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Resumen: El estudio explora si los valores informados en una muestra de hispanos residentes en Nueva York son similares a los informados en estudios tradicionales latinos, y si se cumple la Teoría del Cambio Intergeneracional de Valores. 445 participantes (57.9% mujeres) informaron en un cuestionario abierto qué valores orientan su vida, distribuidos en tres grupos: jóvenes (N=159), adultos (N=168), y mayores (N=118). Los resultados indican dos tendencias con varias categorías de valores que descienden en importancia y otro grupo que incrementa su importancia para las generaciones más jóvenes, mostrando un efecto asociado a la edad. No se encontró un claro desplazamiento de valores que predice la teoría; los resultados muestran una adaptación parcial de algunos valores latinos donde las personas mayores los conservan y los jóvenes los están cambiando. Los hallazgos se discuten a luz de las limitaciones de un estudio preliminar.  
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Abstract: This study explores whether personal values of a sample of Hispanic residents of New York City are similar to those reported in traditional studies about Latino culture, and if value changes follow the pattern predicted by the theory of Intergenerational Value Change Theory. An open survey instrument, which allows participants to freely disclose and prioritize values, was used to collect data. 445 participants (57.9% women) were categorized into three generational groups: Young (N=159), Adult (N=168), and Senior (N=118). Results show no clear shift in values as predicted by the theory, and partially agree with Hispanic core value studies for the older, but not for the younger generations. Implications and limitations inherent in a preliminary study are discussed.  
Key words: acculturation, familism, individualism, social relations

Ronald Inglehart’s Intergenerational Value Change Theory (IVCT; Abramson & Inglehart, 1995; Inglehart, 1977, 1990, 1997; Inglehart & Welzel, 2005) suggests that individuals with a materialistic values profile would be primarily interested in maintaining physical and economic security, and would incorporate values important for confronting life’s challenges (e.g. work ethic). Alternatively, individuals with a post-materialistic values profile would mainly be concerned with their psychological well-being (e.g. personal happiness). According to Inglehart’s IVCT
predictions, change in post materialistic values would take place, above all, in the youngest generations while the older generations would maintain the values of a modernist personality structure.

Empirical support for this theory comes fundamentally from two mass surveys (World Values Survey and the Eurobarometer Series), which entailed a longitudinal observation of the changes occurring in populations of various countries (e.g. Abramson & Inglehart, 1995; Inglehart, 1977, 1990, 1997). As such, the social sciences field assumes that we are witnessing a shift from classic modernist values (e.g. materialistic values based on achievement) to post-materialistic values, principally based on self-expression (Bauman, 2006; Hunter, 1991; Kasser, 2002; Sennett, 2006; Tranter & Western, 2010).

However, most of the research supporting IVCT comes from studies of entire countries using a macro-analysis perspective, which might fail to reveal the internal dynamics of different communities co-existing within each society. A micro-analytic approach, in which different generations of a particular population are studied, might better reveal the intensity of the change in values (Roales-Nieto, 2009; Roales-Nieto, Preciado, Malespin, & Jiménez-López, in press; Roales-Nieto & Segura, 2010). Using a micro-analytic approach, Jiménez-López, Segura and Lorente-Molina (2012) found that change of values in health sciences and social work students was less intense than predicted by Inglehardt’s theory, with students maintaining mixed profiles of personal values with both a high materialistic and a modernist content. Similar results were found by Jiménez-López et al. (under review) in a study of 369 Nursing students and professionals, divided into three age groups (young, adult and senior). These examples strengthen the hypothesis that micro-analytic studies can yield different results when values are measured in detail, rather than surveyed globally (i.e. macro-analytic studies). As such, it is advantageous to carry out micro-analytic studies to gain a deeper understanding of how values are evolving in groups with varying personal characteristics (e.g. age and ethnicity).

Researchers involved with the IVCT considered the “Hispanic World” to be one of the five largest cultural zones, along with the Anglo-Saxon World, the Catholic-European World, the Protestant-European World and the Confucianism World (see Welzel, 2006). The “Hispanic World” is considered to be a cultural zone with a low predominance of secular-rational and self-expression values, whereas the “Anglo-Saxon World” those values are more predominant. For this reason, studying personal values in multicultural societal contexts, a cultural group with well-established values (e.g. Hispanics) comes in contact with another group (e.g. Anglos), could shed some light into the extent and limitations of the theory of intergenerational value change. In order to begin to understand the evolution of values in a multicultural society, we need to first review the literature on values attributed to United States (U.S.) Hispanics.

Extensive literature in the U.S. has shown that personal values of the Hispanic population differ from those held by the majority of Anglo or White Americans; thus, establishing the concept of Hispanic Core Values, the values most often ascribed to the Hispanic population. For example, Garza and Watts (2010) have noted Familism, Respect, and Personal Relationships as the three most important Hispanic Core Values. Familism values are seen as an extension of the self, producing a sense of obligation to the family; in other words, a set of normative beliefs that emphasize the centrality of the family (Garza & Watts, 2010; Germán, Gonzales, & Dunka, 2009). Respect, as a value, refers to obedience and good behavior in a hierarchical system within families and society (Garza & Watts, 2010). Personal relationships are the behaviors that demonstrate a direct interest in, and concern for others (Garza & Watts, 2010). Familism values are considered most representative of Hispanic culture (Marín & VanOss, 1991; Steidel & Contreras, 2003; Zinn, 1982), and specific scales have been developed and validated to measure them (e.g. Steidel & Contreras, 2003; Villarreal, Blodis, & Widaman, 2005).

A related line of study has classified four principal categories or dimensions of Hispanic Core Values (Cultural Pride, Spiritualism, Familism, and Congeniality), and developed a Latino Values Scale to measure them (Kim, Soliz, Orellana, & Alamilla, 2009). Various studies have indicated that typical Hispanic Core Values are different than those established as typical White American Core Values (e.g. Chandler, 1979; Padilla, 2006; Perez & Padilla, 2000).

Other authors such as Carter, Yeth and Mazzulla (2008) highlight the fact that scholars who write about Hispanic values tend to conceptualize Hispanic Core Values only in comparison to White American Core Values (e.g. Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Romero, Cuellar, & Roberts, 2000; Saetormore, Beneli, & Busch, 1999; Sánchez & King, 1986). As a result, Hispanics are characterized as interdependent, collectivistic, and family-oriented, whereas White Americans are portrayed as independent, individualistic and self-focused. Garza, Falcon and García (1996) discussed the contrast between American and Hispanic Core Values and note that some authors (e.g. Abalos 1986; Caplan 1987) claim that Mexican-American and other Hispanics maintain a communitarian perspective. United States Hispanics have a more humanistic set of Latin American values (e.g. Familism values) that distinguish them from the Anglo mainstream population. In conclusion, Hispanic and non-Hispanic analysts argue that Hispanic Core Values are incompatible with American Core Values such as individualism.

This strong contrast between Hispanic and Anglo values is relevant, because central Hispanic values are seemingly against the trend of change towards post-materialistic values, as predicted by Inglehardt’s IVCT. Hispanic values prioritize interdependence, such as family
unity, honor, friendship, and loyalty above individual needs and goals (e.g. García-Pretó, 1996; Ruiz, 1995; Sue & Sue, 2002), whereas White Americans prioritize independence, personal growth, personal autonomy, struggle to succeed, and initiative (Carter et al., 2008).

Numerous studies have documented the process of acculturation of the Hispanic population in the USA (Berry, 1980). Szapocznik and Kurtines (1980) multidimensional model of acculturation suggests that the most important variable is the amount of time a person has been exposed to the host culture. Furthermore, the most salient variable influencing an individual’s retention of Hispanic cultural characteristics is the degree and availability of community support for the culture of origin. Indeed, there have been many studies supporting the process of acculturation with empirical data (Cuellar, Nyberg, & Maldonado, 1997; Keefe & Padilla, 1987; Pérez & Padilla, 2000; Rosenthal & Feldman, 1992; Rueschenberg & Buriel, 1995).

Studies about personal values usually rely on surveys and scales in which respondents are given a number of preselected values, and are told to select those which most closely resemble their own. While these instruments have been found to be valid and reliable, they may only capture those set of values provided by the researchers. Given the heterogeneity of the Hispanic population, the possibility exist that values, which are not part of the options offered by the researcher’s instrument, might be overlooked. Furthermore, some scales have no room for respondents to write in their own alternative values.

Conversely, this study employs an open format instrument to collect information about the respondents’ most important values. Rather than limiting participants’ responses to a list of standard values, an open format allows participants to generate their own list of values and rank them in level of importance (Roales-Nieto, 2009). There are several benefits derived from using an open format. For example, it diminishes the social desirability effect; it reduces response time; it allows the participants to express personal values in their own words; and it may yield new values which were not included in published surveys/scales. The data from studies using the open format indicate that the change in values is not as pronounced as suggested by studies supporting the IVCT (Jiménez-López et al., under review, 2012; Roales-Nieto, 2009; Roales-Nieto et al., in press; Roales-Nieto & Segura, 2010).

In conjunction with an open format, the present study also employs IVCT’s framework to uncover the values found in three different generations of Hispanics. It is believed that such an approach captures a more comprehensive depiction of values ascribed to a particular culture and generation, and thus detecting changes in a more sensitive way. New York City (NYC) has unique urban and multicultural characteristics making it an ideal setting to analyze the change of values theory. Various cultural groups with clearly established values live together in the same location or in close proximity. NYC has a large Hispanic population of predominantly Dominican, Puerto Rican and Mexican groups, which constitute 2.3 million, or 29.1%, of the city’s total population (US Census Bureau, 2010).

The purpose of the study is twofold: to determine whether personal values reported by a sample of different generations of Hispanics living in New York City are similar to those reported by traditional studies about Hispanics; and to determine if intergenerational differences of values support or contradict Englehart’s IVCT. Thus, by integrating these purposes, the hypothesis is that the values found in the present study may differ from those reported in previous studies of Hispanic values, and that intergenerational differences of values will not be as pronounced as the IVCT predicts.

METHOD

Participants and design

An analytical-transversal study was followed (Kelsey, Thompson, & Evans, 1986) in which five hundred people were discretionally selected from two (Bronx 48.4% and Manhattan with 27.2%) of the five New York City boroughs which have the largest percentage of Hispanic residents (US Census Bureau, 2010). Participants had to meet the following criteria to participate in the study: (1) being of Hispanic origin; (2) residing in the U.S. for a minimum of three years; (3) being 18 years and older; (4) and having Spanish as their lingua mater. Participants were recruited from bilingual educational institutions and Hispanic community centers from Manhattan and the Bronx.

After eliminating incorrectly filled out surveys, 445 participants made up the final sample which was then divided into the following three age groups. A Young Adult Group (YAG) included 159 participants who were between 18-35 years-old; an Adult Group (AG) represented by 168 participants who were between 36 and 59 years old; and a Senior Group (SG) comprised of 118 participants over 60 years old.

Instruments and measures

Personal values were assessed using the Report of Personal Values (RPV), which is an open-ended survey instrument whereby participants can freely write up to 10 values following an orderly and prioritized method (a detailed description of the RPV can be found in Roales-Nieto & Segura, 2010). The RPV contains questions related to
socio-demographic data and four open-ended questions about values (Sections A, B, C & D). In this study, we only used the questions that asked about the most important personal values (Section A).

In Section A, the participant read the following instructions before answering:

“Please write the PERSONAL VALUES that are driving your life. Please list them BY RIGOROUS ORDER OF IMPORTANCE. You may write up to 10. Think of the MOST IMPORTANT VALUES FOR YOU, those that you believe are driving your life and list them in order of importance beginning with number 1.”

The values reported by participants were grouped by functional similarity following the approach developed by Bardi, Calogero and Mullen (2008) as a method of value lexicon construction, considering the word universe as all the values reported by the participants, categorized according to their meaning and function.

Procedure

Participants were told that the data would be treated in a manner that respected the confidentiality and the anonymity of their responses. Each participant was given a copy of the SPV, instructions for completing it, and a statement about the anonymity of the responses and the confidential treatment of data. Participants were reminded to provide their most honest responses. Participants individually answered surveys in the same order, beginning with questions related to socio-demographic data, followed by Section A. Completed surveys were placed in an envelope, sealed, and collected by research assistants. Data were collected during the years 2009-2010.

All values disclosed by participants were grouped into categories according to their meaning and function following Bardi et al. (2008) value lexicon construction method. Consistent with this procedure, values reported by the participants were first classified according to their similarity in content, and then assigned to a value category that grouped items with similar meanings. To minimize lexical ambiguity, context-dependent words with multiple meanings (polysemy) were avoided. The agreement of at least three out of four experts was required to form a category and to assign a reported value into a category.

Data Analysis

Contingency tables with Pearson’s χ² were used to identify statistically significant differences between the reports of personal values and the various socio-demographic variables associated with the three groups of participants. The same statistical method was also employed to identify significant differences in reported values between and within groups.

To better detect the magnitude and direction of change in reported values, standardized residual (SRs) were used to measure the degree to which an observed chi-square cell frequency differs from the value that would be expected on the basis of the null hypothesis. SRs display significant differences between groups, indicating either a positive or a negative direction (higher than +1.96 and -1.96, respectively). The positive sign indicates which groups’ had reported values categories with higher frequency than expected, and the negative sign notes which group’s had reported value categories with lower frequency than expected, thus allowing for greater insight into the nature of the statistical differences observed.

RESULTS

Table 1 displays the socio-demographic characteristics of participants in the final sample, which excluded invalid or incomplete surveys. Of the 445 total sample, there were 159 participants in the YAG (57.9% female) with a mean age of 24.4 (SD= 4.81, range: 18-35 years old); 168 participants in the AG (59.5% female) with a mean age of 44.96 (SD= 6.72, range of 36-59 years old); and 118 participants in the SG (49.2% women) with a mean age of 63.94 (SD= 6.38, range 60-90 years old).

Values disclosed by participants were directly grouped into fourteen resulting categories are shown in Table 2, which includes some examples of the values reported and the categories into which they were assigned.

Statistical analyses indicate that there are no significant differences between the reports of personal values and the different socio-demographic variables associated with the three groups of participants. In other words, sex, education level, social status, and country of birth have no statistical effect on how values are reported by any of the three groups.

The results produced three blocks of reported values (one for each group). The YAG provided a total of 1,025 responses as reported values (M= 5.22; SD= 1.86). The AG provided a total of 735 (M= 4.77; SD= 2.01), and the SG provided 501 (M= 5.06; SD= 1.94). The participants’ responses were grouped into the 14 aforementioned value categories.

A Generational Profile of Personal Values (GPPV) is reported for each of the three groups in Table 3. The GPPV displays the percentage of each group’s personal values in each of the categories. The resulting hierarchy in which the categories appear represents the importance
Table 1. Socio-demographic distribution of the three groups of participants (N= 445)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables of Distribution</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Young Adults Group N = 159</th>
<th>Adult Group N = 168</th>
<th>Senior Group N = 118</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>67 (42.1%)</td>
<td>68 (40.5%)</td>
<td>60 (50.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>92 (57.9%)</td>
<td>100 (59.5%)</td>
<td>58 (49.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>18-90</td>
<td>18-35</td>
<td>36-59</td>
<td>60-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age (Standard Deviation)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24.4 (4.81)</td>
<td>44.96 (6.72)</td>
<td>63.94 (6.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/in Relationship</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Level</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master/Doctorate Level</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Middle</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle &amp; Upper-Middle</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country (Total sample)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central-America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

each group assigned to a value category. The results suggest that values categories are ranked in different order of importance by each age group. It should be noted that the Ethical values appears as the highest priority category for all three groups. Significant differences were not found between the three groups’ reports of ethical values, as they show similar percentages (82.4% for the SG; 82.7% for the AG; and 79.7% for the YAG).

To further assess the magnitude and direction of change in reported values, SRs analyses were performed. SRs show significant differences for two categories in which the SG reported values over the expected frequency, whereas the YAG reported values that were under the expected frequency: Familism values ($\chi^2 = 13.410; p = .001; SR$ for $SG = +2.8; SR$ for $YAG = -3.4$), and Religious values ($\chi^2 = 22.604; p = .000; SR$ for $SG = +3.0; SR$ for $YAG = -4.6$). Two other value categories showed statistical differences resulting in a direction opposite than expected, with the YAG showing a report over the expected frequency, and the SG significantly below the expected frequency for Social Relations values ($\chi^2 = 15.559; p = .000; SR$ for $YAG = +3.3; SR$ for $SG = -3.4$), and Individualism values ($\chi^2 = 34.235; p = .000; SR$ for $YAG = +4.2; SR$ for $SG = -5.5$). Finally, the category Hedonistic values also displayed significant differences between the groups ($\chi^2 = 11.641; p = .003; SR$ for $SG = -3.4$), with not a single participant in the SG stating Hedonistic values as personal values.
Figure 1 clearly shows two main tendencies in the change of values between age groups. A downward trend can be seen in five value categories (Familism, Religious, Work/Professional, Social Order and Universal values), indicating that these value categories decrease in importance with younger participants. Familism values occupy second place in the hierarchy for the AG and SG (79.6% and 64.4% respectively), and are in fourth position for the YAG’s (42.8%), implying a decrease of Familism as a personal value of nearly 50% in young individuals. A similar pattern can be seen in the Religious values category occupying the third position in the hierarchy for the SG (41.5%), and the fifth for AG (35.7%), and dropping to the eighth position in the hierarchy for the YAG, with just 17%.

The second tendency charts an upward trend which can be observed in six value categories (Individualism, Social Relations, Affective, Solidarity, Money and Consumption and Hedonistic values). These values became more important in younger participants, with a marked tendency in the first two categories and with less prominence in the rest. Individualism values category stands out in the ascending order of importance. As shown in Table 3, it occupies seventh place in importance in the SG (29.7%), third place in AG (54.2%), and second place of importance in the YAG (64.8%).

The magnitude and direction of change in reported values can be better illustrated by examining the standardized residuals (SR) in the contingency table showing significant differences between groups. Figure 2 shows the groups’ reports in the categories which resulted in statistically significant differences. A positive direction from the SR indicates a higher-than-expected frequency of a value report and a negative direction implies a lower-than-expected frequency of a value report. The Religious, Personal Welfare and Familism values across generations (from older to younger) show a decline from the report levels of the SG to the YAG (see Figure 2). The same figure shows AG with values reports falling between the two. The same tendency, though in the opposite direction, can be seen for the Individualistic, Social Relations and Hedonistic value categories. These three categories go from being rarely stated by the SG to being frequently mentioned categories in the YAG. Once again, the AG holds a middle position between the groups, and a bit closer to the results of the SG.

Another objective of this study was to determine whether evidence of the acculturation process ascribed...
Table 3. Priority order of values (Generational Profile of Personal Values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior people' personal values (N= 118)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Adults' personal values (N= 168)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Young Adults' personal values (N= 159)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ethical values</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>1. Ethical values</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>1. Ethical values</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Familism values</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>2. Familism values</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>2. Individualism values</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religious values</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>3. Individualism values</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>3. Social relations values</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work &amp; Prof. values</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>4. Social relations values</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>4. Familism values</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social relations values</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>5. Religious values</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>5. Work &amp; Prof. values</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social order values</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>6. Social order values</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>5. Affective values</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Individualism values</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>7. Solidarity values</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>6. Social order</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Affective values</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>7. Work &amp; Prof. values</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7. Solidarity values</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Solidarity values</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>8. Affective values</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>8. Religious values</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Money/consume values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Personal welfare values</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%= percentage of participants that mention some value of each category in these reports of personal values.
Values change in US New York Hispanics

Figure 1. Graphical representation of the main intergenerational change tendencies for personal values, displaying the percentage of participants in each group who mention each value category and if the change is of statistical significance or not. (Note: ***: \(p < .001\); **: \(p < .01\); *: \(p < .05\))

to Hispanics in the U.S. literature is present in an intergenerational sample of NYC residents. A simple way to verify this is to compare the intergenerational development of one of the most emblematic values of the Hispanic population, Familism, with one of the most salient American core values, Individualism. Figure 3 shows Familism decreases in importance amongst the younger generation as Individualism increases in importance.

Figure 2. SR of the categories of variables with statistically significant differences between groups.
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Percentages of Familism values across generations show a downward trend of importance from 64.4% and 79.6% (for SG and AG respectively) to only 42.8% (for YAG). Figure 3 also displays percentages of Individualism values across generations showing an upward trend of increased importance from 29.7% for SG to 64.8% for YAG participants.

Contrasting results illustrate how the priorities of these values have evolved across the two generational extremes (SG and YAG). Although Familism values take priority over those related to Individualism in the SG, Individualism takes priority over Familism for the YAG.

Discussion

The twofold purpose of the study was to explore whether personal values of a sample of Hispanic residents of New York City are similar to those reported in traditional studies about Hispanic culture, and if value changes follow or contradict the pattern predicted by Inglehart’s IVCT (Inglehart, 1977, 1990, 1997, 2008). The study employed an open survey methodology to assess values patterns in said population. The adeptness of this methodology was demonstrated in previous studies with samples of the general public in Spain (Roales-Nieto, 2009; Roales-Nieto & Segura, 2010), Germany (Alonso, Jiménez-López, & García-Vargas, in press) the U.S. (Roales-Nieto et al., in press), as well as studies of specific sectors of populations (e.g. Jiménez-López et al., under review, 2012).

It is believed that the open methodology might have played a role in uncovering a value category, Ethics, reported by each of the three age groups, with no statistical differences across generations. This is a significant finding because previous studies indicate that Ethics are not part of the Hispanic core values, thus confirming the study’s hypothesis that only some of the Hispanic values have been identified. Furthermore, this finding is surprising, because Ethics is seen as central to the Anglo culture.

As stated elsewhere, the open methodology allows participants to provide their own values and rank them by order of importance, as opposed to a closed survey approach in which participants-select values from a researcher’s predetermined list. Given the novelty of an open survey approach, one could argue that value changes detected across three generations of Hispanics are due to measuring effects arising from the use of such methodology. One might question whether the use of a closed methodology, such as Inglehardt’s surveys, would uncover a similar pattern of values across generations of Hispanics sub-groups. To address this possible limitation, studies are needed to compare the value profiles generated by both methodologies across different generations of Hispanic sub-groups. Further studies should use both methodologies with diverse samples of said population.

Intergenerational profiles might be a useful tool to detect changes in how values are expressed, or changes in their order of importance across well-defined age groups. One of the contributions of this study is the use of the IVCT’s framework to capture a more comprehensive depiction of values ascribed to U.S. Hispanics. Indeed, this approach was likely responsible for exposing how values are changing across generational groups. Findings show intergenerational differences from the second category of personal values hierarchy onwards for each generation. Specifically, for the AG and SG Familism was predominant and for the YAG Individualism was the predominant value. These differences also showed a downward trend for traditional Hispanic values such as Religious and Familism among the younger generations. The YAG cherished aspects such as friendship, companionship, or being part of a group (i.e., Social Relations) above family relationships (i.e., Familism), which is something does not occur in adults or older Hispanic generations. Finally, another sign...
of intergenerational change was the small, but significant percentage of the AG (8.9%) and the YAG (9.4) which stated Hedonistic values as personal values, something which was not reported by the SG.

The generational profile of the youngest generation (YAG) displays a hierarchy, a mix of five traditional values and five categories considered by the theory of Social change to be post-materialistic. These results indicate that IVCT’s predictions (a shift in personal values in the younger generations) are partially fulfilled among the Hispanic population living in one of the cities at the forefront of Social change. This supports our hypothesis that differences in values will not be as pronounced as the intergenerational values theory predicts.

Although the Dominican population constitutes only 3% of the US Hispanic Population (Motel & Patten, 2012), given that most of the participants in our convenient sample identified themselves as Dominican and that all participants came from an urban enclave, one should exercise restraint when generalizing these findings to other sub-groups (e.g. Mexicans) and to other geographical regions (e.g. west coast & rural areas). Most studies about familism or other Hispanic values have focused on Mexican samples (e.g. Smith-Morris, Morales-Campos, Castañeda, & Turner, 2013), and have neglected Dominicans. As such, we believe that our study contributes to the body of knowledge by offering a snapshot of the values of an understudied and significant population of New York City, Dominicans (Araujo, 2009).

Another objective of this study was to examine the acculturation process by comparing the intergenerational development of Hispanic and American Core Values, Familism and Individualism respectively. Overall, results suggest that although Familism values are present in older generations of Hispanics, they are dissipating in younger generations as they acquire the characteristics of the host culture (Figure 3). Furthermore, Individualism, a central Anglo value, is twice as prevalent in younger than older Hispanics, who tend to hold on to traditional values. Data show the progressive adoption of Individualism, one of the most typical American Core Values, by the younger Hispanic generations. Perhaps this is a social adaptation to living in a competitive social environment such as NYC. Despite the preliminary nature of the study, results seem to support the acculturation process among the younger generation of mostly Dominican Hispanics.

An alternative hypothesis to explicate the loss of Familism and the gain of Individualism among the younger generations of Hispanics attributes the shift in values to language preference (all participants in the study completed the surveys in Spanish). Studies have shown that Spanish dominant Hispanics are more likely to identify with traditional values than English dominant ones (Pew, 2005). Indeed, this study confirms a traditional Hispanic values profile for the older generations, but it also demonstrates that younger generations of predominantly Spanish speakers are changing their values profile to reflect Anglo, rather than traditional Hispanic culture. To overcome this potential limitation, our group is planning to replicate this study with distinct generations of English and Spanish dominant Hispanic subgroups. Consistent with latest research trends (Pearson, Garvin, Ford, & Balluz, 2010), participants would be given the option to choose the language of choice. Such study would better delineate the role of language on the evolution of values among distinct generations of Hispanics.

To summarize, the results partially support the theory of intergenerational value change in a Hispanic population sample of a large cosmopolitan American city. Perhaps changes in the priority of personal values between generations reflect a partial acculturation process in the younger populations. However, this partial acculturation was also observed in older groups which show a mix of values inconsistent with traditional studies of Hispanic core values.

In conclusion, the results from this preliminary study differ from those typically seen in research that employs restricted responses and macro-analytic approaches to study values. The study’s methodological features allow participants to freely express and rank their personal values in order of importance. Such an approach produces distinct generational profiles, which enables researchers to gain a better understanding of cultures and demographic groups co-existing in many societies. Nonetheless, further replication of the study’s methodology with stratified random samples of Hispanic subgroups might be a necessary step before reaching conclusions about its implications.
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