart replies to Putnam, Harrison, and
Fukuyama:

All of these analyses reflect the assumption that contemporary societies are
characterized by distinctive cultural traits that have endured over long periods of
time—and that these traits have an important impact on the political and
economic performance of societies. How accurate is this assumption? (Harrison
2000:81)

Inglehart continues his argument to explain another type of idea contradictory to this
assumption (Harrison 200:81-82). Within this concept, democracy fosters cultural
change (Harrison 2000:81-96). In reference to my study, Inglehart will be highlighted
more than Putnam given the greater significance and relation to service as a positive act and great applicability of Inglehart’s work on materialism and postmaterialism and compared with the applicability of Putnam’s work on social capital.

**Directly Applied Theory**

Barry Schwartz (1993) explains altruism in some psychological circles as stemming back to being irrational or a behavior that after time and learning will disappear (316). In further discussion against this common idea, Schwartz, citing Martin Hoffman’s work, “suggests that altruism has two requirements, one affective and one cognitive. Genuine altruism requires empathy (affective) and perspective taking (cognitive). One’s distress at the distress of another can be direct and immediate” (1993: 321). Schwartz cites understanding of the other’s situation and a desire to change that situation as the needed difference between values tended toward doing service and actual altruism or action (1993: 322).

The difference between action and concern without action that Schwartz highlights is directly related to the topic of this study. My goal is to attempt to find if people with more socially-minded values do more service. This value set may embody the actual idea of understanding others or just the values that Schwartz discusses that motivates thought toward service, while not being strong enough to confirm some motivation for action.

This theory is directly the idea of my study. This is the closest theory that can be applied to my research. The following section contains the research of others using the theories already explained in order to examine the literature and work done in relation to my subject.
Literature Review

The relationship between materialist and postmaterialist value systems and actually completed community service is not very directly researched. The research on this topic falls under several categories. Research has been done on service about values, values correlated with service, and postmaterialism and value change. There is little research on what people do with these values or the values of the people that do so much service. Explanations exist in theory but are not connected directly to research. These theoretical explanations show that research has been done on values, an amount of service completed, or the values of those who do service, but not the relationship between these factors. Rational choice theory itself has a conundrum: more people today are doing service than have been before (Bureau of Labor: 2003). The rates in age groups have changed and driven across the board prompting research on values and service in a more connected method (Bureau of Labor: 2003). This also could imply that older research which may be cited will have one major flaw: service is more widespread and normalized now than in prior years. This research may see service as less popular or irrational while the amount of service being done and number of people doing service is increasing. In one year, the volunteer rates for the ages sixteen to twenty-four changed by 2.2 percent; this is fairly large amount when the final percent for 2003 is 24.1 percent (Bureau of Labor: 2003).

Research Done on Service and Defining Service

The first critical step to review the literature was to define community service and examine definitions of it. This helps to form the ideas for how service can be defined in terms of the survey and how much service people actively do. Volunteering is defined by
one text as, “non-obligatory; it is carried out (among other things) for the benefit of others: society as a whole or a specific organization; it is unpaid; and, somewhat less common, it takes place in an organized context” (Dekker and Halman 2003: 1). The interesting part of this definition is that it relates directly back to Inglehart and Putnam. Putnam defined volunteering as different from social capital and involvement in a social group, while Inglehart did not generally define this idea in his concepts but merely in his surveys.

**Who Serves**

People who volunteer have been researched as a group to attempt to see what makes them unique. A group called ACTION researched specifically who volunteers and in what type of organizations in 1974 (Wolozin1976). This group found that those with an income of $10,000 or less had a rate of volunteering of 58%, while the rate of volunteering declined as the income became larger (Wolozin 1976: 10). This finding contradicted what had been found up until that point: people with a higher income did more service as their income increased (Wolozin 1976: 10). Virginia A. Hodgkinson did research to define and confirm four hypotheses in their basic, simple format about the people who do service (Dekker and Halman 2003: 51). Hodgkinson states these hypotheses about people who do volunteer:

- Individuals who volunteer are more likely to be actively engaged in religious institutions than those who do not volunteer…
- Individuals who volunteer are more likely to be members of a voluntary organization than those who do not volunteer…
- Individuals who volunteer will socialize more frequently, often with other members of the community, beyond family and friends than those who do
not volunteer… Individuals who volunteer are more likely to be engaged in civic affairs than those who do not volunteer. (Dekker and Halman 2003:48-50)

These ideas show an amount of involvement and caring for others that is believed to be associated with those that volunteer. This research shows differing levels and caring and interactions with others. Hodgkinson sees a relationship between the amount of voluntary organizations and the amount of service done within a community (Dekker and Halman 2003:51). College students that are surveyed for whether or not they do service in my study are assessed on their values and caring for others through these values; however, the existence of voluntary organizations, such as those typically associated with service, and the membership of these organizations tend to be more sparse amongst college students and will not be discussed in my survey-research as a result.

Values

Values are discussed as a possible “guideline” for why service is done rather than the motivation (Dekker and Halman 2003:6). “Values are considered to be deeply rooted dispositions guiding people to act and behave in a certain way” (Dekker and Halman 2003:6). Values are used in my study in large groups to set general categories. Paul Dekker and Loek Halman discuss values as not being predictors of action on an individual level but predicting how a society chooses to act and whether their volunteer on a group level (2003: 7).

Value change and service has been a popular topic for a few direct studies. One such study examined the difference in values between those who do service and those who do not. The values, proposed as different by Paul B. Reed and L. Kevin Selbee, are not identified through a specific set, but rather a group of values and beliefs (Dekker
and Halman 2003:92). Reed and Selbee discuss in their literature review types of values such as “culture of separation” and “culture of coherence” and “a positive view of caring” or “culture of benevolence” (Dekker and Halman 2003:92-93). These ideas show a difference in values that is not grasped but somehow seen and known. The study done by Reed and Selbee incorporated 92 different questions with many ideas to then see how volunteers replied to statements differently than non volunteers; Reed and Selbee found a moderate correlation between most of their views and issues and volunteers (Dekker and Halman 2003:95-96). They came up with a list of characteristics of an ethos of volunteers:

1. Recognition of the existence and importance of a civic or communal good.
2. Belief that individuals have a responsibility to support and contribute to the common good, regardless of the responsibilities for supporting the common good that may be delegated to organizations or institutions such as churches or governments.
3. Belief in the necessity of active personal involvement in contributing to the common good and above the standard obligations of citizenship such as paying taxes.
4. A worldview that is notably (a) rather more universalistic or cosmopolitan than particularistic, (b) inclusive, (c) trusting, and (d) more prosocial than individualistic.
5. A worldview that sees individuals and their social milieu as interconnected rather than separated. (Dekker and Halman 2003:97)
This value set shows an active difference between volunteers and nonvolunteers. These values are fairly similar in some ways to Inglehart’s postmaterialist values, while differently defined. The data supports some difference in values which relates to this study since this study attempts to find the difference in values correlating with the variable of the amount of service being done.

**Ronald Inglehart’s Work**

Ronald Inglehart worked with postmaterialism and value change. His theories of value change and World Values Survey (WVS) to assess a level of postmaterialism are a large part of my research. Inglehart’s two theories are scarcity and socialization (Inglehart 1990:68). In my methodology paper on Inglehart, entitled “Right to a Job: Do Gender and Age Influence One’s Opinion towards Women’s Equal Right to a Presence in the Workplace?,” I wrote “Socialization would allude to generational change. Inglehart (1990) cites three models of attitude change in figure 3-1 on page 109; all models take four years for one full change.” (Westlund 2004: 13) The fact these models take four years for a change influenced my idea to do my study merely on current values and not value change. People are only in college for four years and this study has a limited time span so only current viewpoints are considered not a total change; students would need to be surveyed after four years to spot a total value change. With students being in college only in four years, the situation is complicated. In my earlier Inglehart research on the timing of value change, I wrote:

Inglehart discusses postmaterialist values significantly and states that value changes occur when “a younger generation replaces the older generation in the adult population” (1990: 69). Inglehart (1990) lays out a plan for how these values
can be estimated from those of that given time and one’s parents (122). Inglehart (1997) discusses the role of the family and how it has become less important (40-41). The family can break up and the child will still survive. Postmodern values are more individualist than traditional values (Inglehart 1997: 76).” (Westlund 2004: 13-14)

This idea accompanies the break up of the family and the individualism of youth. Students tend to be one group where postmaterialism is the highest. Inglehart wrote, “In addition to students and young technocrats, young professionals are the only remaining category in which Postmaterialists outnumber Materialists” (1990: 320). In terms of this study’s survey, this fact would lead to the idea of more postmaterialists, but does not give any details regarding them and whether or not they will have done service.

A reader of Inglehart must consider that he has done research on many countries. The general value change which he confirms has been across these countries as a trend. Inglehart did specific research in examination of the United States, as a well-established democracy. In my methodology paper on Inglehart, I wrote:

Inglehart (1997) writes, “The only statistically significant influence on levels of democracy in 1995 is level of economic development” (196). Within The North American Trajectory, Inglehart (1996) says that Mexico, the U.S., and Canada all have “a meaningful materialist/postmaterialist dimension” and are in progress of a “gradual change” from “material goals to the postmaterialist goals.” (52) This makes these countries on a similar vein to study. These countries also all share a future direction of values (Inglehart, 1996, 165). (Westlund 2004: 13-14).
While these values are associated with Western countries, Inglehart comments that they are not just associated with Western countries (1997: 158). Value change toward postmaterialist values is more associated with economic advances to a livable state (1997: 158). Inglehart also explains that “where value change has occurred, intergenerational changes are robust” (1997: 158). This means that there is a large difference between the younger and older generations as the change from materialist to postmaterialist has occurred. This can be traced back to Inglehart’s socialization theory (1990: 68).

Inglehart used twelve goals to measure postmaterialism and materialism by asking his sample to rank these goals (1997: 108). Six of the goals “emphasize survival needs [and materialism]: ‘Rising prices,’ ‘Economic growth,’ and Stable economy’ […], ‘Maintain order,’ ‘Fight crime,’ and ‘Strong defense forces’” (Inglehart 1997: 108). Five of the other items were postmaterialist but are not explained. These items have been processed within Inglehart’s (1997) text and ranked on a scale from postmaterialist to materialist (109). The main point of the ideas being ranked side by side over time is that while value change occurs overtime the postmaterialist and materialist value examples used have not changed significantly.

Inglehart touches upon the difference between answering his questions and actual action within Modernization and Postmodernization (1997). Inglehart says that people can give various values ratings “without revealing their underlying priorities” or without even having priorities (1997: 116). This difference applies to my study because the materialist to postmaterialist survey done by Inglehart reveals how someone ideologically likes to think or would think, while Inglehart himself says it may not reveal true main
concerns or views. This is different from whether the person takes action or does act upon their ideal beliefs.

**Ronald Inglehart’s Applied Work**

Inglehart did work with volunteering and Robert Putnam’s work to find out the different types of volunteering within voluntary organizations across the world (Dekker and Halman 2003:62-63). In this work he found that younger people were more likely in a lot of the “less wealthy” countries to be members of theses associations and do unpaid work (Dekker and Halman 2003:62). In this research, Inglehart examined patterns of service across different countries by their wealth and found a higher economic status makes more volunteering in that society (Dekker and Halman 2003:70). At the same time, “the shift from Traditional to Secular-rational values tends to depress participation in the third type of association, but the subsequent rise in Self-expression values, at a higher level of economic development works in the opposite direction” (Dekker and Halman 2003:70).

**Critiques of Inglehart**

Helena Helve, a woman who has done a significant amount of research on value change, seeks in her article to disprove Ronald Inglehart (2001). In her research on values and Finnish youth, she sought to see how people were socialized to have their current values or “lenses of the world” (Helve 2001: 202). She split youth into three main groups, “Humanists’, ‘Individualists’ and ‘Traditionalists’” (Helve 2001: 207). Helve also created a fourth group, which she does not include in her list of three; this group is the “Cynics- Political Passives” (Helve 2001: 207).
On the topic of Inglehart’s work, Helve found that people were postmaterialists within her three separate groups. (2001: 209). Helve explains:

People’s multiple needs, attitudes, and values, however, form a more conflictory value world than Inglehart’s typology suggests. A person may have very different needs, attitudes, and values, a portion of which are materialist and a portion of which are postmaterialist. For example my follow-up study of young people’s value system indicates a decline in postmaterialist values among people during a period of economic recession. (2001:209)

Helve wrote that postmaterialist values may negatively correlate with a recession economically because people who serve may also have to value things in scarcity. She attempts to explain that postmaterialist values still exist, but the way Inglehart measures them they do not exist (Helve 2001: 209). This is something that seems to be identified more with Inglehart’s measure and creation of postmaterialism rather than the idea of a movement toward a societal value change. Helve has a different theory of value change than Inglehart. Her theory, as stated in her concluding discussion, centers on the idea of ideology as almost multiple hats or accessories for a situation, whereas young people choose an ideology or an accessory for each different situation (Helve 2001: 210).

Helve’s ultimate conclusion was that youth belonged to multiple societal groupings and not just one; Helve had even created her own societal groupings for youth in which youth overlapped because youth can capture so many ideas and have positions on more than one thing. (2001: 210).

For the purposes of my study on materialist to postmaterialist values and their affect on service done, my study will center its survey and research on Inglehart since he
has come to some conclusions and has more defined, outlined categories. Inglehart’s value groupings of materialist and postmaterialist will be used. While these groups do have some limitations, as Helve’s critique of Inglehart explains, they do serve as a grouping of several of Helve’s groups. For the previous reasoning, the defined historical and worldwide background, and the proved continued result of Inglehart’s work, it continues to be stronger than the work of Helve.

Other critiques examined, such as Easterlin and Crimmins, show promise to critique Inglehart but do not keep with the same definition in their work of materialism as Inglehart (1997: 75-81). This different operationalized definition of Inglehart’s concept makes the work look very different from that of Inglehart; it is not being considered in this study for the vast difference in the operationalization of a definition (1997:75-81). This critique is one example of a study done to rival Inglehart’s that may have lacked the funding or the global-surveying ability to attempt to rival Inglehart’s work. Inglehart’s work is still open to challenge and has several critiques written about it.

**Conclusions from the Literature Review**

My study will center on values and whether or not they influence the amount of active altruism a person engages in to follow those values. The value measures will be those of Inglehart in materialism to postmaterialism on his scale, since his work despite having flaws is widespread and accepted. These measures of values should help determine and define some motivator within the participants that can be measured and compared with the amount of service done. The requirement will be considered compulsory service or service without a full, independent decision on the behalf of the actor.
Methodology

Survey Instrument

The first step to conducting my study was to choose the method. The method chosen for this study is a survey conducted on a random sample of the population, Wittenberg University students. The survey was made based on parts of Ronald Inglehart’s (1999-2000) World Values Survey with my own questions added.

For my own purposes, I wanted to ask the students about their class year, gender, and amount of service completed each month. Since Wittenberg University, as previously discussed, has a service requirement for thirty hours in one semester, it was also asked in the survey if the respondent had completed this requirement. This can be examined to see if service is done that is not compulsory. The requirement also could inspire more service. Class year is important because the students who are freshmen may not have adjusted yet to the community to even start service and may also not have had a chance to meet the requirement.

To write the survey for values based on Inglehart’s work, Inglehart’s wording was used from his 2000 World Values Survey (WVS) with slight alterations since my survey was E-mailed and sent to boxes in addition to being read over the phone. My survey was received mainly through written format. Inglehart’s survey is based upon twelve different items that are materialist or postmaterialist. The ideas are split into groups of four, with the addition of “Don’t Know;” in response to the group of four, the respondent chooses the two choices that are most important to them (Inglehart 1990: 355). From these choices, Inglehart has constructed a score from zero to five assessing a level from
materialism to postmaterialism (1990: 355, 389). The main alteration that had to be made in the survey is that Inglehart asked for the first and second choices after all of the choices were read with “1” or “2” next to each choice. Inglehart’s survey was administered with a system of show cards by someone as opposed to the individual filling out the survey himself or herself. The way his survey questions appeared was very difficult to understand for someone reading the survey to answer themselves. My survey was filled out by the respondent. A blank was placed at the end of each question for the first and second choice to make the survey easier to read.

**Variables**

A twelve-item list of values has been developed by Ronald Inglehart, postmaterialist and materialist, defined through his work with his World Values Survey. This list was used in the questions in his WVS. This set of values was defined by Inglehart using a list of twelve values. This list included the following six materialist values:

- Maintaining a high level of economic growth
- Making sure this country has strong defense forces
- Maintaining order in the nation
- Fighting rising prices
- A stable economy
- The fight against crime


This set of values included five postmaterialist values:
o Seeing that people have more say about how things are done at their jobs and in their communities
o Giving people more say in important government decisions
o Protecting freedom of speech
o Progress toward a less impersonal and more humane society
o Progress toward a society in which ideas count more than money

(Ronald Inglehart’s (1999-2000) World Values Survey)

Inglehart also used one variable which was neither materialist nor postmaterialist, “Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful.” (Ronald Inglehart’s (1999-2000) World Values Survey). Inglehart, discussing about materialist value responses, wrote, “theoretically, those values should be given high priority by those who experienced economic or physical insecurity during their formative years” (1990: 74-75).

These response sets above all have been used for years and rigorously redefined with wording changes over the years, making this set a powerful choice.

**Method Shortcomings**

The idea of having people rank is known as less statistically sound and more simple than giving a question or Likert scale on each item. Inglehart recognizes this idea within his work, while he discusses the idea versus a general rating for each value (1990: 117). The main point considered is that these values must be a “priority” which implies a relationship or preference over something else (Inglehart 1990:117). Inglehart replies to several authors who critique his work in preference of a rating system per item over a ranking system of the items against one another; however, these authors carried out their own study using ranking and found people would highly rank most choices and not make
the choice between items (1990: 117-119). People replied to ranking wanting every choice to be a reality and not having to weigh opportunity costs nor make rational choices. In response to this idea, the complexity statistically lost by ranking items against one another also gives a gain within the thought process to make those choices when the participant has had to choose one goal over another.

**Participant Selection**

By this point, the survey had been written and read by many eyes so that it was clear and could be E-mailed off. The study was also completely approved by Wittenberg University’s Institutional Review Board. Participants were chosen randomly out of the Wittenberg University student section of the directory. There are forty-one pages in this section. Twenty of the pages were chosen by using Minitab to generate twenty random numbers. When duplicate numbers came up, another number was generated. Ten random numbers were generated to choose the participants off each page. Each page has about fifty students listed. Random numbers were generated from one to the average number of students listed on each page. Each of the pages chosen was then numbered. The people on the chosen pages with the randomly selected numbers were selected for the survey. In the case that a student chosen had withdrawn by this point in the semester, the next listed student in the directory was substituted. This system of multi-stage random selection generated 200 people to take the survey. These people were E-mailed a letter and the informed consent form to tell them the survey was coming on a Sunday. The letter included information about a prize being given out to motivate students to respond. The prizes are five Applebee’s gift certificates for ten dollars each that will be given out to five different students. Students were told they will be called if they win a
prize. The following Monday evening the informed consent form and survey were E-mailed out. The following Thursday students were contacted by phone. On the next Sunday, each student that had not replied was sent a paper survey to their campus mailbox. This paper survey was altered from the original E-mail to explain to write and not type. Each student was given a number in a spreadsheet so that the student’s number can be referenced with their survey. This numbering system allows me to track responses so that students who responded by one form of contact were not contacted a second or third time.

**Coding and Data Analysis Method Inferences**

In order to analyze the data, the data was coded and input into Minitab by the students listed numbers. The surveys are numbered and ordered with these same numbers so that the specific case may be later referenced to the paper survey in addition to the electronic input. The data was analyzed in statistics examining each variable individually to access whether more or fewer students were surveyed with certain characteristics or if there was a greater appearance of a certain characteristic. This simple look at the data will examine the variables individually giving a look at the demographic variables for a profile of the respondents and response to the materialist-postmaterialist battery and questions about service completed one at a time before any work to examine the full relationship, relationship between variables, and trends in the data has been done. For bivariate statistics, I used an analysis of variance or ANOVA F-test and Two-Sample t-Test to test for the significance of the relationship to see if there is a difference in the means amongst a group within a category. Finally, I derived a model to arrive at the materialist-postmaterialist score from the other variables.
The statistical methodology develops to more complex procedures from a simple t-Test as the results are used to see if any of these results are statistically significant and to attempt to control for the intervening variables. The following results section further details the results by variable with univariate analysis, examining each variable individually, and bivariate analysis, examining the relationships between the variables.
Information about the Data

Coding Changes

I coded my data in several ways from merely how it appeared on the survey. The scores on the materialist to postmaterialist scale were calculated. In order to be able to analyze anything with the class year and ages, both had to be changed because there were a lot more traditional students than non-traditional. The fifth year seniors were combined with the seniors. This affected one student. There are 12 students in the survey who are over the age of 22. These respondents range from 26 to 67. With so many students in such a small range from 18 to 22, the other students were lumped together as ‘older.’ This was then considered as a categorical variable with categories of 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and older. Analysis and visual description of the age variable before and after this coding change can be seen in the univariate analysis of age.

Response to the Survey

As was explained in the methodology section, the respondents were surveyed by E-mail, phone, and, then, by a paper survey sent to their campus mail boxes. Fifty-four students responded by E-mail; from those surveys, fifty-three were complete and one was without a name and only partially completed. By the phone surveying, the number completed rose to eighty-eight, with thirty-four completed by phone. This included the partial survey being resolved and completed. There were four more full surveys received by the box mail method for a total of ninety-two completed surveys. One was also received after I had finished analysis and one was received with no numerical coding that was believed to have been printed out after the E-mail. This one was also not included because of the timing of receiving it.
Data Analysis

Univariate Analysis

Gender

Table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender of people within this survey is predominately female. Of the total of 93 respondents, 21 were male and 71 were female. This makes the survey respondents 77.2% female and 22.8% male. Please see the pie chart below, Figure 1.1. The first number on the pie chart label is the frequency, and the second number, the percentage.
Having more women in a survey should not be a surprise, since there are more women at Wittenberg than men, however, this is a much larger number of female than male as can be seen. The data for the whole university is not available, but from this year’s freshman class, there were 326 females and 295 males; this itself is almost 52.5% female (“Wittenberg”). If this is an accurate portrayal of the whole university, then, there are more women here than men, explaining having more women. I wondered whether women were actually more likely to fill out the survey than men.

In a One-proportion t-Test, I explored whether women were more likely to respond than men or men than women. I examined whether women would be more likely to respond than men. Looking at the total beginning number in the sample, 108, there were 71 women that answered the survey. In the test, I examined if the proportion was greater than would be expected with sixty-percent women. The z-value was 1.22 with a p-value of .112. This indicates about an eleven percent change that all things being random, this many women would have answered. It does show a not very significant trend, but indeed a trend, that more women tended to answer the survey than men. The z-value for men for this same test with a test proportion of .4 or 40% was -3.36 with a p-value of 1.00 sowing no significance at all to the number of men answering the survey. This p-value shows that this could be entirely random. This variable is interesting because it does show some trend with more women answering the survey and the larger number of women in general at Wittenberg and in the random sample.
Class Year

### Table 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.8696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.6522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.6522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.6522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.19391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The class sizes at Wittenberg vary as students get older. Once students are older, with an almost seventy percent retention rate for freshmen, it can be assumed that there would be fewer sophomores than freshmen. This trend continues with class sizes getting slightly smaller each year. Juniors also may be abroad since first semester junior year is the time when students typically go abroad. The results by class year can be seen below in Figure 1.2.

### Figure 1.2

**Chart of class year**

- **Freshman**: 35
- **Junior**: 20
- **Senior**: 19
- **Sophomore**: 19

**Class year**

- Count
- Freshman
- Junior
- Senior
- Sophomore
There were almost fifteen percent more freshmen who replied than sophomores, juniors, or seniors as can be seen in Figure 1.2. The unlabeled bar in Figure 1.2 represents couple of the respondents that audit classes or do not have a class year because they may be taking classes for pleasure or another reason. It would seem like freshmen might be more excited to receive a survey or just have more free time to fill out a survey than upperclassmen. This could influence the results since freshmen have just arrived on campus and may not yet have found somewhere to serve if they desire to serve or may be taking time to adjust to their new surroundings. These students are not as familiar with the community if they are from far away.

**Requirement Complete (Whether or not the student has completed the service requirement)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Requirement</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Completed Requirement</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Wittenberg University has a service requirement, this is a variable that needed to be examined because it could change or have an influence upon the final outcome. Not all colleges have a requirement so it is important to see if the requirement has any influence. The outcome could defend the requirement or show no influence. If there is no influence from the requirement on the materialist-postmaterialist score, then the data is representative of more colleges, regardless of whether or not the college has a requirement. This question asked if the student had completed the requirement. Figure
1.3 is a pie chart showing the data. The first number on the pie chart label is the frequency, and the second number, the percentage.

Figure 1.3 shows that about a third of respondents have completed the requirement. Obviously most students who completed this survey have not completed the requirement. This could be influenced by the higher number of freshmen since most freshmen have not had a chance to register for and complete the requirement. Wittenberg recommends that students complete the requirement during their sophomore or junior year. This means that some freshmen and sophomores may have been encouraged to wait to complete the requirement until later in their time at Wittenberg.

Figure 1.4 below shows the breakdown of the requirement completion by class year. It shows a definite large amount of freshman who have not completed the requirement and all of the sophomore have not. This would appear to show the service requirement status as having a strong relationship with class year, especially for the freshmen and sophomores.
Service Outside the Requirement (Does the student do service; If enrolled in requirement, outside of required)

Table 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: Does Service</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: Does Not Do Service or only compulsory service (for the requirement)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question started as an assessment of whether or not students did service in general. Wording was added to indicate that this service should not be for the requirement. This means that those who answered “no” do not do service or may do only compulsory service. I wanted to assess whether or not students did service in general.
The wording appeared a little awkward so the responses may be slightly skewed. Figure 1.5, on the next page, is the pie chart showing that data. The first number on the pie chart label is the frequency, and the second number, the percentage. The unlabeled section is students who did not reply.

**Figure 1.5**

This information in Figure 1.5 shows that about half of the students do non-compulsory community service and half do not, with slightly more students not doing any non-compulsory service.

**Service Hours Done a Month**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) 0-3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 3-6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 6-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 10-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 15-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) 20 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This question assesses the amount of service that students do a month. The way that I worded the question, a low amount of service done a month was grouped with zero. The amounts were done in categories so that students did not have to think of a number and could complete the survey faster. The categories varied in their width to get to twenty hours, at which point the split became 20 and 20 or more. Figure 1.6 below is a bar chart of this data, the bar chart. Figure 1.6 nicely shows the percent of students who fit into each category. The unlabeled section is students who did not reply.

At least half of the students do zero to three hours of service a month. About a quarter of students do three to six hours of service a month. About a quarter of students do any amount of service ranging from six hours to more than twenty hours a month. Figure 1.6 representatively shows these proportions.

Remember from the question of whether students do non-compulsory service that only 47.8 percent of student did non-compulsory service. For a better analysis of which students do zero hours a month of non-compulsory service please see the bivariate analysis.
Materialist-Postmaterialist Scale Question Responses

The questions from Inglehart’s survey that were used in my survey were coded by giving one point to each postmaterialist response regardless of the preference ordering, if the answer was for the first choice or second choice. In the following analysis for each question or group, there are frequency and percentage totals for the question separated by the first and second choice.

In each analysis, the question will appear directly from the survey, followed by a table with the responses and the mathematical analysis.

**Group 1**

Question as it appeared on the survey:

**Group one**

a) Maintaining a high level of economic growth

b) Making sure this country has strong defense forces

c) Seeing that people have more say about how things are done at their jobs and in their communities

d) Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful

e) Don't know

First Choice: ____________________
Second Choice: ____________________
Table 1.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choice</th>
<th>Count as 1ˢᵗ choice</th>
<th>Count as 2ⁿᵈ choice</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Percent Total Response to Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaterialist response</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The twelve-item battery used included 5 postmaterialist responses, 6 materialist responses, and one response that had no connotation either way. As a result, there were only five postmaterialist responses. This question’s postmaterialist response was C. This question had two material responses, A and B. Choice D was a neutral answer choice. On this question, as can be seen in Figure 1.7, more people answered the postmaterialist question as their first choice. The bar chart in Figure 1.7 shows the first choice responses; Figure 1.8, the chart on the right, the second choice responses. In this question, if every person answered completely randomly, it would be expected that one out of four people or twenty-five percent would answer the postmaterialist response. However, the total by first and second choice is much higher than a twenty-five percent. This is shown in Figure 1.7 and 1.8 below where the responses are broken down by type. In this question, there is only the one postmaterialist response, as opposed to two postmaterialist responses in all of the other questions.
Figure 1.7 and Figure 1.8

Group 2

Question as it appeared on the survey:

**Group two**

a) Maintaining order in the nation

b) Giving people more say in important government decisions

c) Fighting rising prices

d) Protecting freedom of speech

e) Don't know

First Choice: ________________

Second Choice: ________________

Table 1.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choice</th>
<th>Count as 1st choice</th>
<th>Count as 2nd choice</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Percent Total Response to Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Postmaterialist response</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Postmaterialist response</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this question, the postmaterialist responses are B and D. The materialist responses were A and C. There is still no differentiation in preference of first or second choice in coding, but it is shown in Table 1.7. The two postmaterialist responses have about an almost equivalent percent that chose that response as the first or second choice. In general, on this question, there was a high percentage of postmaterialist responses; in Table 1.7, sixty-seven percent of the responses are postmaterialist answers. This is considered high because if all was completely random, then the chances for a postmaterialist response would be two out of four or fifty percent. Sixty-seven percent seems a lot higher than fifty percent. Each one of the postmaterialist answers shows some priority tendency amongst respondents through their choices to want a more postmaterialist society. The responses are shown below in a pie chart with the frequency of the response first, followed by the percent. In Figure 1.9 and Figure 1.10, the bar chart on the left shows the first choice responses; the right, the second choice responses.

![Figure 1.9 and Figure 1.10]

Responses to Group One for 1st Choice and 2nd Choice

Percent within all data.
Group 3

Question as it appeared on the survey:

Group three
a) A stable economy

b) Progress toward a less impersonal and more humane society

c) Progress toward a society in which ideas count more than money

d) The fight against crime

e) Don’t know

First Choice: ____________________
Second Choice: ____________________

Table 1.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choice</th>
<th>Count as 1st choice</th>
<th>Count as 2nd choice</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Percent Total Response to Q1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaterialist response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaterialist response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question tended to have a lower percentage overall of postmaterialist answers than the question prior. The postmaterialist answers, as can be seen in the above table, are B and C. The answers tended to be around a twenty-five percent response for each postmaterialist answer. Overall, this means that about fifty percent of the answers
were for both postmaterialist responses. This is about the same as if people had randomly chosen a response. As a result of its lower level of response per postmaterialist answer, twenty-five percent as compared with over thirty percent on the other questions, this question could have bad wording. I wonder if the wording made a difference in this question. This question’s wording can be examined in the appendix as compared with the other questions. This could help to examine which postmaterialist responses had a stronger response. It is not my role to critique each question or stronger items in the battery since these questions have been developed and refined well over time by Ronald Inglehart through his work. In Figure 1.11 and Figure 1.12, the bar chart on the left shows the first choice responses; the right, the second choice responses.

**Figure 1.11 and Figure 1.12**

General Conclusions

From the above analysis of the responses to each question, the strength of postmaterialist responses to each question and each specific item can be seen. There was a stronger response on certain items as compared with others. This can be examined as compared with another study to see specifically where this sample’s priorities lie. 50.5 percent of the total responses were postmaterialist. This in itself is a lot of the responses
considering, not including Don’t know, five of the twelve responses were postmaterialist; seven of the twelve responses were not postmaterialist; including Don’t Know, ten of the fifteen or two thirds of the responses are not the postmaterialist items. In a One-proportion test to see if the choice made was significant or just people arbitrarily and randomly choosing answers, the $z$-score was 4.23 with a $p$-value of 0. The test proportion was $5/12$ or the number of postmaterialist responses/ total responses. This shows that Wittenberg is significantly more postmaterialist and the outcome was not random.

Age

The category of age began in my coding process as a merely numerical listed variable. There are so many traditional college students at Wittenberg that the ages tended to be more in the eighteen to twenty-two range rather than across the whole age range from eighteen to sixty-seven. The median age is twenty, while the ages below the median span two years and those above, or older than, the median span forty-seven years. Figure 1.13 is a dot plot of the ages as they appear before being put into categories.

Figure 1.13

Dotplot of Age of Respondents
This large right-tailed difference led me to decide to group age as categorical. The non-traditional or School of Community Education students (SCE) at Wittenberg are still very important to the population. There are students in classes that are older than this traditional age range of eighteen to twenty-two. The way that this was accounted for was by grouping the ages of eighteen to twenty-two each as their own category with an additional category of older spanning from age twenty-six to age sixty-seven. Table 1.9 below reflects these changes.

**Table 1.9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows the frequency of the respondents’ ages. There are many more nineteen-year-olds and many fewer twenty-two-year-olds than each of the other categories. This could be contributed to the fact that there were a lot more freshmen answering the survey than any other class. The survey was taken early in the year so that there may be few seniors who have already turned twenty-two. Figure 1.14 is a bar chart of the ages by the percentage of the total respondent population.
The categories discussed above, nineteen-year-olds and twenty-two-year-olds, are the categorical extremes having more and fewer, respectively, respondents within them. There are also less SCE students or older students as compared with the other groups. This categorical grouping still shows that 13.04 percent of the respondents were older, non-traditional students.

**Materialist to Postmaterialist Score (M-PM Score)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O: Most materialist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Most postmaterialist</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scores on the Table 1.10 are based on a coding system from zero to five. For each postmaterialist item response the respondent receives one point. Zero is the most materialist, who has responded no postmaterialist responses. Five is the most postmaterialist that has responded choosing all five postmaterialist items. The range from zero to five is important because it does not group all of the people with scores of one through four together as mixed respondent. There is an obvious difference between those who have chosen four of the five items and those who have chosen one. Figure 1.15 is a histogram showing the score distribution.

In Figure 1.15, it is important to consider what would happen if zeros and fives were counted as the defined opinions, materialist and postmaterialist. There are not a lot of zeros and fives considering that these would be the only responses counted. The histogram in Figure 1.15 appears to be negatively skewed with a left tail. This means that the scores are not normally distributed with a center to the right, showing Wittenberg to appear to be leaning more toward postmaterialist values than materialist values. Few Wittenberg students received a score of zero. This leaves the concentration of scores between one through five, showing the concentrated range of the range. The smaller range on this six-group score to being is predominately over five of the six groups.
My Univariate Results versus the 1999-2000 WVS USA

Explanation

The World Values Survey was led by Ronald Inglehart for his research in 1999 to 2000 in the United States. Below are my data side by side with his. There are some differences obviously in his design and data set. Inglehart had a lot more money and time to complete his survey so the sample is more accurate to the population represented. I also used the same Twelve-item post-materialist index that he did; however, he keyed in the zero as materialist and the five as postmaterialist. Finally, his survey was a random survey with the sample of the United States, not just college students, so his ages are on a larger range.

Materialist-Postmaterialist 12-item index score

Figure 1.16

Figure 1.17

---

1 All data used in this section from:
Table 1.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>My Count</th>
<th>My Percent</th>
<th>WVS Count</th>
<th>WVS Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O: Most materialist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Most postmaterialist</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My data:

Mean: 3.054
Median: 3
Standard Deviation: 1.321

WVS Data:

Mean: 2.46
Median: 2
Standard Deviation: 1.198

Figure 1.16 is the data from my study of Wittenberg students. The WVS USA survey results are in Figure 1.17. The results within Table 1.11 displayed are the counts and percentages for my study and the counts and valid percentages for WVS. The valid percentages from WVS exclude the missing responses. Since my survey did not have any missing responses in this scale, I used the data from WVS that excluded their missing responses. Both data sets do not have a lot of zeros, extreme materialists, and appear similar in the range of one to four, mixed responses. However, the peak and center in the
distributions is different. Wittenberg’s center is more postmaterialist with a peak around three and four, while the WVS center is more middling or closer to materialist with a peak at two and three. Wittenberg tends to have more extreme postmaterialists, score of five, than Inglehart’s survey found in a random sample in the United States. This could have to do with the age-range limitations at Wittenberg. If younger people are more postmaterialist, then Wittenberg’s younger sample would be more postmaterialist. This could also be related to Wittenberg’s service requirement.

I did a Two-sample t-Test to test whether Wittenberg students are particularly more postmaterialist than Inglehart’s respondents. This test showed that Wittenberg students are more postmaterialist than Inglehart’s sample. The p-value was .000 with a T-value of 8.06. The difference in means was estimated at 1.054, showing Wittenberg students in general tend to be about 1 point more postmaterialist in this scoring system than Inglehart’s sample. This change can be accounted for with the age difference. I did not examine Inglehart’s average college-age students, but instead his entire population versus my age-limited population.
Figure 1.18 is the data from my study of Wittenberg students. The WVS USA survey results are in Figure 1.19. The obvious difference is that Inglehart’s survey included more ages than mine. The ages of the respondents in my study were concentrated in categories mainly from eighteen to twenty-two, while Inglehart had eighteen to twenty-nine as one of his categories. For future bivariate analysis by age, the numbers from the first age range of Inglehart’s, eighteen to twenty-nine category will be used since only nine people in my study are over that age range.

**Gender**

**Table 1.12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My Count</th>
<th>My Percent</th>
<th>WVS Count</th>
<th>WVS Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The gender split in the WVS survey was equal amongst men and women. In my study at Wittenberg, the split was with 77.2 percent women and 22.8 percent men as displayed in Table 1.12. Inglehart’s data is much closer to the true split of men and women. While at Wittenberg there are more women than men, my study has significantly more women than Wittenberg in general.
Bivariate Analysis of My Survey

Materialism-Postmaterialist score by Gender

Figure 1.20

Table 1.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Done</th>
<th>Two-Sample t-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis: There is no difference in materialist-postmaterialist score by gender. The means across the genders are the same.

Females:
Mean: 3.141
Standard Deviation: 1.222

Males:
Mean: 2.762
Standard Deviation: 1.609

Figure 1.20 shows a difference in the actual placement of the boxes from male to female, but a general overlap of the scores. The above Two-Sample t-Test was done to examine if there is a difference in the materialist-postmaterialist score by gender. This test was chosen because there are only two distinct categories of gender, male and female. The results in Table 1.13 indicate that there is not reason to overturn the null hypothesis for this test. There is not a difference in the scores by gender. Gender tends to have the same distribution of responses over the materialist-postmaterialist score.
There could also be an effect by the distribution of women as more likely to complete the survey while males more randomly chose whether or not to complete the survey, as was seen in the univariate analysis of gender. There were also in general more women in this survey. This is a difficult comparison to make to find a trend because of the sample with so many more women.

**Materialism-Postmaterialist score by Age**

**Figure 1.21**

![Materialist-Postmaterialist Score by Age as a Category](image)

**Table 1.14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Done</th>
<th>One-Way ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis: There is no difference in materialist-postmaterialist score by age. The means across the age categories are the same.
The One-Way ANOVA F-Test was done to see if there is a difference in the materialist-postmaterialist score by age. This test was chosen because there are more than two categories of ages. The p-value in Table 1.14 is not large enough to overturn the null hypothesis. This means that there is not a difference by age. With such a small age range, this is not very surprising, but as students can change quickly in college, I would have expected some change by age. Most surprising is that there is not a large difference between specifically the older students and other categories as can be seen in Figure 1.21. The boxes all tend to have a similar location with a general trend of rising in materialist-postmaterialist score in age, while the ranges all overlap.

**Materialism-Postmaterialist score by Class Year**

Figure 1.22
Table 1.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Done</th>
<th>One-Way ANOVA F-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis: There is no difference in materialist-postmaterialist score based on class year. The means across the class year are the same.

For the purpose of this test, a new set of data was generated without row 21 and 28 of data, which did not have a class year. The One-Way ANOVA F-Test was done to see if there is a difference in the materialist-postmaterialist score by class year. This test was chosen because class year is a categorical variable with four categories. The p-value, in Table 1.15, was low enough to show a definite relationship between class year and materialist-postmaterialist score. The p-value can be explained as the chance that were everything completely random the results could be as extreme as these. P-values range from 0 to 1, similar to 0 percent to 1 or 100 percent. This p-value implies that there is a 1.1 percent chance the results could be as extreme as these randomly. This small of a p-value shows a relationship between two variables. This means that there is a difference between the average materialist-postmaterialist score by class year. Figure 1.23 on the next page is a visual layout of the confidence intervals by class year. The lack of overlap between some class years shows the definite difference.
Figure 1.23 shows how within a 95% confidence interval for the difference between two class years; these are the results from a Tukey Pairwise Comparison. There is a definite difference in the range for two class years, freshmen and senior who do not overlap zero at all. If the confidence interval includes zero, there is a chance the difference could be zero. For freshmen and seniors this is not possible. In terms of the data, this means that there is a definite change in the materialist-postmaterialist scores between freshmen and seniors. As was seen, there is also a large difference in the score if the respondent has completed their service requirement. My model will seek to control and see if the difference in the sample between freshman and seniors is as a result of the fact more seniors will have the requirement than freshmen or the time spent learning and at Wittenberg University those four years.
Materialism-Postmaterialist score by Service Requirement Status

Figure 1.24

Yes means the requirement has been completed.
No means the requirement has not been completed.

Table 1.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Done</th>
<th>Two-Sample t-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>-4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis: There is no difference in the means of the materialist-postmaterialist score based on whether the service requirement has been competed. The means across those who have completed the requirement and those who have not are the same.

A Two-Sample t-Test was chosen for examining whether or not there is a difference in the means of the materialist-postmaterialist score whether the respondent has completed the service requirement. This test could be done because there are only two categories in the categorical variable. The result, as can be seen in Table 1.16, is such a small p-value and large test statistics that the null hypothesis can be overturned. There are different means for the materialist-postmaterialist score across the group who has completed the requirement and the group that has not. The placement of the boxes in
Figure 1.24 also shows this difference. The estimate for the difference is -1.04 with a 95% confidence interval for the difference of -1.53 to -0.54. The confidence interval means that there is ninety-five percent certainty that the materialist-postmaterialist scores of those who have not completed the requirement will be .54 to 1.53 below those score of those who have completed the requirement. There is over .5 to 1.5 point difference between those who have and have not completed the requirement. Those who have completed the requirement have a mean score of 3.742; those who have not, 2.70. On such a small scale, with so few zeros, this leaves five more concentrated points on a six-point scale. This result indicates a large difference in the means. There is a definite connection between the service requirement status and this materialist-postmaterialist score. There is also a connection between class year and materialist-postmaterialist status. The challenge in the model will be to find whether as one ages and moves through the class years at Wittenberg, one becomes more postmaterialist or if one becomes more postmaterialist after completing the requirement. As people move through class years, they would then complete the requirement in larger numbers because of a need to complete it to graduate.

**Materialism-Postmaterialist score by Service Outside Requirement**

*Figure 1.25*

Yes means non-compulsory service is completed. No means no service is done or all service done is compulsory.
Table 1.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Done</th>
<th>Two-Sample t-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis: There is no difference in the means of the materialist-postmaterialist score based on whether or not non-compulsory service completed. The mean materialist-postmaterialist scores across those who complete non-compulsory service and those who do not are the same.

In order to do this test, the two rows (5 and 40) without a response were taken out. A Two-Sample t-Test, refer to Table 1.17, was then done because there are only two categorical groups on the response. Examining Figure 1.25, there does not seem to be a difference in the means of those who do non-compulsory service and those who do not. The large p-value and small test statistic in Table 1.17 show that there is not a difference in the means of the materialist-postmaterialist scores of those who do non-compulsory service and those who do not.

Materialism-Postmaterialist score by Service Hours a Month

![Figure 1.26](image-url)

- Materialist-Postmaterialist Score by Service Hours Complete a Month
  - Categories d, e, and f combined
Table 1.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Done</th>
<th>One-way ANOVA F-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis: There is no difference in the means of the materialist-postmaterialist score based on the amount of service completed a month. The mean materialist-postmaterialist scores across the groups of those who complete different amounts of service a month are the same.

In order to examine the data, the two rows, 5 and 63, without responses to the amount of service completed were removed. Categories for a large amount of service done each month had a small number of responses; these categories, d, e, and f, were all combined. A one-way ANOVA F-Test test was chosen because there are several categories of amounts of service. The test was completed and had a large p-value so the null hypothesis could not be overturned. The results are in Table 1.18 and Figure 1.26. The box plot Figure 1.26, however, does show an interesting thing about this data set; the median of b is 3 exactly, and while there are people who do ‘b’ amount or three to six hours of service with materialist-postmaterialist scores above and below 3, the average sits at 3 and there are very few who are not 3. This in itself is not significant because of the span of the data, but it is very interesting. There are no whiskers for ‘b’ or outliers marked for ‘b’ because they are so far from the median of the distribution and out of the range. This was so unique in looking through the actual numerical data that the dot plot below, Figure 1.27, was generated to show this. Figure 1.26 shows how little variance there is in the materialist-postmaterialist score of those who replied answer ‘b.’
Service Requirement Status by Gender

With so many female respondents and so few male respondent, this is a difficult relationship to examine. When percentages are done for who has completed the requirement and stacked into a bar chart, seventy percent of the area is women, making the result appear very much dominated in both categories, completed and not completed, by women.
Figure 1.28 shows the relationship between those who have completed the service requirement by age. It can be seen that most people who have completed the requirement are older and that no eighteen-year-olds and nineteen-year-olds have completed the requirement. This should not come as a surprise since the requirement is encouraged to be completed during the sophomore or junior year. This analysis shows a definite difference in who, by age, has completed the requirement.
Service Requirement Status by Class Year

Figure 1.29

Figure 1.29 shows the relationship between those who have completed the requirement and their class year. This is interesting to examine after Figure 1.28 because it shows that some people from freshman have completed the requirement, while the youngest age groups had not completed the requirement, as can be seen in Figure 1.28. This could explain slightly how class year had more of a relationship with the materialist-postmaterialist scores since the class years appear in both sections and the age groups are slightly more limited. This allows for freshmen to have completed the requirement. More seniors are seen as having completed the requirement, while in the age bar chart more twenty-one-year-olds had completed than not, but not more older students. It is interesting that no sophomores have completed the requirement while some freshmen have completed the requirement. There is still a trend to complete the requirement as one
rises in class year at Wittenberg as can be seen the juniors and seniors, who had at the start of that academic year, completed the requirement.

**Hours of Service a Month by Age**

Figure 1.30 does not show any relationship between age and amount of service completed. This graph shows people doing ten or more hours of service in almost every age group. This shows a larger percentage in the ages where I had surveyed more students from that age group. This is the only dramatic change.

**Hours of Service a Month by Class Year**

Figure 1.31
Figure 1.31 does not show any true relationship between class year and amount of service completed. However, this graph does show that mostly people in the higher class years do the highest amount of service, 10 or more. This shows perhaps that only older class years do such large amounts of service or some type of relationship between class year and larger amount of service. Compared with Figure 1.30, class year seems to be a more distinguishing characteristic related to amounts of service hours completed a month than age as a category.

**Hours of Service a Month by Service Outside the Requirement**

![Figure 1.32]

Figure 1.32 shows the accuracy of the question about whether people do non-compulsory service. This is done by comparing the response of the amount of service done a month to the question about whether the student does non-compulsory service. The students who said that they did not do service were mostly in the zero to three hours response category, which could be zero. Students who said they did not do service outside the requirement for the most part did not do service overall. There are some
students in ten or more hours category who do service but said they did not do non-compulsory service. It would make sense that these students are in the requirement, which is about two or three hours of service a week or eight to twelve hours. Please note all of these students with ten or more hours combined category were in the ten to fifteen hour category from the survey. Figure 1.32 shows that the question about non-compulsory service, regardless of its confusing and awkward wording, did tend to be fairly valid.

**Bivariate Analysis of WVS Responses [Inglehart’s Data]**

**Post-Materialist Index Score by Age**

Figure 1.33

![Postmaterialist Score by Age](image)

**Table 1.19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Done</th>
<th>One-Way ANOVA F-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>4.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Data Set:
Mean: 2.04
Median: 2
Mode: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-29 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and + years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.33 shows the way the postmaterialist score breaks down over each age group. For this analysis, the age category of eighteen to twenty-nine can be used since most of my study was in that age group. There was not a distinct difference for my data of the postmaterialist score over the means of the different age categories. In Inglehart’s data, there is a significant difference by age in the postmaterialist score. The outcome of the F-Test in Table 1.19 shows that there is a difference in means of the postmaterialist scores in the United States in adults ages eighteen and over across age categories. This can be seen by the significant p-value of the F-Test in Table 1.19. The order tends to make people more materialist as they get older. This can be hypothesized to be true because as people get older they need to be more materialist and personally economically driven, e.g. having to start saving for retirement or caring for family. This changes the concentration of one’s world’s view to one’s family’s immediate needs versus a worldwide view. People who are currently in the older grouping also endured the depression and as a result may tend to have different views about money. Inglehart had a much larger age range and sample than my sample of college students. The crosstabulations for Inglehart’s survey of the postmaterialist score by age are in Table 1.20.
### Table 1.20
**POST-MATERIALIST INDEX 12-item * AGE Recoded (2) Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within AGE Recoded (2)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-29 years</td>
<td>30-49 years</td>
<td>50 and + years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Materialist Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within AGE Recoded (2)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within AGE Recoded (2)</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within AGE Recoded (2)</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within AGE Recoded (2)</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaterialist Count</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within AGE Recoded (2)</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within AGE Recoded (2)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-Materialist Index Score by Gender

**Figure 1.34**

![Postmaterialist Score by Gender](image)
Table 1.21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Done</th>
<th>One-Way ANOVA F-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.34 shows the way that Inglehart’s WVS data break down the postmaterialist score by gender. The One-Way ANOVA F-Test in Table 1.21 shows that gender is not a significant variable for Inglehart in relation to the postmaterialist score. This data spans all ages in Inglehart’s sample, most ages eighteen and over. The ANOVA F-Test’s large p-value shows that in the whole United States there is no difference in the means of postmaterialist scores of males as compared with those of females. The crosstabulations for postmaterialist score by gender are in Table 1.22 below.

Table 1.22: POST-MATERIALIST INDEX 12-item * SEX Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST-MATERIALIST INDEX 12-item</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmaterial</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within SEX</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within SEX</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of my Hypothesis and Model

Assessment of my Hypothesis

Figure 1.35

Scatterplot of m-pm (0-5) score vs midpt of serv a mo.

Figure 1.35 shows a scatterplot for the materialist-postmaterialist score by the service hours done a month. For the service hours done a month, the responses were multiple choice. The midpoint of these multiple choice answers was computed and used as the variable in this computation. Figure 1.35 shows my hypotheses in action. My hypotheses are:

Null hypothesis: There is not a significant relationship between the amounts of service done by people and their score on the materialist to postmaterialist value scale.

Alternative hypothesis: Test for a relationship between the amount of service people do and their scores on the materialist to postmaterialist value scale. My hypothesis is that people who do more service will tend to be more postmaterialist.
Figure 1.35 shows that my null hypothesis is true, there is no significant difference between the amount of service done by people with more materialist or postmaterialist values. In order to prove my alternative hypotheses and disprove my null hypothesis, there would need to be some pattern to the dots in the scatterplot. There is not a pattern.

However, there still was a strong relationship among several factors in my dataset and the materialist-postmaterialist score. This relationship was seen in the data analysis. There was a very significant relationship with having completed the service requirement and class year. The relationship with the materialist post-materialist score is similar to my hypotheses, showing that some service experience, even compulsory service, does positively affect the materialist-postmaterialist score, making the student more postmaterialist. The variable of class year was also related. This logically can follow the pattern that as students advance through their academic careers closer to graduation, they complete the service requirement so that they can graduate.

**Model**

Looking at which variables to use, I decided to try to incorporate the requirement status and class year. In order to make my model, I removed rows 21 and 28 from the worksheet since they do not have a class year. I also followed suit and removed a couple other rows, removing those rows that had any places in which they did not reply. This allowed me to work with the data and make a full model without the problem of empty cells. My first model included class year, service requirement status, service outside requirement, service hours a month, gender, and the following interaction terms for gender: class year*gender, service requirement status*gender, service outside requirement*gender, and service hours a month*gender. It was not possible to do a full
model with interaction terms for all of the data since I kept running out of degrees of freedom. This first large model had no real significant variables because of the number of terms in the model. Since the purpose of the larger model was to test the interaction terms for gender, I looked at each of their p-values. None were significant and gender had not been a significant variable. I had also had problems in my sample with having enough surveys from males and having so many more women. Taking out the gender interaction terms, I worked with the full model without the interaction terms. There were no significant p-values in this model except for the status of the service requirement, which had a p-value of .006. I tried the full model with the interaction terms for class year, but I ran out of degrees of freedom. I then tried each of the interaction terms for class year individually with just a couple variables in that were in the interaction terms with class year. I still had problems with degrees of freedom and the statistics program, Minitab, doing the computations. In looking at the full model, I made a model with just the service requirement status and class year to see what the p-value was after accounting for the service requirement status and then factoring in class year. The p-value for class year in this model was .106 and the service requirement status still had a very small p-value. This shows that, in my sample, it was not the time spent at Wittenberg, but the actual service experience which had the effect upon the materialist-postmaterialist score. Table 1.23 shows the final analysis of variance results for the One-Way ANOVA Test and General ANOVA Test to find the coefficients. Table 1.24 shows the coefficients for the equation.
Table 1.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>service require</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>131.82</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>153.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = 1.238   R-Sq = 14.30%   R-Sq(adj) = 13.31%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Coef</th>
<th>SE Coef</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.2268</td>
<td>0.1404</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service requ no</td>
<td>-0.5319</td>
<td>0.1404</td>
<td>-3.79</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.24

| Require N | Mean | StDev | ---+---------+---------+---------+------|
|-----------|------|-------|     +---------+---------+---------+------|
| status    |      |       |     |        |        |        |       |
| no        | 59   | 2.695 | 1.355 | (------*-----) |       |       |
| yes       | 29   | 3.759 | 0.951 | (--------*--------) |       |       |

---+---------+---------+---------+------
2.50      3.00      3.50      4.00

Pooled StDev = 1.238

The final equation is:

Materialist-postmaterialist score =

3.2268 - 0.5319(service require no)

The ‘service require no’ is those students who have not completed the requirement. This equation has an r-squared of 14.3 percent or 13.31 percent for the r-squared adjusted.

This is all of the equation that could be predicted for with the data that this study collected. This means that students who have competed the requirement tend to be more materialist, along with students who are not sophomores tending to be more postmaterialist. Figure 1.36 below is the normal probability plot of the residuals for this model, the difference between the observed and calculated materialist-postmaterialist...
score. Figure 1.36 shows the residuals are normally distributed and that the assumptions are met to use regression

Figure 1.36
Limitations

There are some limitations to my research. Obviously, I had a limited time span and no funding. This research was done mainly in one semester for my senior thesis. The timing implication made my surveying time limited. I had a limited response to my survey. There were over one hundred people that did not respond to my survey. I must acknowledge the possibility that the people who did not return my survey were materialist. These people could have altered my results significantly; perhaps these randomly selected people did not reply because they were too materialistically attached to their time to fill out the survey. The people who did return the survey also had some characteristics that made them unequally spread out. For example in my data set, there were fifteen percent more freshmen than students of any other class and many more women than men. This could have affected my study or the results in the tendency of women or freshmen to have varying views and leaving men significantly underrepresented. It also made assessing my sample based off the respondents’ gender not possible.
Conclusions and Implications of this Study

Conclusions

From my research, I was able to form a model. I can conclude Wittenberg University students that have done the service requirement tend to have .5 to 1.5 points more postmaterialist values. In general, Wittenberg students are more postmaterialist than Ronald Inglehart’s sample. This could be as a result of the limited age range or that Wittenberg students truly are in general more postmaterialist. My hypothesis failed. The amount of service completed does not have an effect on the materialist-postmaterialist value scoring. However, similar to my hypothesis, I did find that students tend to be more postmaterialist after the requirement. This was in theory close to my hypothesis that doing service could have an affect in fostering postmaterialist values or that those who do service or have done it would be more postmaterialist.

In my theory section, I cited Barry Schwartz who discussed the idea of an understanding truly fostering altruism and this understanding being needed for altruism. Explaining this idea, Schwartz, citing Martin Hoffman’s work, writes that this theory “suggests that altruism has two requirements, one affective and one cognitive. Genuine altruism requires empathy (affective) and perspective taking (cognitive). One’s distress at the distress of another can be direct and immediate” (1993: 321-322). The requirement attempts through reflection and service to foster this understanding. Wittenberg could give students an understanding of the situation of others though the requirement. This idea would explain the postmaterialist ideas associated with those who have completed the requirement.
Suggestions for Future Research

In future research, if I had another opportunity or could suggest to the research of others, I would suggest some changes and improvements upon my research. I would do a larger systematic random sample using information from the university to get the proportions within the university of each class year, gender, and traditional and nontraditional students. This would help to extend the population to which the sample is applicable and have more degrees of freedom with which to model. This sample would also have less possibility of problems in the data set. In order to ensure a response I would offer better incentives to everyone or have a large amount of students, like a junior and senior class help with the research. The students would probably feel comfortable getting friends and acquaintances randomly selected to fill out the survey. I would like to see they survey administered to students before they start the requirement, e.g. at their service requirement orientation, and a few weeks after they have finished the requirement. It would also be interesting to track a group of students who have completed the requirement and follow-up with them four years later, since value change takes four years according to Inglehart (1990:109).

In future research and theory done on based off this topic, I would emphasize Pitirim A. Sorokin, who I discovered late in my research process so that his work is not directly incorporated into my theory review nor my variable operationalization. He had many theories on the connection between altruism and love. In *The Ways and Power of Love*, Sorokin wrote, “Love as psychological experience is ‘altruistic’ by its very nature” (1954: 10). Sorokin also discussed altruism as vital to life and life-extending. In the context of his ideas of altruism, he explained that friendly approaches will yield friendly
responses, making love “contagious” (Sorokin 1954: 58). The very interpretation of altruism as being linked with a need to be altruistic to live and the link to love would allow for further interpretation of altruistic feelings and behavior. Are there parts of the value sets essentially almost essential to have at some point in one’s life? Is giving and caring for others essential? Is giving truly as easily spread as Sorokin implies love is able to be spread? Sorokin, even more specifically than in his theory writings, did work to survey people about their altruistic gestures. In his text, *Altruistic Love*, Sorokin worked with saints and “good neighbors” (1950). Sorokin found these people were happier by doing these deeds “above the minimum of social conduct required by official law” (1950: 77 and 81). He connected this happiness to ideals of love (Sorokin 1950: 13-14). How does the love that Sorokin relates to altruism relate to service? Do people with postmaterialist values tend to have more of love, as defined by Sorokin? In future research, this text could help build theoretically and in operationalization off of the ideas of postmaterialism and altruism.

*Implications*

This study has some very implicit implications. Wittenberg’s service requirement should be commended. If students who have completed the requirement tend to be more postmaterialist, this should be considered by the community service office, the office teaching the requirement. Is this a goal or in some way fostered by the program? Schools similar to Wittenberg University may see a value in developing a service requirement since Wittenberg’s requirement and focus on service have fostered what Schwartz would call an understanding of the social place and experience of others (1993:
Those who have done compulsory service at Wittenberg are more postmaterialist and have an understanding of the situation of others.
Epilogue

After my senior thesis defense, I realized that there were some results that could be interpreted or concluded differently. My thesis leaves a challenge for Inglehart. His theory of a cycle of values for those in society over age eighteen articulates that a full value shift in society takes four years. This could be interpreted differently if my results are significant when done in a similar experiment over time. My results can be expanded to show that almost all Wittenberg students who have completed the requirement have more postmaterialist values than those who do not. In the future, I hope future research will be done to organize surveys with students who are and are not taking the requirement at the beginning and end of a semester. Still, the idea lingers that if those who have completed this requirement have these values and those who have not have others, then the requirement could be significant for value change theories. My results force an analysis of the idea of value change taking such a large amount of time.
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Appendix 1: E-mailed Survey

Dear Participant: Thank you for answering this survey. Below is the informed consent form. Following this is the survey. Please hit reply and answer the questions or copy and paste the survey. Thank you.

Informed Consent:
You have been randomly selected to take this 3 to 5 minute, voluntary survey as a part of the sample of Wittenberg University students. This study is very important to helping determine the connection between values and community service completed. This survey is being used for my senior thesis for Sociology to distinguish whether people with more materialist or postmaterialist values do more community service.

The results of this survey will remain anonymous and confidential. Each person will be coded with a number in the corner so that I can track if you have replied. I will log a reply when I receive it so I can cease contact with that person and enter them in my prize drawing. After the reply is logged, I will tear off the tracking number from the survey corner. The results will be presented at Sociology senior thesis presentations in the spring semester. You may also contact me in the spring semester to receive a copy of my results or discuss my findings.

There is a competition for a PRIZE. After I receive all of the surveys which have been coded with a number for your name, I will randomly select five numbers and five students will receive a FREE gift certificate to Applebee’s for 10 dollars.

By completing and returning this questionnaire, you state that you understand this consent letter and have agreed to contribute your responses. Your help is greatly appreciated. Thank you so much for your time and for making such a difference to my senior thesis research.

Sincerely,
Katherine Westlund

Survey
Please complete this survey to help me in my research for my thesis. Please return this survey to s05.kwestlund or box 2800.

Directions: Please circle or fill in the appropriate answer.

Gender: Male Female

Age: ______________
Year at Wittenberg:  1st year  Sophomore  Junior  Senior  5th year

Have you completed Wittenberg's service requirement?  Yes  No

Do you do community service, outside of the requirement if you are currently enrolled?  Yes  No

How many hours of service do you do a month?
(a) 0-3  (b) 3-6  (c) 6-10  (d) 10-15  (e) 15-20  (f) 20 or more

Directions
For each of the following groups, there are listed some of the goals which different people would give top priority.

Please choose one goal from each group that you, yourself, consider the most important, your first choice, and type the reply (a-d) in the blank at the end of the question.

Please choose the one you, yourself, consider the second most important, your second choice, of the four choices and type the reply (a-d) in the blank at the end of the question.

Group one
a) Maintaining a high level of economic growth
b) Making sure this country has strong defense forces
c) Seeing that people have more say about how things are done at their jobs and in their communities.
d) Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful
e) Don't know

First Choice: ____________________
Second Choice: ____________________

Group two
a) Maintaining order in the nation
b) Giving people more say in important government decisions
c) Fighting rising prices
d) Protecting freedom of speech
e) Don't know

First Choice: ____________________
Second Choice: ____________________

Group three
a) A stable economy
b) Progress toward a less impersonal and more humane society
c) Progress toward a society in which ideas count more than money  
d) The fight against crime  
e) Don’t know  

First Choice: ___________________  
Second Choice: ____________________  

Thank you for you time and filling out this survey. I will notify you if you are the randomly selected prize winner!
Appendix 2: Cover letter sent to Campus Boxes

November 2004

Dear Participant:

You have been randomly selected to take this 3 to 5 minute, voluntary survey as a part of the sample of Wittenberg University students. This study is very important to helping determine the connection between values and community service completed. This survey is being used for my senior thesis for Sociology to distinguish whether people with more materialist or postmaterialist values do more community service.

The results of this survey will remain anonymous and confidential. Each person will be coded with a number in the corner so that I can track if you have replied. I will log a reply when I receive it so I can cease contact with that person and enter them in my prize drawing. After the reply is logged, I will tear off the tracking number from the survey corner. The results will be presented at Sociology senior thesis presentations in the spring semester. You may also contact me in the spring semester to receive a copy of my results or discuss my findings.

There is a competition for a Prize. After I receive all of the surveys which have been coded with a number for your name, I will randomly select five numbers and five students will receive a FREE gift certificate to Applebee’s for 10 dollars.

By completing and returning this questionnaire, you state that you understand this consent letter and have agreed to contribute your responses. Your help is greatly appreciated. Thank you so much for your time and for making such a difference to my senior thesis research.

Sincerely,

Katherine Westlund
Appendix 3: Survey sent to Campus Boxes

Hello. My name is Katie Westlund. You have been randomly selected to take this survey as a part of the sample of Wittenberg University students. It takes 3 to 5 minutes. Please complete this survey to help me in my research for my thesis and return this survey to s05.kwestlund or box 2800.

There is a competition for a PRIZE. After I receive all of the surveys which have been coded with a number for your name, I will randomly select five numbers and five students will receive a FREE gift certificate to Applebee’s for 10 dollars.

Thank you.

Directions: Please circle or fill in the appropriate answer.

Gender: Male Female

Age: _____________

Year at Wittenberg: 1st year Sophomore Junior Senior 5th year student

Have you completed Wittenberg’s service requirement? Yes No

Do you do community service, outside of the requirement if you are currently enrolled?

Yes No

How many hours of service do you do a month?

(a) 0-3 (b) 3-6 (c) 6-10 (d) 10-15 (e) 15-20 (f) 20 or more

Directions

For each of the following groups, there are listed some of the goals which different people would give top priority.

Please choose one goal from each group that you, yourself, consider the most important, your first choice, and write the reply (a-d) in the blank at the end of the question.

Please choose the one you, yourself, consider the second most important, your second choice, of the four choices and write the reply (a-d) in the blank at the end of the question.

Group one
a) Maintaining a high level of economic growth
b) Making sure this country has strong defense forces
c) Seeing that people have more say about how things are done at their jobs and in their communities
d) Trying to make our cities and countryside more beautiful
e) Don’t know

First Choice: ____________________
Second Choice: ____________________

**Group two**
a) Maintaining order in the nation

b) Giving people more say in important government decisions

c) Fighting rising prices

d) Protecting freedom of speech

e) Don't know

First Choice: ____________________
Second Choice: ____________________

**Group three**
a) A stable economy

b) Progress toward a less impersonal and more humane society

c) Progress toward a society in which ideas count more than money

d) The fight against crime

e) Don't know

First Choice: ____________________
Second Choice: ____________________

Thank you for you time and filling out this survey. I will notify you if you are the randomly selected prize winner!