

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology

Psychology, Department of

1997

Morality and Change: Family Unity and Paternal Authority among Kipsigis and Abaluyia Elders and Students.

Carolyn P. Edwards

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, cedwards1@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/psychfacpub>

Edwards, Carolyn P., "Morality and Change: Family Unity and Paternal Authority among Kipsigis and Abaluyia Elders and Students." (1997). *Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology*. 610.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/psychfacpub/610>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, Department of Psychology by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

3

Morality and Change: Family Unity and Paternal Authority among Kipsigis and Abaluyia Elders and Students

Carolyn Pope Edwards

Periods of rapid social and economic change entail dramatic transformations of value systems and priorities. In Kenya, as elsewhere, urbanization, industrialization, formal education, and rapid population growth have stressed traditional systems of shared family management and support that were historically integral to the social fabric (Kilbride & Kilbride, this volume; Bradley, this volume). It is equally apparent, however, that the core cultural values—the system that Weisner (this volume) calls “socially distributed family nurturance”—have not gone away. As this volume amply documents, for example, norms of respect for elders still prevail in Tiriki (Sangree this volume), norms of helping the aged in Samia (Cattell, this volume), and norms supporting high fertility and large family size in Kericho (Suda, 1992).

How best, then, to look and listen for inevitable changes in values controlling kinship relations? How can we hear whether the central themes of family morality, such as “respect,” “harmony,” and “unity” in Kenya, have been eroded or replaced by economic, educational, and demographic change? And then how to determine the implications of the findings for social policy? The questions may be more complicated than they seem. For example, many in Kenya today are worried about the seemingly increasing numbers of socially isolated, poverty-stricken old people in rural communities (e.g., Cox with Mberia, 1977). But are the traditional obligations of caring for elder parents actually changing? Instead, it could be that the appearance of increased numbers of aged poor is simply a by-product of population increase and longevity, without either the values or the underlying patterns of help-giving having changed at all. Or, alternatively, it could be that the numbers of elderly poor do reflect changes in patterns of help-giving behavior, but that these changes may be the result, not of weakening values regarding care for the old, but rather of changing residential patterns and competing financial obligations facing adults who have both elderly parents and children in school. The an-

swers have practical significance. With regard to obligations to care for elderly parents, for example, if the underlying values regarding care for aged parents are actually weakening or changing, then the solution would be to provide new systems of societal assistance to fill that gap; on the other hand, if the values are still intact but merely losing out to higher priorities, then the solution would be to find ways to assist the younger generation to continue to fulfill obligations that they still recognize as valid. To tackle contemporary social problems best, then, it is critical to know how people today understand and cope with their multiple and sometimes conflicting role obligations.

Yet studies of value change rarely permit a close look at how individuals use and understand key moral concepts involving role relations and obligations. Instead, studies more often involve comparisons of behavioral indicators such as owning or using modern consumer goods, obtaining a certain level of education, or holding a certain kind of job. Household studies allow close examination of the actual help and resources exchanged between target individuals, such as elderly parents and their children. Or, if the focus is on espoused values, then value priorities and shared perspectives may become the issue. Parents may be asked to list what values they wish to promote in their children, or case-study informants may be asked to reflect on the changes they have seen in their lifetimes (e.g., Davison, 1989). Alternatively, survey techniques may be employed to assess people's value priorities, with possibilities of larger sample size and more complex statistical treatment of the data. For instance, subjects may be asked to identify or describe themselves by completing sentence stems such as "I am _____," or to rate or rank order statements chosen to represent different value positions or goals (e.g., Rokeach & Ball-Rokeach, 1989; Triandis, 1989; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui 1990).

Yet all of these techniques have in common that they assume we know what informants mean when they use moral words. The survey methods, for instance, assume that all respondents understand more or less the same thing when they rate statements such as "A wife should respect and obey her husband" or "The young owe obedience and care to the old," as if there were a universally agreed upon meaning within a society or community for moral terms such as "respect," "obedience," and "care." Instead, as this chapter will show, individuals' understandings of key moral terms may be overlapping enough for them to communicate and dispute with one another but still show important distinctions that deeply affect what they mean to say. It is in the way that informants weave different concepts together into a fabric of an argument—rather than the way they respond to isolated statements taken out of context—that best reveals their underlying explanatory system.

This chapter will examine the underlying concepts of paternal authority and family unity and understanding put forward by Kipsigis and Abaluyia men engaging in discussion of moral dilemmas focused on family roles. It presents thematic and statistical analyses of the values of paternal authority, as put forward by representatives of two generations of rural Kipsigis and Abaluyia men. The work rests on a reanalysis of interview data originally collected in 1972–1973 to test the

cross-cultural validity of a cognitive-structuralist stage theory of moral development (cf. Edwards, 1974, 1975, 1978, 1979, 1982, 1985, 1986; Harkness, Edwards, & Super 1981; Snarey, 1985). For this study, Kenyan informants of several different language groups and age and education levels were individually interviewed using a series of hypothetical moral dilemmas, requiring them not only to make decisions but also to justify why they thought one or another decision to be right. All of the moral dilemmas contained story characters related by kinship; in answering the probing questions, the informants provided insight not only into the complexity of their moral judging processes but also into their core moral values regarding parent-child and husband-wife roles and obligations. Reviewing this material now in the light of issues concerning the changing family in contemporary Western Kenya, it is striking to see how active the informants were in interpreting the changing nature of Kenyan society and values, as well as how individualized and personalized their responses were. The data, though readily scorable in terms of Lawrence Kohlberg's six stages of moral judgment, nevertheless also contain rich information about the informants' moral understanding that was never captured by the moral-stage system that rated informants on a scale from one to six.

In the first section of the chapter, the men's values are described. Within each subgroup of informants, orientation toward paternal authority is summarized—starting from those men most strongly oriented to hierarchical authority and going to those least so. It is seen that within subgroups there is a substantial range and variation of moral orientations toward authority. In addition, across subgroups there are certain general, though subtle, differences between the Kipsisis and Abaluyia informants in their typical way of talking about paternal authority, and these will be described. Quotations are used to convey precisely the meanings put forward by the men.

Underlying this thematic analysis is a cognitivist perspective on values as elements of cultural meaning systems. According to this theoretical framework, culture is conceived to consist of *learned and shared systems of understanding, communicated primarily through natural language* (D'Andrade 1992). Put another way, culture is "chunked" into meaningful packages of knowledge, "schemas," that allow a person to accomplish four critical tasks: construct an individualized mental reality, respond affectively to events and experiences, make behavioral choices, and communicate and interact with others. In constructing a moral meaning system, individuals creatively draw elements from the culture around them, actively make selections among the alternative ideas available, and may even introduce revisions. Therefore, theories are needed to explain why different individuals make the choices they do and how cultural meaning systems evolve over time through repackagings of old elements and introductions of new ones. In order to construct such theories, social scientists must make use of texts from formal interviews or naturalistic conversations and then link that content to information about the backgrounds and experiences of informants and the general social context. The moral judgment interviews analyzed in this paper offer an example of such a body of texts.

Following the thematic analysis, a correlational analysis is presented to address the individual differences in informants' orientations to authority. Given the obvious variation that is seen in the texts, the question arises, Are the individual differences at all related to such general factors as ethnic group, social position, age, education, and religion—factors that may be associated with degree of modernization and hence be expected to relate to attitudes toward traditional values? It was hypothesized that (1) older and (2) less schooled subjects would be found to be more likely to advocate traditional strong paternal authority than those informants who were younger and more educated. Similarly, (3) religious traditionalists (non-Christians) were expected to be more authority-oriented than Christians; and among Christians, Roman Catholics were expected to advocate more strongly traditional authority than the members of Protestant denominations (in accordance with Munroe and Munroe's [1986] finding that Protestant Logoli schoolchildren were more individualistic than Roman Catholics). Between Kipsigis and Abaluyia, no differences were predicted *a priori* other than those that might co-occur with differences in education and religion, since in both groups traditional family patterns have involved public emphasis on status hierarchies based on age and sex (LeVine, 1973), including such beliefs as that old men and women may curse their adult children when grossly neglected by them (Saltman, 1977; Wagner, 1949). (For maternal-child relations, see Super & Harkness, this volume; Weisner, this volume; Whiting & Edwards, 1988). To undertake this correlational analysis, informants' overall orientation to paternal authority was indexed using the dichotomous choice ("yes/no" type) questions from the moral dilemma interviews.

SAMPLE AND METHODOLOGY

In 1972–1973, forty-seven males and fourteen females living in seven communities in the Central and Western provinces of Kenya were interviewed (Edwards, 1975). These subjects belonged to five different ethnic groups (Kikuyu, Meru, Kipsigis, Abaluyia, and Ismaili). The Kipsigis and Abaluyia will be the focus of this paper.

Seven University of Nairobi students served as the staff of interviewers. The students, upper level majors in the social sciences, participated in a training seminar where they mastered the technique of Piagetian clinical interviewing, whose goal is to find out not only what the interviewer believes to be right but also the structure of the reasons behind that deliberative choice. During the December school holidays, the student interviewers headed home and conducted interviews with subjects of their own ethnic group. The interviewers selected as informants both adults residing in their local area and secondary students also home for vacation. The Kipsigis interviewer went to Sigor Location, fifty miles from Kericho. The two Abaluyia interviewers went to North Wanga Location, fifty miles from Kisumu, and Idakho Location, twelve miles from Kakamega.

The adult informants they selected were all community leaders, that is, persons considered "moral leaders" in their locales. They had reputations as responsible

and honest citizens noted for giving sound and wise advice and counsel. Most of them were officers or members of local civic organizations or church groups; some were also holders of local political office. About half were nonschooled, the others had some primary education. Most were peasant farmers, though other occupations represented were schoolteacher, trader, shopkeeper, and mason. They identified themselves as traditionalists (non-Christians), Roman Catholics, and members of various Protestant denominations (Anglican, Church of God, Salvation Army, African Inland Church, African Gospel Church). The secondary school informants, in contrast, were intended to provide a comparison group to the community leaders. They were on the whole younger and more educated than the community leaders; their interviews offer a sampling of the moral thought and values of the "new generation" in the communities. They ranged from Form 1 to Form 5; most were attending school in Western Province. The majority of the students identified themselves as Roman Catholics. Although the university interviewers were instructed to collect data on both male and female subjects equally, they had much more success recruiting male subjects. Accordingly, the qualitative analysis to follow will consider the data from males only, since there were too few female interviews to permit balanced comparison. (However, the women's data are included in the quantitative analysis.) This male sample includes a total of twenty-five individuals: six Kipsigis community adults (aged thirty-two to seventy-five); five Kipsigis secondary students (aged twenty to twenty-seven); eight Abaluyia community adults (aged thirty-six to seventy-two); and six Abaluyia secondary students (aged seventeen to twenty).

All of the interviewers were equipped with tape recorders to record their interviews, which lasted from one to two hours each. The interviewers had previously translated the moral dilemmas and probing questions into their own home language, and they conducted the community adult interviews in that language. They interviewed the secondary school students either in that same language or in English, whichever the informant preferred. The interviews were later transcribed in full and translated into English by the students at the University of Nairobi.

The interviewers told informants the purpose of the research was to understand their ideas of right and wrong by having them discuss some hypothetical moral dilemmas with no right or wrong answers. Four hypothetical dilemmas were used, three of which had been drawn directly from the work of Kohlberg (Kohlberg, 1981, 1984; Kohlberg, Levine, & Hower, 1983) but adapted in minor details to suit the Kenyan setting (cf. reviews in Edwards, 1979, 1982, 1985, 1986; Snarey, 1985). The fourth dilemma, similar in format but entirely new and especially tailored to Kenyan core values, grew out of the intensive discussions conducted in the training seminar.

Of the four dilemmas, two proved best in eliciting familial values and will be the subject of this paper: "Daniel and the School Fees" (developed in the training seminar) and "James and the Nairobi Show" (adapted from Kohlberg). These dilemmas are presented in Table 3.1. Note that both dilemmas involve authority and obedience issues between a father and a son: "Daniel and the School Fees" focus-

Table 3.1
Two Moral Dilemmas

Moral Dilemma 1: Daniel and the School Fees

A man, Daniel, managed to complete his secondary school education (Form 4) on the basis of school fees given him by his brother. Afterwards he married and took his wife to live with his parents in the rural area, while he got a job in the city. Eight years later, when his first son was ready to go to primary school, his mother and father came to him and said, "Your brother who educated you has been in an accident and cannot work, so you must begin to pay for the education of your brother's child." This child was the same age as his own son. The man, Daniel, did not have enough money to pay school fees for both his own son and his brother's child. His wife said he must put his own son first.

Questions

1. What should Daniel do in this situation? Should he put his son or his brother's child first? Why?
2. What obligation does he have to his brother who educated him?
3. What does he owe his son?
4. Should he obey his parents in this case? Do you think a grown son has to obey all of his parents' wishes? Why, or why not?
5. What should a grown son do for his parents?
6. Is it more important to maintain harmonious relations with his wife or his brother and parents? Why?
7. Would you condemn Daniel if he just moved his wife and children to the city and did not pay for the education of his nephew? Why or why not?
8. Would you yourself expect your eldest children to help their younger brothers and sisters with school fees? Why, or why not?

Moral Dilemma 2: James and the Nairobi Show

James is a 14-year-old boy who wanted to go to the Nairobi Show very much. His father promised him that he could go if he saved up the money himself. So James worked hard and saved up the shillings it cost to go to the Show, and a little more besides in case he saw something at the Show he wanted to eat or drink or buy to take home. But just before the Show was going to start, his father changed his mind. Some of his father's friends decided to go to town to drink beer, and James' father was short of money. So he told James to give him the money he had saved. James did not want to give up going to the Nairobi Show, so he thought of refusing to give his father the money.

Questions

1. Should James refuse to give his father the money? Why or why not?
2. What is the best reason you can think of to justify James' refusing to give his father the money?
3. What is the best reason you can think of to justify James' giving his father the money?
4. Who actually has the right to the money, the son or the father? Why?

Table 3.1 (continued)

5. Does the father have the authority to tell the son what to do in a case like this? Why? What should be the authority of a father over a son, in general? At what age does this authority grow less? Why at that age? Why is it good for a father to have this authority over a young son?
6. What does a son owe his father in a case like this? Why is it good for a son to obey his father most of the time? Can you think of specific examples where a son does not have to do what his father says?
7. Whose conduct in the story was unfair? Why was it unfair?
8. Why should a promise be kept, by anyone? Why is it important for people to keep their promises? What would the community be like if people did not keep their word?
9. What effect does it have on a son if his father breaks promises to him? In the case of this story, what effect will it have on James? 10. Would a good father, a respected man in the community, do to his son what James' father did in this story; that is, promise him he could go to the Show if he earned the money, and then change his mind? What effect does it have on a father if his son breaks a promise to his father?
10. Would a good father, a respected man in the community, do to his son what James' father did in this story; that is, promise him he could go to the Show if he earned the money, and then change his mind? What effect does it have on a father if his son breaks a promise to his father?
11. If a son breaks a promise to his father, is that better or worse or just the same than if a father breaks a promise to a son? Why?

es on a grown son and his conflicting role obligations to his various close relatives, while "James and the Nairobi Show" involves an adolescent son's relationship to his father.

Table 3.2 presents a capsule summary of the background information of the twenty-five men, in the order in which they are mentioned in the following discussion. Table 3.3 presents the sides they took on five key questions: (1) Should Daniel pay school fees for his son or his nephew? (2) Should Daniel prefer harmony with his wife or with his parents? (3) Should a grown son obey his parents? (4) Should James give his father the money he earned himself or refuse? (5) Does James's father have the authority to ask for that money in this situation?

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Thematic Analysis of the Texts

Concepts of the Kipsigis community leaders. As a group the Kipsigis community leaders were strongly concerned with intergenerational family unity and interdependence and with upholding the authority of the male head of household. The core value of "respect" was variously used by men to include such meanings as to fulfill one's role obligations; to reciprocate; to obey parental commands, advice, or requests; to treat aged parents generously; to receive discipline from el-

Table 3.2
Description of Informants (in Order of Mention)

Case No.	Age	Highest Year of Schooling	Occupation	Religion	Marriage Type
Kipsigis Elders					
K1	45	Standard 3	manual worker (school)	traditional	polygynous
K2	54	0	farmer	traditional	monogamous
K3	48	0	farmer & shopkeeper	African Gospel Church	polygynous
K4	55	Standard 3	agricultural assistant	African Inland Church	monogamous
K5	32	Standard 4	mason	African Gospel Church	monogamous
K6	75	0	farmer & subchief	African Inland Church	polygynous
Kipsigis Students					
K7	20	Form 2	secondary student	Roman Catholic	not married
K8	20	Form 1	secondary student	Roman Catholic	not married
K9	22	Form 5	secondary student	Roman Catholic	not married
K10	22	Form 5	secondary student	African Gospel Church	not married
K11	27	Form 2	secondary student	Roman Catholic	<i>not married</i>

Case No.	Age	Highest Year of Schooling	Occupation	Religion	Marriage Type
<i>Abaluyia Elders</i>					
A1	50	Standard 2	farmer	Roman Catholic	monogamous
A2	43	Standard 6	farmer	Roman Catholic	polygynous
A3	52	Standard 4	trader	Roman Catholic	monogamous
A4	36	Standard 7	primary teacher	Anglican	monogamous
A5	53	0	farmer	Church of God	monogamous
A6	36	Standard 7	primary teacher	Roman Catholic	monogamous
A7	72	0	farmer	Church of God	monogamous
A8	51	Standard 4	farmer	Salvation Army	polygynous
<i>Abaluyia Students</i>					
A9	18	Form 4	secondary student	Roman Catholic	not married
A10	19	Form 3	secondary student	Roman Catholic	not married
A11	19	Form 3	secondary student	Roman Catholic	not married
A12	17	Form 2	secondary student	Roman Catholic	not married
A13	20	Form 3	secondary student	Church of God	not married
A14	20	Form 4	secondary student	Roman Catholic	not married

ders; and to treat subordinates well, listening to their advice and ruling them by peaceful means. They evidenced a strong sense of moral reciprocity. They were much more likely than the other groups in the sample to refer to community elders, or old men, as a moral reference group. They were also most likely to name as a moral motivating force the paternal sanctions of blessing, cursing, and repudiating. Four of the six said it would be more important for a man to maintain harmony with his parents and brother than with his wife; two even spoke of the wife as a potentially divisive force in the father-son relationship. While they strongly believed that economic progress and the means to a "good life" come through members of the family helping one another over time, they also believed a man should become "self-reliant." One man even suggested that a father wants his son to leave the father's land at adulthood and clear the way for younger siblings.

Case K1, a farmer with three years of education and one of the two non-Christians, said that Daniel should educate his nephew first, in order to maintain "love and peace" with his brother and out of reciprocity: He would not have "become economically strong" if his brother had not helped him. When asked what Daniel owes his son, this man was unique in saying, "Nothing in particular, in terms of school fees." He clearly stood for the authority of the elder generation and the solidarity of the patrilineal line, achieved through harmonious feelings and cooperative exchanges. He spoke of both paternal sanctions: the sanction of cursing his son, thereby ruining his material prosperity, and the sanction of repudiating the son and "leaving him aside." He saw the wife as introducing a divisive element into the father-son relationship.

A grown son should obey [all his parents' wishes] because parents are the elderly people who have had a long time experience and knowledge about the world. When the son is faced with a problem, his parents will help him, and this therefore calls for obedience.

[What should a grown son do for his parents?] A grown son should help his parents in any activities that are being done at home, such as farming.

[Is it more important for Daniel to have harmonious relations with his brother and parents or with his wife?] It is more important to maintain harmonious relations with his brother and parents because they can be able to work hand in hand. They can do *Harambee* ['pull together' in a self-help group]. If we leave our parents alone, they can spoil and curse us, because we have developed rudeness. One has a different relationship with a wife than with parents: In a family a man must do everything through force or against the wife's resistance, indicating he is not on such good terms with his wife; but when a man visits his parents, there is always peace.

Similarly, for the James dilemma, Case K1 argued that James cannot refuse his father and risk losing his blessings. The father has authority in James' situation because "If you don't have any authority over your son, then things will never work out well. Your son may not even help you if you don't have authority over him."

...There is no occasion when the son should disobey his father. When you can't do anything about the rudeness of your son, then you have to just leave him aside."

The son should love and obey his father because of what the father has done for him. This obedience continues up until the son is about eighteen, "when the son can work for himself and become self-reliant." But note: the father-son respect relationship is not one-way, it is reciprocal: "The son should obey his father, and the father should obey his son. If my son shows me respect, then I have to show him respect also. I don't want my son to respect me, while I can't reciprocate."

The other religious traditionalist, Case K2, was an unschooled man of fifty-four years. Like Case K1, this man argued that Daniel should educate his nephew before his own son out of a feeling of reciprocity, "because his brother educated him. And then his brother's children will also in future take care of his children. They will educate his children." But Daniel should under no circumstances abandon his son in terms of his monetary obligation, paying the son's brideprice, lest his son become proud and ungenerous towards his father. "[What does he owe his son?] Daniel should pay the brideprice of his son. . . . Even if the son could pay his own brideprice, the father should still contribute; otherwise the son will say, 'Why did you not help me?' If you let your son pay his own brideprice, he will be proud and say, 'I paid the brideprice by myself, without your help.'"

Case K2 said that a grown son should obey all of his parents' wishes, again for the sake of reciprocity: so that his own children will obey him to the same degree. The son should buy clothes and build a house for his parents, which will secure their blessings. When asked whether it is more important to maintain harmony with wife or parents, he placed parents first: "After developing a good relation with my parents, I will go and teach my wife that we should develop harmonious relations to the same degree. I give priority to my parents, because they are my parents. My wife takes the second priority."

Yet, in answering the James dilemma, this man said James should refuse his father because "his father made a mistake" by instructing his son to work, then seeking his money. "The father should tell his friends he has no money." But Case K2 also believed that James's father does have the authority to ask for the money: "If you are my son, I can tell you what I want you to do," and furthermore, "The son wants to respect his parents." The father's authority does not become less until the son has married, at about twenty years of age, and is considered an adult with his own family responsibilities. At this point the son's formal status in society changes: "He develops his own family authority and begins to issue instructions to his children. He also comes into the category of older people."

The community leader with strongest ideas about how a father must encourage his sons to strike out on their own was Case K3, a forty-eight-year-old, non-schooled farmer and shopkeeper, member of the African Gospel Church. He considered Daniel's repaying his debt to his brother a matter of "respect."

Daniel should show great respect to his brother, because he was the one who brought him

into a good position where he can see what is good for himself. The education he has received is the key to his success. . . . Daniel should not think of himself only.

[Does a grown son have to obey his parents?] Yes, a grown son should obey all of his parents' wishes. If your parents have done something good for you, then you must show them respect and obedience. You should build them a house and provide them with food and clothing.

When asked whether it is more important to maintain harmonious relations with wife or parents, he placed the wife first. This was not, however, because he favored separation or autonomy of the husband-wife unit but because he saw the husband-wife relationship as the source of harmonious extended family relations.

When the husband and wife have harmonious relations, then a harmonious chain of good relations can develop among the siblings and parents too. The good relationship between husband and wife is a stepping stone. Marriage ties make a husband and wife united as one. . . . The two of them develop good relationships toward their parents. You understand your parents when both of you understand each other.

This man's concern with proper respect for parents was also seen in his answers to the James dilemma, where he took the position that the father had the right to the money because in instructing James to work and earn, the father was actually teaching him self-reliance. He had a great deal to say about the father-son relationship:

[Does the father have the authority to tell the son what to do in a case like James's?] Yes, more fathers at present tell their son to do so. Even in the past, a father would tell his son, "I will no longer buy any cloth for you. You are now able to buy it for yourself. You can be employed in a farm to drive the oxen, or go to the White Highlands to pick pyrethrum, or you can go to the tea estates to pluck tea, to get the money for your cloth. You are a grown-up person; give me a chance to look after the younger ones. . . ." Your father tells you these words so that you can know that you are a grown up person and you should look for your own property. This is another way of teaching. Your father loves you when you have a job, but if you are not employed and are with him most of the time and causing some disturbance, then he can't have any love for you. . . . Your father will think that you are not able to think ahead.

[At what age does this authority grow less?] Things have changed in the present days. In the old days, a child of fifteen years was able to look for employment. He would stay away until he comes for initiation to grant him the status of manhood. After initiation, he would begin to realize he has to look for his own brideprice money so that the father would only give him additional brideprice. At the age of fifteen, a child had nothing in particular to do for his father. At this age, children began to loiter. [What does a father owe his son in a case like this?] The son should know that whatever the father tells him is nothing but advice on how to lead a proper life. . . . The son might think that the father is against him; he might forget that his father is planning to get him into a proper way. It is like when your father is chasing you to go to school. You can't say that he doesn't love you, but he doesn't want you to stay at home with nothing to do. He wants you to use the school fees and buy the

knowledge through those school fees he has paid.

This man had not only a keen sense for the father's proper guiding authority but also a belief that the mother may undermine a harmonious father-son relationship.

A father and mother may be on bad terms, and sometimes the mother does not like the way the father instructs his son. If she has nurtured a grudge against the father [common in cases where the father has misused the bridewealth], she will instruct the son to disobey the father. A clever son should . . . not follow the mother's instructions. Some mothers can even tell their son to kill the father! Other sons see how much the mothers love them, therefore they accept the mothers' instructions. A woman's ways are never adequate. . . . The mother can spoil the son to the extent that the son will never again be on good terms with his father. The son and mother can be the enemies of the father. . . . The father will never trust a son who breaks a promise to him. The father can't call him his son, and there is nothing valuable that he will see in him.

A man with many views similar to Case K2 was Case K4, a fifty-five-year-old agricultural assistant, member of the African Inland Church, who had attended three or four years of school in the early 1930s. He argued that Daniel should educate his nephew first "to repay the debt" and show his "great friendship with his brother who educated him." He believed that a grown son should continue to obey all of his parents' wishes, although this obedience has limits and must be reciprocal: "The parents should not, for example, take all the child's property by force. If the parents take things by force, there is no reason the son should obey. [What should a grown son do for his parents?] A grown son should obey his parents, and the parents should also listen to him."

When asked whether it is more important to maintain harmonious relations with wife or parents, Case K4 chose the parents. Like Case K3, he had a great deal to say about the selfishness and divisiveness of wives.

The wife may not bring unity among the brothers and parents. Wives usually say a lot of things against the husband's brothers and parents, and this may cause hatred. The husband turns around and shows more love to his wife alone, and leaves the others out. This is not good. He should only maintain harmonious relations with his wife on certain desirable issues, their own family matters. A husband is supposed to be more clever than the wife. The usual aim of a wife is to cause a split. She is not pleased to see that some things are given to the parents.

This man, however, also said that James should refuse to give his father the money, and he was the only Kipsigis leader to repudiate the father's reason for asking: "The father was going to misuse the money on beer. A beer party is wasteful."

While he agreed that James' father has the authority to ask for the money, he went on to say that the father's authority is limited and reciprocal:

There are certain things in which the father has to exercise more authority. . . . The son

should be instructed not to be wasteful and he should also obey advice. [Yet] there are also certain things that the child has to tell the parents, and the parents also must obey and do as the child says. There is a knowledge that the father has, and he should pass it on to his children. The son also has a portion of knowledge which the father lacks, and therefore the father must listen to his son. There should be equal understanding between the son and the father. When understanding exists, there is no word that is small: the son's advice is as big as the father's. Except that the greater authority remains with the father—but only for what is seen as necessary.

This authority should diminish at about age eighteen, or whenever the son is able to leave his father's land and earn his own money. In fact, it is good if he leaves home and clears the way for younger brothers and sisters: "If I allow one son to dominate my land or the other children, that is not good; he must go out and become economically independent somewhere else. . . . 'Strength' means to get wealth. You are not strong when you don't have wealth."

An interesting aspect of this man's thinking is that he sees the importance of the respectful father-son relationship in larger systems perspective: both over time and within the broader community.

What the son does is actually preparing for the future. If you obey your father, your children will also obey you in future. . . . A person will never be respected in a community if he never shows respect to his children. A respected man in the community cannot change his mind on whatever he has told his children. The children of a respected person tend even to receive discipline from the community members. The community members usually tell them, "We like your father, and we can't see the reason why you are misbehaving." The father will not be happy in his own heart. [What would the community be like if people did not keep their word?] The opinions of the people cannot coincide or converge. The people will be like animals, because they have no power to think over what they have done. There will be no progress in that community, no cooperation of any kind.

The first of the Kipsigis community leaders to favor the son over the nephew in the Daniel dilemma was Case K5, a thirty-two-year-old mason, member of the African Gospel Church, with four years of schooling: "In doing so he is helping his family . . . [but] Daniel should help his brother whenever he is able. Daniel shouldn't listen to his wife, but should know that his brother gave him great help."

This subject also had somewhat different ideas regarding obedience. He said a grown son should not obey his parents' wishes if they are based on tradition as opposed to a Christian way of life. His definition of "respecting" parents appears based on maintaining outward respectful behavior, however, and on the traditional consideration of avoiding being cursed. "[What should a grown son do for his parents?] He should respect his parents, that is, he should behave well before them. He should avoid drunkenness because this might cause his parents to curse him."

The weight Case K5 placed on maintaining close relations with parents is seen in the following answer. In spite of his stated preference for Christian over traditional values, note how he self-consciously describes his viewpoint as based on the Kipsigis way of life:

What is actually very important in Kipsigis is for a person to maintain harmonious relations with his siblings and parents, so that the wife will automatically follow. Parents are elderly persons, and you should maintain harmonious relations with them; they teach you about your future life. ... [Daniel shouldn't separate his family from them and go live in the city] ... By going to the town, they are becoming the enemies of the others and they are actually lost.

This man's concern with gaining blessings from the parent was also evident in his answer to why James should give his father the money he had earned to go to the Nairobi Show:

James should give his father the money because this is the only way one can show respect to his parent, and the parent will bless him for doing so. His parent will bless him to get more money in future. [Does the father have the authority to tell him what to do in a case like this?] Yes, the father knew that he was going to bless him to get more money and get a better life. A Kipsigis father can bless his son to stay [i. e., live] longer.

According to Case K5, the father's authority grows less when the son at age 18 is able to work for his own survival and is old enough to understand what is to be done. What is the basis of the authority system? According to this man, it derives both from Kipsigis tradition and from an expedient concern for one's future well-being: "It is something that has existed for a very long time that a son should obey his father most of the time. It is our traditional behavior. If you don't obey your parents, you will not get a satisfactory life."

The eldest of the Kipsigis community leaders, Case K6, was seventy-five years old, nonliterate, a member of the African Inland Church, and a subchief as well as a member of the school committee. He expressed his arguments clearly and forcefully, drawing upon proverbs and traditional concepts of cursing and blessing to justify his choices. Yet, unlike the others, he did not strongly side with the father's authority in either one of the dilemmas. He had little to say about respect: When asked to describe a respected man in the community, he said simply, "To be respected is to have wealth." Concerning the Daniel dilemma, this man favored educating the son before the nephew because a man rightfully solves his own problem before another's: "You know it is said, 'When sparks jump from the fire onto you as you are holding the baby, you have to knock them off yourself first—even though the baby is yours.'"

When asked whether a grown son must obey his parents, he replied that yes, a grown man should obey, but not necessarily in all things, because he must help himself also and because they had "great hardship" in bringing him up. He needs to help his aged parents when they are really lacking in the necessities, but otherwise he should be left to help himself.

Indeed, this man believed that it is more important for a man to maintain harmony with his wife than with his parents, "so that they can be self-reliant and have good understandings between themselves." Yet, while he thus argued for some autonomy of the grown man from his parents, he nevertheless did not want complete

separation. He urged Daniel to maintain a close connection between grandparents and grandchildren and drew a multi-generational vision of family unity. "Yes, I would condemn Daniel [if he just took his wife and children away to live in the city]. If he had taken his children to town, his children would have less acquaintance with Daniel's parents. It would be better for him to leave his children at home, so that his children can be able to know his parents well."

Likewise, in addressing the James dilemma, Case K6 took a moderate position. He argued that James should refuse to give his father the money because it was "not good" and "not right" for the father to go ask the child to give him that money when the child "had saved the money for an intended purpose" and "in his heart this boy actually wanted to go to the Show." On the other hand, Case K6 felt the father has the authority to ask for the money, if he and his son have a good, respectful relationship: "Yes . . . if the son is the type who listens to what the father says. If the son does not listen to what his father says, that son is bad. Such a son is not even good in the eyes of the old men. The father has this much authority because that is his child. The father and son should be helping each other always; the father and the son are one."

It would be right for the father to ask for the money only if he faces genuine troubles:

The father has the right to have it when he needs it. Before this boy can support himself, he has been using his father's money. . . . If this boy had refused to give his father the money, and if his father had left him alone and told him, "Let that money be enough [i.e., I will never give you anything more]," then the money would have troubled the son. . . . [Nevertheless] the father should use peaceful means to get the money. . . . But the son is still young and highly dependent on his father. . . . It is good for a son to obey his father most of the time, because in this way the son is trying to be good and is developing respectable behavior. . . . The father will bless him . . . but if he disobeys, the father will not be happy. The father's heart will dislike that son . . . and he will leave him alone . . . and that child will never succeed in what he wants to accomplish.

[When does the father's authority grow less?] Generally when the son is between 25 and 30, the father's authority grows less. Because he now becomes an independent person who can lead himself and become self-reliant. By that time he also has a burden of his own to carry—his own children. . . . At that age you now consider him not as your child, but rather as a person of your clan.

What was striking was the judicious and balanced, multigenerational moral vision, laying out how both community and family are held together by mutual trust and appropriate obedience. In such a community or family, the old are listened to respectfully by the young, but they do not rule them arbitrarily or by force. Instead, they listen to the young in such a way as to convey their respect and understanding and desire to protect the integrity of a fragile system. Trust and respect can easily break down, and then the cooperation and continued progress of the group comes to a halt. Wealth, the basis of respect, can no longer grow.

When the people in a community don't keep their word, there will be misunderstandings. Nothing can be done in that community. People will not cooperate and there will be conflicts and quarrels. There will be no leaders in that community. [Instead] we need a community where when an old man sits and talks, the people will listen and obey his words. ... There will be communal work done in good spirit—work done in love.

[Likewise] fathers usually don't break promises to a son . . . because the father is the law-maker, therefore he can't fail to say the truth. . . . James's father is probably an alcoholic. . . . Drinks have finished him and spoiled his brain so he no longer says the truth. . . . The son comes to despise his father's words, and then the father leaves him alone. . . . The mistrust between son and father will continue on. To cure this system is hard. Probably the grandfather originally showed this behavior to the father and now the father passes the same chain of breaking promises to his own son.

Concepts of the Kipsigis secondary students. The five Kipsigis secondary students, as can be seen in Table 3.3, made choices that closely paralleled those of the Kipsigis leaders, except that they were much more ready to say that a grown son need not obey his parents' wishes (Dilemma 1) and that James' father does not have the authority to demand his son's money (Dilemma 2). In the substance of their interviews, they were also more likely than the Kipsigis community leaders to speak of the educational benefits of the Nairobi Show; and they did not talk about the paternal sanction of blessing and cursing. However, the language of "respect," reciprocity, and family interdependency figured prominently in their discourse; as one said, "We need to be dependent." Three of the six spoke of Daniel's paying school fees a matter of "respecting" his brother and/or nephew. They also supported the traditional value of masculine authority: two warned that a wife can "mislead" a husband or interfere with his "communication" with his parents.

Case K7 was a twenty-year-old Roman Catholic attending Form 2 at Kabianga School in Kericho. Echoing the argument of Case K3, he stated that Daniel should educate his nephew first in order to "respect his brother," who educated him. He believed, however, that a son need not always obey his parents if they are leading him the wrong way, though he owes them respect and help: "In some cases a son would just obey his parents, but in some other ways he cannot. If a father told him to do something, he should do it, but if the father is leading me another way round, it is not good. I think a son would not follow that way. [What should a grown son do for his parents?] I think a grown son should just have respect to his parents. I think if there is any work to do, he just helps."

But he was oriented to closeness of the parent-child relationship. He argued that a man should not follow his wife when she is leading him away from his family of origin: "Daniel should stay in good terms with his brothers and parents, and later on with his wife, because if you just follow what your wife is saying, it is not good, because she leads you into a position where you can't communicate with your brothers and others."

The James dilemma was difficult for this young man because he felt strongly that James had the right to the money and yet, at the same time, that the father,

Table 3.3
Informants' Responses to Questions about Moral Dilemmas

Case No.	Dilemma 1 (Daniel)			Dilemma 2 (James)	
	Pay for son or nephew?	Harmony with wife or parents?	Must a grown son obey?	Give to father or refuse?	Does father have authority or not?
Kipsigis Elders					
K1	nephew	parents	yes	give	yes
K2	nephew	parents	yes	refuse	yes
K3	nephew	wife	yes	give	yes
K4	nephew	parents	sometimes	refuse	yes
K5	son	parents	sometimes	give	yes
K6	son	wife	sometimes	refuse	yes
Kipsigis Students					
K7	nephew	parents	sometimes	refuse	yes
K8	son	parents	no	give	yes
K9	son	wife	sometimes	give	yes/no
K10	nephew	parents	no	refuse	no
K11	nephew	wife	no	refuse	no
Abaluyia Elders					
A1	nephew	parents	yes	give	yes
A2	both	both	yes	give	yes
A3	both	both	sometimes	give	yes
A4	son	wife	sometimes	give	yes
A5	son	parents	yes	refuse	no
A6	son/both	no answer	no	refuse	no
A7	son	wife	sometimes	refuse	no
A8	son	wife	sometimes	refuse	no
Abaluyia Students					
A9	nephew	parents	yes	give	yes
A10	nephew	both	sometimes	give	yes
A11	nephew	both	yes	refuse	no
A12	both	wife	sometimes	refuse	no
A13	son	parents	no	refuse	no
A14	son	wife	no	refuse	no

although he was being unfair, had the authority to claim the money, simply because "he is the head," giving his son all the necessities. The father's authority, he said, diminishes whenever you leave school, around the age of eighteen, and are a "bit mature" and able to understand problems. When does a son not need to obey

his father? "I myself am in school now, and if my father tells me to marry—when I have not yet decided to—that is the way I can refuse to obey."

At the end he concluded that the father-son relationship may deteriorate to fighting if either one breaks his promise to the other, but overall it is worse if the son disrespects the father: "The son will be against the father and not even help him. The father will never feel good and he will be against the son. . . . The father can't break the promise of the boy because he will break the good terms they have had."

Case K8, a twenty-year-old Roman Catholic attending Form 1 at Sigor Secondary School in Kericho District, argued that Daniel should help his brother and brother's family in other ways, but still pay the school fees for his own son first. He was another Kipsigis informant who felt respect must be reciprocal: "Daniel owes his son respect. His son should try to respect his father, because the son is under him." When asked about a grown son, he said he should not obey wrongful commands. He defined "respect" as showing obedience:

A grown son should not obey all of his parents' wishes because the parents sometimes may tell you something which is not good in the eyes of the community. Perhaps you are told to steal; you should not try to steal. . . . [If I do] I will suffer, maybe be arrested by the government, and I will suffer without the aid of my father. Another example is that if I am told to go and elope with somebody's child without the knowledge of that child, I will be arrested also. . . . [What should a grown son do for his parents?] A grown son should try to respect his parents, obey his parents, and try to help his parents in the way he was helped. To obey is to have respect.

His sense of the importance of the parent-child relationship was made clear in his answer that Daniel should try to maintain harmonious relations with his parents first: "Before he married he was with his parents. And [now] after that he should try to copy what he was seeing in his family."

Furthermore, he stated James should give his father his money. The father has the authority to ask for it because "James is under his father" and as "a respect," even though the father was "wasting" the money on beer and the Nairobi Show would benefit James. The father's authority becomes less, Case K8 said, when the son becomes mature and independent, "when he is married," whatever the age, twenty to forty, at which he is actually living independently away from his father's supervision. "You are not going to be followed by your father when you are going to a faraway country—when you are far from your father's home—and you will not have troubles from your father at any time. . . . You have your property, your real property, not your father's property. So when you are not married, you are still depending on your father's property."

He concluded by speaking of the importance of promises in the context of maintaining interdependent community relations, based on communication. "A promise is a means of communication. . . . A community where people don't keep their word will be corrupted because everyone will be solitary. He will have to depend upon himself, not helping each other. . . . It is wrong to be independent. May-

be you are going to have some troubles which need the community to help you. We need to be dependent."

Case K9, a twenty-two-year-old Roman Catholic attending Form 5 at Kagumo Secondary School in Nyeri, felt Daniel should put his son first, "because he has the obligation to respect him" and so that "in future the son will not turn against him." In general, he felt a man should put the interests of himself and his family, in the sense of his wife and children, before obligations to other family members.

[Should a grown son obey all of his parents' wishes?] He should obey in some cases, but in others he should not. [What should a grown son do for his parents?] If he is well-educated and earning quite a big amount, he should be giving some to his parents if they come and ask him. But if the money is not enough to share with his parents, he should first of all see that his family are well served, and his parents later on.

[Is it more important to maintain harmonious relations with his wife or with his brothers and parents?] I think I should maintain harmonious relations first of all with my wife and later with my parents.

On the other hand, he strongly opposed severing relations with the parents: "I condemn [Daniel] for moving his family to the city. . . . He should leave his family to live in the reserve. . . . In that case, he will be breaking relations between his family and parents completely. . . . Just because you are not on good terms with your parents, that doesn't mean your family should not be in good terms with your parents."

Addressing the James dilemma, Case K9 underscored his concept of obedience by stating that James should give his father the money, because otherwise he would be "disobeying the father and yet he is still too young to support himself." He expressed contradictory ideas on the father's authority, first saying that father "has no authority in a case like this" because of "the hard working [that] James had just done" and then saying, "in our society there is no limit [to the father's authority] so long as you are still in school." The authority continues as long as you are "still young or still unable to support [your]self," or "after having got married you are left alone." But during the period the son is young, he should "owe respect" to his father even when his father seems to be saying something that seems wrong to him. The father may indeed have better judgment than the son about the best interests of the son, for example, if the son seems to want to use his father's limited funds for brideprice rather than for school fees, when actually it would be foolish to get married without the means of supporting himself and his family.

Case K10 was a twenty-two-year-old member of the African Gospel Church attending Form 5 at Alliance High School in Kikuyu. He echoed Case K9 in saying that Daniel should educate his nephew first to "respect his brother," who educated him. His concept of "respect" seemed very broad—encompassing notions of following the wishes of someone, as seen in these answers:

[What does he owe his son?] He ought to respect him. He ought to be respected also, but when the two sons are there—his brother's son and his very [own] son—he should respect

his brother's son more than this very son of his. He should help his son. I think it should be only respect, nothing more.

[What should a grown son do for his parents?] In the first place, he should respect them if the parents are also very respectful. If the parents are not respectful, I think there should be a bit of understanding between them, rather than deep respect. It would be something like the respect [that is seen] not in the family circle but like you respect your villagers and the rest. He should help them if the parents are very old and can't help themselves, just doing something which is necessary, just building a house or digging the *shamba* ['garden'], looking after the cows.

Besides being the only Kipsigis informant to speak in these terms, he was also the only one who spoke of moral behavior as being related to "self-respect." "[Would you expect your older children to help your younger ones with school fees?] Yes, I think it is necessary for them to help themselves [each other], because they will be respecting themselves much better if they help [each other] than if I just try to help them all. I think that is the only way that better relationships will be established."

When asked about the James dilemma, this student argued that James should refuse the money because he had "the right" to it. "I doubt whether [the father] has authority [in a case like this] because the father had promised." He commented, "I think the boy was trying to respect his parents as far as possible," and then said something else about respect that no other informant did: "I think a son owes his father disrespect—no respect at all—because his father did not respect him."

When asked whether a son needs to obey all of his parents' wishes, Case K10 agreed with the other students in saying, no, he has only to obey those which are good, "those which are reasonable, for example, if someone is sick." He ought not to obey if his father advises him to go and steal something from someone. The authority of the father, which continues until the son is "mature," at age twenty-one or so and self-supporting, extends to "what is reasonable, and there shouldn't be any exploitation by the parents."

Yet he still said harmony with parents comes before that with a wife, who can lead a man into selfish ways: "The wife, I doubt whether she really knows the life history of the person. She doesn't know even how the person was educated and the rest. . . . As a married man, as the head of your family, you have to give at all times the directives, and if you try to follow your wife's, the wife can really mislead you at times, and you will end up being just considering yourself."

This student strongly opposed ungrateful, selfish behavior within the family: "[James' father] is very right to have authority over his son, because the son can be moved by the world until he is lost. Training means being disciplined in a family life."

Similarly, he shared with the others a vision of a cooperative community. "[What would a community be like if people did not keep their promises?] There is a disorganization in the community, and there is no work at all to be done in the community. Many hands could not do big work: for example, if there is a forest

to be cleared, it ought to be cleared first by very many people because it is a very heavy work, and if there is a dangerous fire to be put out, many people are needed."

He condemned selfish behavior—not as being against Kipsigis custom, but as being universally wrong. He was the only Kipsigis informant in the sample who used such universalistic terms as these in defending familialistic values: "If [Daniel] doesn't want to help his brother who helped him that will be very bad indeed, very immoral. Moral behavior is something which is spiritually good, which is faultless. [What do you mean, spiritually good?] Something spiritually good is universal—universally good. There is nothing individual which is moral."

Case K11, at twenty-seven the oldest secondary student and the least oriented to paternal authority, was a Roman Catholic attending Form 2 in Kitale. He also said Daniel should educate the nephew first because "he has an obligation" and a "close relationship" with his brother. On the other hand, he did not consider this a matter of obedience to parents.

It was not something in force. It was something suggested by the parents, to inform the man about the accident so that the man may think himself whether he could manage to help his brother or not. He should not obey; he is a big man, like his parents. [Should a grown son obey all of his parents' wishes?] No . . . if the parents ask you now that you should go and kill somebody, would you go and kill? So you must agree to what you think is right. . . . So the son should consider what the parents are saying. Some parents are saying things correctly, others might say things which are not correct in the real sense. [Examples?] Parents may tell you that you should not go and drink, when you are grown up. What about if you go out; are they following you just telling you not to drink?

He felt a grown son does owe his parents a sense that they are well cared for: "Suppose they become very old, what you should see is that they get enough clothes, and other than that, you should have to build nice houses for them so that they can see for the rest of their lives that, 'Our son has just built for us this and this.'"

This man also viewed harmony with the parents as following from harmony with the wife: "The relation starts first of all from the house, from inside the house where the people stay, [and then] it spreads out until the parents have to come to the same category. . . . They inherit from how you are staying. If we copy from the parents, maybe my wife can say, 'Now I am on the other side.'"

Addressing the James dilemma, Case K11 was the only Kipsigis informant to say James should refuse his father because attending the Nairobi Show was such "a very important thing to young people." He went on to discuss the educational benefits of attending the Nairobi Show and learning different things from all over the nation: "James should have to tell his father reasons why he is attending the Show. . . . The father might think that the Show was like going to town. I justify it by saying that James was attending an educational film, maybe James was in school and he can learn more about education and different things. The show ground is where [you] learn different things from different parts of the country."

He was the first of the Kipsigis informants to feel James' father does not have any authority in a case like this, because James had been instructed by his father to go earn his own money and, now that he has got it, he must be treated as a grown-up who can control its use. He had definite ideas about the source and limitations of the father's authority.

The father has authority over a young son because the father is the person who develops a child's mind to have harmonious relations with the country or within the country. The father trains the child for good behavior in the community.

[What should be the authority of a father over a grown son?] In general, it is to ask him about home affairs: what they should do, what they should plant this year, what they should actually do to get extension of farming in the family; but not the matter of just coming to me saying, "How much are you getting? Let me have this and this."

The father's authority, this man argued, diminishes after marriage or after leaving school, at twenty, twenty-five, even thirty years of age. In speaking of this, he again makes clear his sense of identification with the whole country of Kenya: "Because you are now counted as a citizen of the country. When you are schooling, you are not a citizen, you are just taken as a child."

Concepts of the Abaluyia community leaders. The Abaluyia community leaders that I interviewed, as can be seen in Table 3.3, were much less likely than the Kipsigis leaders to say James' father has the authority to ask for his money and to say Daniel should favor his nephew. Instead, they either favored Daniel's son or else insisted he must treat both boys equally. However, they were quite similar to the Kipsigis leaders in the degree to which they chose harmony with wife versus parents, said that a grown son must obey, and recommended that Daniel give his father the money.

In the substance of their interviews, they expressed subtly different values from the Kipsigis informants. "Respect" seemed less of a touchstone value. Instead, many spoke about a kind of moral "reasonableness," or depth of moral knowledge, acquired through age, experience, and education. This concept included the following various meanings: not quarreling "thoughtlessly" or creating disharmony "stupidly"; learning how to seek out knowledge and make up one's own mind as a mature adult; making judicious, impartial decisions; as head of household, becoming "answerable" on all problems; listening to the advice and wisdom of elders and parents and "praising any good advice"; not mindlessly "complying with the old things"; wanting one's children to "advance in knowledge."

In addition, family unity was valued: They focused on the need for kinfolk to live together harmoniously, maintain communication, avoid quarrels and escalating tensions, and pull together to achieve economic progress and success. None spoke of the divisive influence of women; indeed, one man spoke of the wife as a "real friend." In speaking of what a grown son should do for his parents, they differed from the Kipsigis informants in adding "love" to the list of "respect" and "help." The father's authority, they seemed to say, consisted mainly of the limited responsibility to control the son's waywardness until such time as he can behave

responsibly and authoritatively to build his "own family." While they were strongly interested in education and recognized the importance of progress and increasing "civilization," two men spoke explicitly of the need to continue to "follow traditional custom."

Case A1, a fifty-year-old Roman Catholic farmer with two years of schooling, served as a village Chairman. He was the only Abaluyia community leader to clearly favor Daniel's nephew. He felt Daniel must obey his parents in this case because he was educated by his brother and must reciprocate. Even a grown son should obey his parents, "because at such a stage you know what is right and wrong according to the rules." His obligation to his parents is to assume the mantle of responsibility: "[What should a grown son do for his parents?] A grown up son is like a father to others in the home. If his father dies, he becomes answerable to all issues in the home, and if anything goes wrong, he has to be responsible for it, and he takes care of all things in the home."

He felt the wife should fit into this system and also obey the parents: "You should all live together harmoniously. He who quarrels with his parents due to his wife is thoughtless. Your parents have cared for you for quite long, and when your wife comes, she is also to care for you, and so both of you should obey parents and live harmoniously with them."

He likewise felt that James should give his father the money, because "that which belongs to the son also belongs to the father, while that which belongs to the father also belongs to the son. All have a right to it." The father has the authority to ask for it, but the respect relationship should be reciprocal: "The son ought to obey his father, and if the son also tells his father something that is reasonable, the father should listen too. . . . If the father was not giving [James] anything, he too can refuse to give his father."

The father's authority grows less when the son gets married and comes to have authority in his own homestead.

Case A2, a forty-three-year old Roman Catholic farmer with six years of schooling, insisted that Daniel must help both boys. According to this man, it is an issue, not of reciprocity or respect, but rather of fairness: "It is not fair to educate only one of them and leave the other. In this case his parents would see that he is impartial and does not favor either of them."

Likewise, he had a strong sense of balance and maintaining closeness with both wife and parents.

He should maintain good relations with both his wife on the one hand and with parents on the other. The reason is that his parents also maintained such loyalty and obedience to their parents, according to custom. . . . If he goes to town and forgets about his parents it would be bad because he will have deserted them. The mere fact that he has less money should not make him break away from those who cared for him and brought him up. He should do all he can to be in touch with them even if he has nothing.

[What should a grown son do for his parents?] A grown son who has his own wife and children could assist his parents financially or materially if he can. But since he also has family members to assist, the help which he may give may also be limited.

Concerning the James dilemma, this man felt that James could give his father some and "remain with a little sum for entry to the Show." It was "not a must" for James to give the money; but on the other hand, "the father traditionally has authority over his son" to "show him what is right and wrong or how to conduct his general affairs in an acceptable way." Furthermore, perhaps his father was just trying to test James to "see the reaction" of this boy: "Despite the fact that James' father had promised him to go to the Show, he had a right to change his mind because of visitors who arrived and had to be entertained. This [giving by James] would show that he was a good, respectful son."

The father's authority continues until the son is about twenty years of age: "Even then, advice from parents may still be valuable. At an early age he [the son] is taught to be social to others and cooperate with them; he should visit relatives and friends and help them in times of difficulties. He is taught how to face life situations."

Finally, this man referred to the traditional council of elders as a moral reference group: "[Why should a promise be kept?] Traditionally, a promise was a sort of contract represented by an object, a cow. It must not be broken or the one who breaks it will lose. The promise was made in front of elders. If it was broken, traditionally elders often convened a meeting to reconcile the parties who have not kept their promises and there is hostility. The same elders will decide the proper action."

Case A3, a fifty-two-year-old Roman Catholic trader who had worked twenty years for the East African Railways, was one of two Abaluyia community leaders who insisted Daniel must find a way to school both son and nephew in the Daniel dilemma. "He should educate his brother's child. In this way he is directly helping his brother who helped him. . . . This is in accordance with customs. . . . At the same time, he should not throw away his son or fail to do all that is necessary for him. He should do all he can, even getting into debts, to support his own child and his brother's child."

This man had a keen sense of the importance of harmonious family relations and at the same time specific strategies a man must follow to maintain them. A man should give economic help to his parents and listen to their advice, then decide for himself what is reasonable to do.

When you disagree with a parent, you should not criticize what he tells you. You should rather praise any good advice that he may give on occasion. . . . [What should a grown son do for his parents?] If he is working, he should support them financially and materially. It is only when his parents are uneconomical, that is, when they spend money brought to them recklessly, that the son can think of refusing to help them. By refusing to help them he creates tensions: the social relations between them will be restrained, which is not good. Within a household, members should live harmoniously and cooperatively.

All adults—man, wife, and parents—must exercise restraint and a kind of balance if household tensions are to be contained.

The wife should try to maintain good relations with her husband's parents. Where they disagree, attempts should be made to reconcile them. A man should not disagree with his wife because of his parents; he should not side with his parents and send away his wife, because should he be unable to raise brideprice to find another wife, he could blame his parents. [Likewise] the parents should not interfere with their son's wife, because if she gets annoyed and deserts, the son would blame his parents. On the other hand, should he ignore his parents because of his wife, the parents will be disappointed and may not carry out traditional obligations when the son falls into difficulty. All these misunderstandings could be minimized when a son starts his own household.

Regarding the James dilemma, this man suggested James should give his father his money because "his father has a right to stop him from going to the Show. By going without permission, he violates acceptable rules." The father has authority to claim James' money because "he might have good reasons why he does not want his son to go to the Nairobi Show," for example, he might get lost there or see things not approved. A father has authority until a child is about sixteen years of age, when he becomes able to choose for himself what is right and wrong. Proper obedience in a son is important because it leads him into the right relation with the community elders: "The son has to obey and follow whatever he is told by his father. By so doing he learns to obey those who are older than himself and learns proper, acceptable behavior. A good child is welcomed by elders. He follows their advice and does as he is told to do. . . . A child who does not sit with elders will never know what is required. He will never know what is good and what is wrong."

The remaining Abaluyia community leaders argued that Daniel should put his son before his nephew. For example, Case A4, a thirty-six-year-old Anglican primary school teacher with a Standard 7 level of education, argued that it is only "human" for Daniel to put his own son first: "As a human being—although he has been helped—I am sure he has to look at his son first before he looks to anyone else's son."

A grown son, in general, should do some of the important things to help his parents if possible, for example, give them food and pay their taxes. He should obey some, but not all, of his parents' wishes; and harmony with his own wife comes first before harmony with parents: "She's the one who cares for your life more than your mother will do, because when you are grown up, you have not much dealings with the parents."

On the other hand, he also felt James should give his father the money, because he "has to respect his father" and because "James's money is, in fact, very little in comparison with what the father does for him." The father has the authority to claim the money "because he's a big man; he knows what should be done to the son and the whole thing remains to him to decide." The authority of the father continues until about the age of eighteen years, when the son becomes mature and can make his own decisions and "see some other different things on his own." The basis of this authority, as described by this school teacher, comes not from Abaluyia custom but from God: "Even in the Bible, we read that a child should obey his parent; and as he obeys his parent, he grows up to be a good citizen."

Still, he returns to sounding much like the other community leaders in speaking of the importance of a good relationship between father and son: "[What is the effect on a son if a father breaks a promise to him?] The effect is a son loses respect for his father, and then he becomes rude to him, and their life together is not co-operative. . . . The father loses friendship for the son, and therefore, there is almost no help between them in the family."

Case A5, a fifty-three-year-old Church of God farmer with no formal education, was a member of the Land Consolidation Committee. He echoed the others in saying a grown son owes his parents "love, obedience, and help in things like money," if he is working. If he is not working, he should help them with farm work.

Like many of the remaining Abaluyia leaders, he felt Daniel must put his own son first to preserve his future relationship with him: "If he starts with his nephew, his own son might, when he grows up, feel bad for having been left behind. This will lead to conflicts with the father, and such a thing is not good for the family."

Likewise, he argued that James should refuse his father the money because going to the Show is important for his development: "If he gives the father the money, the father is just going to waste it buying beer; then James will miss very important knowledge he would have gotten by going to the Show, and this might be a setback in his studies."

He did not believe the father has the authority to claim James's money, "because the son worked hard for it himself." On the other hand, he argued that harmony with parents has priority over harmony with wife because they are the source of all his assets and identity. "Because they have borne him, brought him up, and educated him. They gave him cattle to marry with and gave him a farm. If it were not for them, he would not have gotten that wife he has or those children. It is because of his parents that he is referred to as 'so-and-so's son.'"

The authority of a father should continue until the son is about age twenty and is old enough to look after himself and his own family. The father should control the son to see "that he does not indulge in drinking and going around with girls, moving about, and so on." Even when the son becomes independent, he is at first "not very grown up and you might find you still have authority over him to see that he takes proper care of his family."

When asked to think of specific cases in which a son does not have to obey his father, this man presented ideas never voiced by the Kipsigis informants, namely, that the father might cruelly try to create disharmony between son and mother: "You might have a cruel man who drinks, comes home, and beats the wife, and even tells the son to help him. Or he hates her and tells the son to do the same. The son should not follow him. This is a stupid thing to do and a wrong thing for a son to do to his mother."

Or he might try to interfere with the son's education: "Let's say, there is a father who wastes his money in drink and can't afford to pay school fees for his son. If the son goes, for example, to his uncle and gets school fees, and then the father asks him to give him the money, the son should not obey . . . because he will miss his education which is important for his life."

Case A6, a thirty-six-year-old Roman Catholic primary school teacher with a Standard 7 level of education, strongly felt Daniel must educate both boys, though educating the nephew was not "a must" but "a willingness." Unlike all the others, however, his reasons had much more to do with increasing the level of literacy in Kenya than with Daniel's relationship with family members:

In case we are talking about a country like Kenya, a country which is developing ... "*Harambee*," we are told, by the head of state, I mean, we should try to rectify things. . . . Daniel is not doing this [educating his nephew] to obey the brother, he's doing this to make the country develop, to make the country have less illiteracy. . . . He would also be very proud if his nephew is educated. . . . We cannot accept to comply with the old things.

His educational orientation was also seen in his argument for why James should refuse his father the money, since he had earned it himself, and besides:

[Does the father have the authority to tell his son what to do in a case like this?] If he's a right father, who knows and understands the Show—because the Show is where all people, farmers, can learn about agricultural machines—where in general people who are doing all kinds of things in the country can go to see any changes. . . . The father has got a right to advise his son on things that will make him learn the purpose of the country. James' father wanted the money to go to the bar; he is not going to learn anything from the drinks, and after drinking he becomes hopeless. . . . [Indeed] James could not be wrong to take this money and ask his father to go to the Show with him. ...

When asked what a grown son should do for his parents, this man said, "A grown son should obey his parents in actions and deeds." The authority of the father "these days" ends after the son has finished his schooling and has got a job, around age twenty-five.

This teacher's strong orientation to Kenya the nation rather than the Luyia people was evident throughout his interview: "[What would the community be like if people didn't keep their promises?] It is always important for people to keep the promises. If you get people who cannot keep promises in the community, or anyplace, or in a country—well, in this country there [would be] no purpose at all, no civilization can take place in such places."

Case A7, a seventy-two-year-old Church of God farmer with no formal education, was chairman of a primary school committee, a church committee, and the coffee board. He felt Daniel must help his own son first because "Daniel has now become a family man and is to look after it. If he now concentrates on his brother's family, his own won't grow up properly and his name won't be known." On the other hand, "I would expect him after some time to have saved some money to educate his nephew. If he doesn't, it would mean that he doesn't care about the help his brother gave him, and this is unfair."

According to this man, a grown son owes his parents "respect, love, and help" in the form of money, blankets, clothing, help in farming, and so on. He has to obey only those of his parents' wishes "which he thinks are right and beneficial to

him," and harmony with his wife is more important than with parents because "it is his wife he is going to live with and bring up a family."

Likewise, he believed James should refuse his father the money, simply because it was he who "worked very hard to save the money." Moreover, "a good man would not prevent his son from going to a beneficial thing like the Show just because he wants the money to go and drink." A father has authority over his son until about the age of twenty, when the son is grown-up and has acquired enough knowledge about the world to look after himself. James' father does not have authority to claim his money in this case; his authority, in general, consists mainly of controlling waywardness:

A father should see that his son does not become destructive. For instance, if I find my son destroying vegetables, or if I find that he has just taken my clothes to put on, I have a right to rebuke him. I have a right to beat him or rebuke him if he steals my chickens to go and sell, or if he steals my money. Also, I should see that he does not grow into a ruffian, waiting for people on the roads and beating them up.

The father has this authority so that the son "follows his father's good example: to do good things in order to be respected in the community when he grows up."

Case A8, the final Abaluyia community leader, was a fifty-one-year-old Salvation Army farmer with four years of primary schooling. He echoed Case A7, above, when he said Daniel should put his own son first: "Because he has now to start building up his own family, and if he devotes his money to the brother's family, then his family will lag behind."

Echoing others of the Abaluyia leaders, he felt a grown son owes his parents "help" in the form of food, clothing, and money and also "respect and love." In general, he did not think a grown son has to obey all of his parents' wishes because he "can think for himself" and "obey those wishes or advices he sees as right and beneficial to him." He went even beyond Case A7 in arguing for the importance of maintaining harmony with his wife: "Because the wife is the real friend. They live together, rear a family together, and therefore, they must agree with each other."

He was the most extreme informant in upholding Daniel's right to autonomy from his other relatives: "He has the right to do what he thinks is right, and if to him moving to the city is okay, I don't see why I should blame him. Moreover, his nephew is not a member of his own family; in this case the nephew's ties to him are weaker than those of his wife and his son."

Similarly, he argued that James should refuse his father the money because he worked hard for it and the Show will be beneficial to him. The father does not have the authority to claim the money in this case because "it is the son's money and he has the right to do what he wants." A father's authority, which continues until the son is about twenty-two and old enough to look after himself, consists mainly of controlling him from drinking, stealing, fighting, roaming, moving around with girls, and so on. In a more positive sense, "A good person knows what his son needs, and he is ready to provide him with everything and also satisfy his son's

wants. A good man would also like his son's knowledge to advance by going to things like the Show."

Concepts of the Abaluyia secondary students. The Abaluyia secondary students that we interviewed generally agreed with the Kipsigis students in their choices on all five questions. In the substance of their interviews, however, they sounded much like the Abaluyia community leaders. They did not introduce new moral themes; instead, they emphasized how education is vital to the success of the individual, family, even the whole country of Kenya. They stressed the importance of good relations with wife and with parents in order to "live a good life." Like the Abaluyia community leaders, they appealed to the value of moral "reasonableness," including the need for a son to obey his father "to know the ways to respect people," to learn to think for oneself and not be led around by others, and to avoid waywardness (drunkenness, stealing, and other wrong and dangerous things). They recognized the obligation of a grown son to listen carefully and with understanding to his parents' advice but then make his own decisions about what is reasonable to follow. As one said, it has been "from the beginning of the world, actually, that you should respect your parents. . . I don't see why this should not be carried on."

Case A9, an eighteen year old Roman Catholic attending Form 4 at Namulungu Secondary School in North Wanga Location, was unusual among the Abaluyia students in believing that Daniel should educate his nephew out of gratitude and reciprocity to his brother. He believed a grown up son should be obedient to his parents because "however old he is, he has to obey the parents." A grown son owes his parents "respect," as well as "financial help," if they need it. Furthermore, harmony with parents is paramount, for the son's best interests lie with them: "If he has to live a good life, he has to live in very good relations with his parents and brothers. Better than his wife, I think. This is because even if you divorce your wife, or you do without your wife, your father—your parents, I mean—and your brothers remain your parents and brothers, even if you have a different wife."

Similarly, James should give his father the money "because he must obey his father; he is supposed to obey." The father does have the authority to tell his son what to do in a case like this: "Yes, he has . . . because his father can help him later. The son should obey because it is his father who brought him up. . . . So he has to do much to respect his father and to obey him."

When does the father's authority grow less? Surprisingly, this student said the authority does not grow less at any age. "He has to obey his father in order to know the ways to respect people and in order to have his father helping him all the time."

Case A10, a nineteen-year-old Roman Catholic attending Form 3 at Namulungu School, also said Daniel must help his nephew first, since his brother had helped him; however, "in this case, it is not a must, but it is according to the willingness of Daniel." His reasoning focused on the value of education, not just to the boys themselves, but to the world around them: "The present world doesn't need the one who is not educated, but it needs everyone to be educated."

He felt Daniel does have authority in a case like this, but in general, he should obey only when what they tell him is right and he can manage it. A grown son, he argued, owes his parents obedience only in cases where they aren't forcing him. However, he strongly advocated family unity and maintaining harmony with both wife and parents. He empathized with the needs of parents' and brother's households as well as James's:

"If a house is divided against itself it just falls," and here if Daniel separates himself from the wife, then obviously the house will fall, or the family will fall. . . . Not only should he make up a good relationship with the wife but also with the brothers and parents. The parents are the ones who gave him his wife, and here the brother is the one who educated him and made him to be employed. And also if Daniel can separate from his father's family, then obviously they will have no support; they will remain poor and die in a poor way, since the brother is unable to support himself.

Similarly, out of empathy with the father's needs for companionship, he argued that James should give his father the money. "If his father's friends are asking him to go with them to drink, and he doesn't have money, he is to ask James because James has got money. But if he does not ask for the money, so that the friends do not get anything, then at least the friendship will die."

The father has the authority to tell James what to do because "he is the one who brought him up." However, the authority grows less as the boy becomes a teenager, between thirteen and eighteen years of age, and "becomes somehow mature" and knows what is right and wrong and whether to obey the father or not.

This student concluded by affirming his sense of the whole world as his moral reference group:

[What would the community be like if people didn't keep their promises?] The world would be very much disorganized. And everyone will be termed a liar, which is wrong, to be a liar. Even God, when He created the world, said to keep His commandments. In case you disobey, then you may leave society. . . . People should have respect for each other, because in case there is no respect at all in the world, there will be calamity everywhere.

Case A11, a nineteen-year-old Roman Catholic attending Form 3 at Pehil Secondary School in Homa Bay, South Nyanza, echoed the others' arguments in saying Daniel must educate his nephew out of reciprocity to his brother. He also felt a grown up son has to continue to obey his parents and maintain harmony with both wife and parents because "they are all important. Without [either] one, I think your life should not be in a good mood." When asked what a grown son should do for his parents, he said he should "be ready to help them in everything they like or want" for the house or "in the family as a whole."

On the other hand, he felt James should refuse his father because the father was just going to use the money for drink, whereas James's aim was for education, "to learn very many new things that he had been hearing of." In fact, the father has no authority to prevent James from having access to information about the whole

world: "As you know, the Show is where many things are brought from various countries, various places, various districts, and probably this son has never traveled to these countries." The father's authority should only be applied when the son is trying to misbehave. This authority continues until the son is married and has his own home and family.

Case A12, a seventeen-year-old Roman Catholic, in Form 2, the third of the students attending Namulungu School in North Wanga, felt Daniel should not choose between his son and nephew but instead divide the money between them. He did not feel a grown up son needs to obey his parents in everything, because the parents may be selfish—"the parents want money"—so he should neglect them a bit. Still, a grown son owes his parents help "until they die." Even if they educated the other children but not him, he can still help "to a little extent." He should maintain harmony most with his wife because she is the one with whom he lives: "He must at least just live with the wife, because he won't leave the wife and go live with the parents again. He has already established with the wife."

At the same time, he should not abandon his other relatives: "[Would you condemn Daniel if he just took his wife and children and went to live in the city?] Yes, he must stay there and persevere with that whole situation—the situation of the parents plus the family of the brother, rather than moving to the town, leaving them behind suffering. For they helped him very much."

Concerning the James dilemma, he felt James should refuse his father because he had earned the money himself and his father was breaking his word. His father does not have the authority to tell James what to do in a case like this because "it is too late." The father's authority, which continues until the son is settled into his own married life, should have some limits. The father may control the son regarding drinking and going out at night, but not regarding whether he gets women and girls. When asked why a son should obey his father, he told an anecdote about his own brother:

I have a brother who, when the parents were trying to advise him, he was refusing. Sometimes when he was taken to school and changed to another, he said, "I am not a policeman to be taken from station to station." Therefore, when the parents refused to take him to school, he practiced stealing. And even now he is a thief. And though he is a thief, he is not living a happy life. He is worried all the time. He doesn't know when he will die, for a thief does not know if he shall die sometime.

Case A13, a twenty-year-old member of the Church of God, attending Form 3 at Musingu Secondary School on the boundary of Isukha and Idakho Locations, was one of the two Abaluyia students who argued Daniel should put his own son first, otherwise "his family won't progress quickly enough." A grown son, he said, does not need to obey his parents in everything, but rather only when they speak sensible and useful things. He owes them help in food, farming, and clothing, and "he has to love them and respect them."

He gave a singular answer to the question about whether Daniel should maintain harmony with wife or parents. He cautioned Daniel not to become womanlike

by agreeing too much with his wife and, moreover, losing his inheritance by antagonizing his father.

If a son, for example, maintains strong harmonious relations with the wife, the latter might control him so much that he might adopt character[istic]s of a woman. He might even ignore his parents, and yet he is living in his father's home. The father might be annoyed, and he has the right of sending away this son. Probably this son may have no money to buy any other piece of land somewhere, and he may hang himself, causing great loss to the community.

Concerning the James dilemma, however, this student argued James should refuse his father because it is his money and "therefore he must fulfill his needs as he wants." The father does not have the authority to tell James what to do because he only wants the money for beer, which "isn't necessary as far as James is concerned." The father is supposed to teach his son not to steal and to be serious with his studies in order to gain the means to live in future. This authority diminishes when the son is around twenty-one and is no longer "called a boy but a man" and is able to marry and live his own life. When asked for specific examples of when a son need not obey his father, he again showed originality in his answer: "Again, his father may be a wizard; if he goes out to jump, and advises his son to follow him, the son should refuse, because this is not a good thing to do."

The final student, Case A14, another Roman Catholic, was a twenty-year-old attending Saint Peter's Secondary School in Mumias. He said Daniel must educate his own son first to avoid that son's blame when the son gets older. He owes his son education, especially in these modern times: "Especially on the side of education, it is very important these days." A grown son need not obey all of his parents' wishes because "some of them can mislead." Looking toward his own interests in the future, he should maintain harmony first of all with his wife: "The reason is that if the husband does not maintain a good relation with the wife because of the parents' advice, or other people's advice, then it's obvious they might end up in a divorce, and this would not help him in his family. Especially if the parents die, you should have your family, and if the family is not good, or there is no good relationship, you will end up in divorce and will not have a good life."

His relative detachment toward parents was also evident in his answer to what a grown son should do for his parents: "It depends on whether the parents can afford to live life by themselves . . . then there should be nothing he should do for them. In fact, it is the parents who should keep on helping him! But if at all the parents cannot afford to live by themselves, I think you can give small help which is necessary."

Unlike most of the others—Abaluyia and Kipsigis—he did not believe in reciprocity of helping obligations: "Well, what I know, if someone helps you, it is not necessary that you have also to help him, but you can help him also." Still, it would be wrong for Daniel to just move to the city and spend money on expensive living that he could be using to help his nephew.

This student, like those previous, felt James should refuse to give his father the money because he had taken the trouble to save this money himself, after his father told him to do so. The only reason to give the money would be "just to keep the relationship between his father and his friends good." The father has no authority in a case like this because by breaking his promise he is "contradicting himself" and being unfair. In general, his authority should concern preventing his son from doing wrong or dangerous things. This authority declines when the son reaches his early twenties and becomes mature. Why should a son obey his father most of the time? "[I]t has been like that from the beginning of the world, actually, that you should respect your parents. As a son you should respect your parents and the father especially. I don't see why this should not be carried on."

Yet, the respect should be reciprocal, in order that people in the family continue to listen to one another and trust each other: "The father should not break a promise to the son, and the son should not break a promise to the father. Both of them should keep their promises because they are people staying together in the family. Once somebody loses faith or hope in another, then it will have the same effect on both of them, so both of them should keep faith in the other."

Correlational Analysis of the Moral Choices

The thematic analysis has suggested that the sample individuals varied substantially in the moral choices they made and in their reasons justifying those choices. The four subsamples differed in their respective moral choices (for example, in whether they favored Daniel's nephew or son), but it appeared that they overlapped heavily in how they talked about family harmony, unity, and paternal authority. These moral values were clearly salient and important to all of the informants. Kipsigis and Abaluyia men differed stylistically in their emphasis on the touchstone values of "respect" versus "reasonableness," respectively. To the Kipsigis, attitudes of respect seemed most essential to finding ways for family members to get along, whereas, with the Luyia, attitudes of reasonableness seemed predominant. Even within each subsample, individual differences seemed to appear in the precise meanings the men applied to such key terms as "respect" and "paternal authority." Case K1, for example, argued that a son should always obey his father and may be cast aside if he cannot be controlled. Case K4, another Kipsigis elder, described a more equal relationship where both father and son listen to each other and the father has greater authority "only for what is seen as necessary." Case K5 defined respect as simply behaving well before parents and avoiding drunkenness.

But did the men's actual choices on the dilemmas, such as whether they thought Daniel should pay school fees for his son or nephew, tend to relate to the informants' objective situations, experiences, or position in life? It appeared, for example, that community elders were more likely than secondary students to answer that, "Yes, grown sons should obey their parents," rather than, "No, grown sons need not obey their parents." To systematically examine whether the background variables of ethnic group (Kipsigis versus Abaluyia), social position (com-

munity adult versus student), formal education (years of schooling), age (in years), and religion (non-Christian versus Roman Catholic versus Protestant) were associated with informants' moral choices, a correlational analysis was performed. To do this, the informants' answers on the five key questions in Table 3.3 were assigned numerical values. This could be done because the questions had dichotomous answers, such as "yes/no" or "give/refuse." In all cases, the choices indicating *higher* endorsement of paternal authority (e.g., "Yes, James's father does have the authority to ask for his money," or "Daniel should [obey his parents and] pay school fees for his nephew") were assigned a score of 0, whereas the choices indicating *lower* endorsement of parental authority (e.g., "No, James's father does not have the authority to ask for the money," or "Daniel should pay school fees for his son") were assigned the score of 1. (The few cases of undecided or halfway responses, such as "Sometimes the father does have authority, sometimes he doesn't," were assigned the compromise score of .5). In addition, TOTAL JAMES and TOTAL DANIEL indices were constructed by adding up the scores on all of the objective questions in each dilemma (see Table 3.4, footnotes a and b). Then, the background variables of Ethnic Group, Religion, and Social Position were also assigned nominal values, while those of Age and Education were quantified in years, and all five were correlated with the moral choice scores. The results are displayed in Table 3.4.

Two sets of correlations can be seen in this table: one set for what is referred to as the original sample (composed of the twenty-five men whose interviews have been described so far in this paper); and another for an augmented sample. This augmented sample was created to add power to the statistical analysis by adding subjects to increase the sample size. To the data on the twenty-five men were added parallel data on ten women (four Kipsigis community leaders, two Kipsigis secondary students, two Abaluyia community leaders, two Abaluyia secondary students), who had also been interviewed by the university students as part of the original study. In addition, data on twelve more Kipsigis community adults were available from a study by Harkness, Edwards, and Super (1981), conducted in the community referred to as Kokwet, using the same approach to moral judgment interviewing as Edwards (1974).

The findings for the Augmented Sample were clearly stronger than for the Original Sample, but the directions and magnitudes of the correlations were very similar; accordingly, the Augmented Sample results will be emphasized in this discussion. Of the three background variables—Education, Age, and Religion—by far the strongest predictor was Religion, followed by Education. Religion correlated significantly ($p < .05$) with five variables: DANIEL Q1 (School fees for son or nephew?), JAMES Q1 (Give the money or refuse?), JAMES Q5 (Does father have authority?), TOTAL DANIEL, and TOTAL JAMES. Examination of the means within subsamples showed that for all four groups, Protestants scored higher (i.e., were less authority-oriented) than Roman Catholics; while among Kipsigis elders (the only subsample with religious traditionalists), Christians scored higher than non-Christians. Similarly, more years of education correlated positively with lower authority orientation on three variables: DANIEL Q4

Table 3.4
Correlations between Background Variables and Informants' Answers

	Dilemma 1 (Daniel)			Dilemma 2 (James)		Total Daniela ^a	Total James ^b
	Pay for Son or Nephew (Q1) nephew=0; both=.5; son = 1	Harmony with Wife or Parents (Q6) parents=0; both=.5; wife= 1	Should Grown Son Obey? (Q4) 0=yes; .5=some-times; 1=no	Give Money or Refuse? (Q1) 0=yes; 1=no	Does Father Have Authority? (Q5) 0=yes; .5=yes and no; 1=no		
Education (in Years of Schooling)							
Original Sample	-.0734	.0892	.4812*	-.0109	.2913	.2400	.1227
Augmented Sample ^c	.0316	.0363	.4978**	.2417	.3321*	.3295+	.3079*
Age (in Years)							
Original Sample	.1504	.1009	-.3445+	.1045	-.1956	-.0884	-.0401
Augmented Sample	.0686	.0234	-.3553*	-.2064	-.2783+	-.1652	-.2788+
Religion (1=NonChristian, 2=Roman Catholic, 3=Protestant)							
Original Sample	.4493*	.2482	.2310	.1993	.2209	.3758+	.2408
Augmented Sample	.3482*	.2670	.2099	.4530***	.4070**	.3550*	.5101***
Ethnic Group (1=Kipsigis, 2=Abaluyia)							
Original Sample	.2253	.1443	-.0953	.0260	.3535+	.0211	.2465
Augmented Sample	-.0323	.1544	.0424	.2457+	.3976**	-.0420	.4342**
Social Position (1=Elder, 2=Student)							
Original Sample	-.1373	.0407	.4202*	.1364	.3134	.2054	.1937
Augmented Sample	-.0897	.0649	.4941**	.3395*	.4129**	.2625	.3610*

Note: All tests of significance for Pearson correlations are two-tailed.

*+p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*

- ^a The TOTAL DANIEL index consists of the respondents' answers on the three Dilemma 1 questions listed in this table (Questions 1, 4, 6), plus Question 4 (Should Daniel obey his parents in this case? 0=yes, .5=yes & no, 1=no), Question 7 (Would you condemn Daniel if he just moved his wife and children to the city and did not pay for the education of his nephew? 0=yes, 1=no), and Question 8 (Would you yourself expect your eldest children to help their younger brothers and sisters with school fees? 0=yes, 1=no) in Table 3.1. TOTAL DANIEL scores could range from 0 to 6, with a *high* score indicating *lower authority orientation*.
- ^b The TOTAL JAMES index consists of the sum of the respondents' scores on the two Dilemma 2 questions listed in this table (Questions 1 and 5), plus Question 4 (Who actually has the right to the money, the son or the father? 0=father, .5=both, 1=son), and Question 11 (If a son breaks a promise to his father, is that better, worse, or just the same than if a father breaks a promise to a son? (0=worse, .5=just the same, 1=better) in Table 3.1. Scores on the TOTAL JAMES index could range from 0 to 4, with a *high* score indicating *lower authority orientation*.
- ^c To increase the statistical power of this correlational analysis, the original sample of 25 men has been augmented by DANIEL and JAMES data for 10 women interviewed by the Kipsigis and Abaluyia university students as part of Edwards's (1974) dissertation. Furthermore, data for the JAMES dilemma have been added for 12 male community adults interviewed by Sara Harkness, from the Kipsigis community called Kokwet (for details, see Harkness, Edwards, & Super, 1981). This yields a total Augmented Sample, $n = 47$ (22 Kipsigis community adults, 7 Kipsigis secondary students, 10 Abaluyia community adults, and 8 Abaluyia secondary students).
-

(Should grown son obey?); JAMES Q5; and TOTAL JAMES. In contrast, Age (being younger) correlated significantly with lower authority orientation on DANIEL Q4 only. It is interesting to note that one of the interview variables, DANIEL Q6 (Harmony with wife or parents), did not correlate significantly with any of the background variables.

What about the subgroup factors: Ethnic Group (Kipsigis versus Abaluyia) and Social Position (elder versus student)? Within the augmented sample, JAMES Q5 and TOTAL JAMES correlated significantly with authority orientation: the Kipsigis men were more authority-oriented than the Luyia men. Even when the effects of subgroup differences in age, education, and religion were statistically controlled for (by partialling them out), still the correlation of Ethnic Group with TOTAL JAMES remained significant at $r = .3308$ ($d.f. = 42$, $p < .05$, two-tailed). To many of the Kipsigis informants, it seemed, James's yielding his money to his father was a matter of appropriate respect by a young son; many suggested the father might really be "testing" James to see if he is a good, respectful boy who could be relied upon in future. To the majority of the Luyia informants, in contrast, it seemed that the father's seeking James's money for beer was completely out of bounds, beyond reasonable authority, while the long term educational benefits for James of going to the Nairobi Show were too great to pass up.

Social Position was a more powerful predictor than Ethnic Group. Within the augmented sample, being a student rather than an elder correlated with lower authority orientation on four variables: DANIEL Q4, JAMES Q1, JAMES Q5, and TOTAL JAMES. Even after partialling out the effects of age, education, and religion, the correlations for JAMES Q1 and JAMES Q5 remained significant at the $p < .05$ level (r 's = .3257 and .3230, respectively). This suggests that the social role of being an elder (household head, husband, father, someone looked upon as a role model in the community and used to giving advice and counsel) versus being a young, unmarried student may have influenced the men's tendency to side with established paternal authority beyond what was contributed simply by their respective experiences connected to church and school.

CONCLUSION

The moral-judgment interviews of Kipsigis and Abaluyia community leaders and secondary students were examined for what they had to say about concepts of paternal authority and family unity. The thematic analysis revealed that all of the men—young and old, married and unmarried—shared a common vocabulary for talking about the underlying issues and moral conflicts raised by the dilemmas. The core values of respect, harmony, interdependence, and unity were not only alive and well, they were stressed over and over as the central virtues of family living by members of all four subgroups. In a stylistic variation on these themes, the ideal of seeking "reasonableness" in one's thinking and behavior seemed more prominent among the Luyia men, whereas maintaining "respectful" role relations (often defined as reciprocal communication and demonstrated loyalty) seemed to preoccupy the Kipsigis elders and students.

Although the men of all four subgroups shared a common ground for talking about the moral conflicts, they did disagree in the sides they took on various questions, and their choices varied systematically with their ethnic group, social position, age, education, and religion. Not surprisingly, the young, unmarried students—and educated persons in general—tended to take more positions against the side of paternal authority, especially on DANIEL Q4 (Should a grown son obey his parents?) and JAMES Q5 (Does the father have the authority in a case like this?). Perhaps more surprisingly, however, was how strongly religion influenced informants on both James and Daniel dilemmas. According to Harkness and Super (personal communication, 1992), this result makes sense for Kipsigis subjects because the Protestant churches have characteristically made much stronger demands for psychological culture change than have the Roman Catholics in the Leldayet area. Furthermore, the Protestant missions even today have always involved whole families of outsiders coming to live in Kipsigis communities, thereby providing role models of western, nonauthoritarian, monogamous family life, whereas Catholic missions are run by members of a religious order, people without spouses and children. Similarly, for the Abaluyia, Munroe and Munroe (1986), discussing how the Protestant ethic has played itself out among the Logoli of Western Province, have noted that since the turn of the twentieth century the Quakers have preached an individualistic philosophy looking toward achievement in the here and now. This Protestant ethic seems to be mirrored in our Abaluyia informants' emphasis on "reasonableness" as a standard of interpersonal conduct and on autonomy in decision making.

In conclusion, the texts resulting from moral-dilemma interviews have been shown to offer rich information about the content of people's values, in particular, the individual meanings that people construct as they grapple with delicate and important issues concerning family roles and relations. These data offer a different kind of information from that generated by behavioral studies or survey questionnaires, the usual means of studying moral value change. When conducted systematically on a representative sample of people, moreover, the moral dilemma texts offer the possibility of establishing not only what values are shared by a reference group but also how particular experiences and background factors have shaped individuals' perspectives on those values.

NOTE

This chapter is based upon a new analysis of data originally collected during 1972–1973 at the Child Development Research Unit (John Whiting, director) at the University of Nairobi and supported by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health (MH1096–18) and the Carnegie Corporation. A faculty grant from the University of Kentucky, Research and Graduate Studies, supported the reanalysis and presentation of this paper at the international conference, "Changing Families and Ecology in Contemporary Western Kenya," Kakamega, Kenya, August 1992. I especially wish to thank my original research assistants, University of Nairobi students Ezra arap Maritim, Runo Elijah, and Salma Gulamali, who helped in data collection, transcription, and interpretation, and Beatrice and John Whiting, my academic advisors and intellectual guides.

REFERENCES

- Cox, F., with Mberia, N. (1977). *Aging in a changing village society: A Kenyan experience*. Washington, DC: International Federation on Aging.
- D'Andrade, R. (1992). Schemas and motivation. In R. D'Andrade & C. Strauss (Eds.), *Human motives and cultural models* (pp. 23-44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- D'Andrade, R., & Strauss, C. (1992). *Human motives and cultural models*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davison, J., with the women of Mutira. (1989). *Voices from Mutira: Lives of rural Gikuyu women*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Edwards, C. P. (1974). *The effects of experience on moral judgment: Results from Kenya*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Edwards, C. P. (1975). Societal complexity and moral development: A Kenya study. *Ethos*, 3, 505-527.
- Edwards, C. P. (1978). Social experience and moral judgment in East African young adults. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 133, 19-29.
- Edwards, C.P. (1979). The comparative study of the development of moral judgment and reasoning. In R. Munroe, R. L. Munroe, & B. B. Whiting (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural human development* (pp. 501-527). New York: Garland.
- Edwards, C. P. (1982). Moral development in comparative cultural perspective. In D. Wagner & H. W. Stevenson (Eds.), *Cultural perspectives on child development* (pp. 248-279). San Francisco: Freeman.
- Edwards, C. P. (1985). Rationality, culture, and the construction of "ethical discourse": A comparative perspective. *Ethos*, 13, 318-339.
- Edwards, C. P. (1986). Cross-cultural research on Kohlberg's stages: The basis for consensus. In S. Modgil & C. Modgil (Eds.), *Lawrence Kohlberg: Consensus and controversy* (pp. 419-430). Sussex, England: Falmer Press Limited.
- Harkness, S., Edwards, C. P., & Super, C. (1981). Social roles and moral reasoning: A case study in a rural African community. *Developmental Psychology*, 17, 595-603.
- Harkness, S., Edwards, C. P., & Super, C. (1992). Personal Communication.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development: Vol. 1. The philosophy of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on Moral Development: Vol. 2. The psychology of moral development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1983). *Moral stages: A current reformulation and a response to critics*. New York: Karger.
- LeVine, R. A. (1973). Patterns of personality in Africa. *Ethos*, 1, 123-152.
- Munroe, R. L., & Munroe, R. H. (1986). Weber's Protestant ethic revisited: An African case. *The Journal of Psychology*, 120, 447-456.
- Piaget, J. (1948). *The moral judgment of the child*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. (Originally published 1932).
- Rokeach, M., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1989). Stability and change in American value priorities, 1968-1981. *American Psychologist*, 44, 775-784.
- Saltman, M. (1977). *The Kipsigis: A case study in changing customary law*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Co.
- Snarey, J. R. (1985). Cross-cultural universality of social-moral development: A critical review of Kohlbergian research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 202-232.

- Suda, C. A. (1990). Division of labour by gender and age—Implications for equity. In G. S. Were (Ed.), *Women and development in Kenya* (pp. 39–56). Nairobi, Kenya: Institute of African Studies, University of Nairobi.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989* (pp. 41–133). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1006–1020.
- Wagner, G. (1949). *The Bantu of North Kavirondo, Volume 1*. New York: Oxford.
- Were, G. S. (1967). *A History of the Abaluyia of Western Kenya, c.1500–1930*. Nairobi, Kenya: East African Publishing House.
- Whiting, B. B., & Edwards, C. P. (1988). *Children of different worlds: The formation of social behavior*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.