

A NEW STUDY OF THE WORK ETHIC AS DETERMINED BY OCCUPATION,
EDUCATION, AGE, GENDER, AND WORK EXPERIENCE

by

KIMBERLY DESHAN HARVELL

(Under the Direction of Roger B. Hill)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to provide a second iteration of the research completed in 1992 by Hill, examining differences in the work ethic of employees grouped by occupation, level of education, age, gender, and years of full-time work experience. Data was collected using the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI). A univariate analysis of variance was used to analyze data collected. Significant differences in work ethic for factors having more than two levels were further examined using a Fisher's Protected Least Significant Difference (LSD) procedure. Recommendations for further research were provided along with results and conclusions to provide employers and educators with current information about the status of the work ethic.

INDEX WORDS: Work Ethic, Occupation, Employees Work Ethic, Occupational Work Ethic

A NEW STUDY OF THE WORK ETHIC AS DETERMINED BY OCCUPATION,
EDUCATION, AGE, GENDER, AND WORK EXPERIENCE

by

KIMBERLY DESHAN HARVELL

B.B.A., Columbus State University, 1993

M.B.A., Columbus State University, 1996

M.Ed., University of Georgia, 2002

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

© 2009

Kimberly DeShan Harvell

All Rights Reserved

A NEW STUDY OF THE WORK ETHIC AS DETERMINED BY OCCUPATION,
EDUCATION, AGE, GENDER, AND WORK EXPERIENCE

by

KIMBERLY DESHAN HARVELL

Major Professor: Roger B. Hill

Committee: Elaine Adams
John Schell
Myra Womble

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2009

DEDICATION

“So do not fear, for I am with you; do not be dismayed, for I am your God. I will strengthen and help you; I will uphold you with my righteous right hand.” Isaiah 41:9-10

First, this dissertation is dedicated to God because had I not let go and let God have his way, this dissertation would have never been finished. I must thank the woman who was God’s chosen vessel to give me life, the late Linda Hicks Harvell. She brought me into this world at the age of 18 and God decided that her job was well done and finished so he called her to her heavenly home when she was 28 years old.

In knowing that God never closes one door without opening another door, it was no surprise that my maternal grandmother, Lottie Perry Hicks would take up where her late daughter had left off. She has seen me through a high school diploma and four post-secondary degrees and countless other triumphs in my life. After my birth mother’s death, my grandmother quit her job as a nurse and spent the rest of her life making sure that I was able to chase all my dreams by giving me a safe home, buying my first car when I was 16, having the courage not to pay for any more of my traffic violations with the threat of letting me go to jail (my granddaddy showed up at 4:59PM to pay my fine so I escaped that threat), and sending care packages full of tea cakes, homemade jelly, and pound cake to me at Howard University. Most importantly, my grandmother taught me how to be an independent woman, and I want to thank her because she made me find my inner strength.

Then I was blessed to have the late Mignon Phyllis Sims in my life as my Godmother. She, as well, had a connection to my late mother as her friend and choir director. She took me under her wing and guided me whenever I seemed to falter and get off track.

Finally, my walk would not be complete without mentioning my mother Jewel Ann Knighten, who is so special to me because she and I chose each other. She too knew my late mother and when God gave me to her, she never hesitated. She has been one of my biggest cheerleaders, my teacher, and my strength while always reminding me that through God all things are possible. Thanks, mama, for being my hardest critic, reminding me to put God first, pushing me even when I did not want to be pushed and wanted to throw in the towel. I can never thank you enough for all your love and support. Please know that I would not be the woman I am today if it had not been for your unconditional love and support. When I used to say “I can’t,” you would always encourage me and tell me “Yes, you can;” you are continuously teaching me how to let go of my past disappointments and live for today; but most of all mama you taught me about forgiveness, and I am a better woman for it.

This dissertation is dedicated to all the women and men (David Hicks, Sr. and Glen Knighten) in my life whose backs I have stood on, because without their standing in the gap, I would not be here and none of this would be possible.

Standing in the Gap

I'll stand in the gap for my daughter.
I'll stand til the victory's won.
This one thing I know
That you love him so,
And your work with my child is not done.

I'll stand in the gap every day,
And there I will fervently pray;
And, Lord just one favor,

Don't let me waver
I'll never give up on that girl.
Nor will you, for you promised her joy.
For I know it was true
When he said "Yes" to you,
Through the enemy seeks to destroy.

I'll not quit as I intercede,
For you are her Savior, indeed!
Though it may take years,
I give you my fears,
As I trust every moment I plead.

And so in the gap I will stand,
Heeding your every command,
With help from above,
I unconditionally love,
And soon he will reach for your hand.

Shirley Pope Waite

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to thank God because without Him and the prayers of the righteous, none of this would have been possible. The following passage from Psalm 40 in the Bible expresses my gratitude for what God has done in my life.

“I waited patiently for the Lord; he turned to me and heard my cry. He lifted me out of the slimy pit, out of the mud and mire; he set my feet on a rock and gave me a firm place to stand. He put a new song in my mouth, a hymn of praise to our God. Many will see and fear and put their trust in the Lord. Blessed is the man who makes the Lord his trust, who does not look to the proud, to those who turn aside to false gods. Many, O Lord my God are the wonders you have done. The things you planned for us no one can recount to you; were I to speak and tell of them, they would be too many to declare. Sacrifice and offering you did not desire, but my ears you have pierced burnt offerings and sin offerings you did not require. Then I said, “Here I am, I have come-it is written about me in the scroll. I desire to do your will, O my God; your law is within my heart.” I proclaim righteousness in the great assembly; I do not seal my lips, as you know, O Lord. I do not hide your righteousness in my heart; I speak of your faithfulness and salvation. I do not conceal your love and your truth from the great assembly. Do not withhold your mercy from me, O Lord; may your love and your truth always protect me. For troubles without number surround me; my sins have overtaken me, and I cannot see. They are more than the hairs of my head, and my heart fails within me. Be pleased, O Lord, to save me; O Lord, come quickly to help me. May all who seek to take my life be put to shame and confusion; may all who desire my ruin be turned back in disgrace. May those who say to me, “Aha! Aha! Be appalled at their own shame. But may all who seek you rejoice and be glad in you; may those who love your salvation always say, “The Lord be exalted!” Yet I am poor and needy; may the Lord think of me. You are my help and my deliverer; O my God, do not delay.”

My struggle in life has been one of patience. I am not where I want to be with this virtue, but I can testify that I am better than I used to be, still with much work left to do. I can truly say that waiting on the Lord is what has gotten me through this process.

I would like to thank my major professor Dr. Roger B. Hill for his only accepting quality work and not allowing anything but my very best. I want to say thanks to Dr. Myra Womble, Dr. John Schell, the late Dr. Helen Hall and Dr. Elaine Adams for serving on my dissertation committee.

I also want to thank my great-grandparents, grandparents, parents, siblings, in-laws, aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews, cousins and extended family for all their support through this journey in my life. I would like to thank the Scott, Guthrie, and (Bill) Sims families for taking me under their wings when I was going through one of the most difficult times in my life.

I would also like to give a special thanks to Mr. Gilbert and Dr. Frankie Hill for their opening up their home and their hearts. I also want to thank April Burnett and sons for letting me “bunk out” when I needed a place closer to the UGA library. I want to thank Marci Favors for checking my mail and “having my back”. I would like to thank the Cisrow and Favor families for the homes away from home and home cooked meals. To my sorority sisters of Delta Sigma Theta, I would like to say thanks for their encouragement.

I would like to thank two very important women who I had the pleasure of meeting when I moved to Louisiana. I do not have to mention their names because they know who they are, but I do have to say thank-you for their friendship, sisterhood and perfect examples of being phenomenal women. So to the both of you much love...I look forward to my metamorphosis!

I would like to thank Barbara “Mom” Regan and Michelle Grant for being ever prayerful and supportive. I want to also thank Jennifer McMullen for your summer help over the summer. Thanks to my right hand Kendra Rochelle Garrison and Keyah Wilson for helping me hold things down at BPCC! I would like to thank Chancellor Tom Carleton, the Division of Business & Computer Science, Bossier Parish Community College, and the Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce for their support. I want to say thank-you to Dr. Joyce Feagin for being a great doctor as well as becoming such a good friend. Thanks also to Gloria McCray, Rosetta Boone, and Martha Boone for making my move to Shreveport a smooth one and reminding me that people are still kind and compassionate.

I would like to thank the Brinsons for allowing me to use the Beamer (Smile). I want to thank the Winston and Harris families for keeping me present in their hearts even when I was not present for major events. I had the pleasure of meeting Jewel “Ruby” Lewis and having her teach me that I do not have to be a victim of my past. I want to thank Christopher, Justin and Amaya Hooks for sharing their mommy. To the ladies of NANBPW: please know that you helped mold me into the woman I am, especially Margaret “Grandma “Belcher, Maretta Taylor, Earnestine Hunt, Lois Williams and Jacqueline Gates. I would like to thank my past and present ministers and church families at St. James (Chicago, Illinois), Nichols Chapel (Phenix City, Alabama), Metropolitan (Washington, DC), Turner Chapel (Shreveport, Louisiana), Greater St. Matthew (Shreveport, Louisiana) African Methodist Episcopal Churches and Liberty Christian Center (Monroe, Louisiana). I want to thank Bishop William & Pam DeVeaux for welcoming me into their family as a seventh child.

I have to send up some mighty thanks to the late Levin Robinson for showing patience and understanding to the new girl from Chicago and for introducing me to his loving wife Evelyn “Maw” Robinson. I want to thank the late Barbara Buckner for telling me never to give up on my education and giving me a chance to steal away to the house at the top of the hill. I would also like to acknowledge my Great-Aunt Jessie King for understanding me when everyone else did not. I want to thank the late William and Henrietta Houston whom were the world’s best babysitters and always saw my potential.

So many people offered encouragement, but I would be remiss if I did not mention Debra Thomas, the late George Thomas, Paula Carmack, Marion Turner, Pamela Gosha, previous UGA Workforce graduates (I am the last from the group), and Charles Worthy for his hiring me on the spot, and all my favorite teachers for not allowing me to give nothing less than my very best. I

want to thank Jermal Chambers for being my trusted courier. Detrese Addison you made it easier to work knowing that you were living up to your responsibilities of daughter; so thank-you.

Finally, to my old friends and new friends, I want to thank you for your acceptance of me when I could not do something because of school. To those of you who have been there through the good and bad, I am honored to be your friend. LSU thanks for being a breath of fresh air and letting me know that it is possible for me to achieve everything I want on a career and personal level. To a few of my special aunties I want to say thank-you (Pamela, Mallorie, Essie, Marion) for editing, offering encouragement and allowing me to see another example of sister friendship.

I want everyone to know that for whatever part any of you have played or continue to play in my life that I am everything because you loved me!!

May God bless each of you and remember to wait on the Lord!!!!

Dr. Kimberly DeShan Harvell (aka Kim)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	4
Purpose Statement	6
Research Questions	6
Theoretical Perspective	7
Significance of Study	8
Delimitations of Study.....	9
Definitions of Terms	9
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
Historical Perspective on American Work Ethic	11
Ethics versus Work Ethic	12
History of Work Ethic	13
Protestant Work Ethic	13
Early Influences of Louisiana.....	14
Early Influences of Shreveport	18
Work Ethic and Technology	22
Changes in Work Ethic.....	23

Social Influences	24
Social Learning Theory	25
Work Ethic in the Workplace	27
Employers Expectations	28
Predominant Influences on Contemporary Work Ethic	29
Work Ethic and Occupations.....	29
Work Ethic at Various Levels of Education.....	30
Work Ethic Age.....	30
Work Ethic and Gender	31
Work Ethic and Years of Experience	32
Work Ethic Research.....	32
Work Ethic Instruments.....	34
Occupational Work Ethic Inventory.....	36
Conclusion.....	37
3 METHODOLOGY	38
Purpose Statement	38
Research Questions	38
Population and Sample.....	39
Research Design	39
Instrumentation.....	40
Independent Variables	42
Dependent Variables	43

Data Collection Procedures	43
Data Analysis	45
4 DATA ANALYSIS.....	48
Background Information	48
Findings Related to Research Question #1.....	52
Findings Related to Research Question #2.....	58
Findings Related to Research Question #3.....	62
Findings Related to Research Question #4.....	65
Findings Related to Research Question #5.....	67
5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATION	71
Summary of Research Study	71
Summary of Findings	73
Conclusions	78
Recommendations for Further Research	80
Contributions of the study	81
REFERENCES	82
APPENDICES	
A APPENDIX A SAMPLE	93
B APPENDIX B OWEI PERMISSION TO USE OWEI.....	98
C APPENDIX C EXPLANATION OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT	100
D APPENDIX D LETTER OF INTRODUCTION FROM BOSSIER PARISH COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHANCELLOR	102
E APPENDIX E LETTER OF INTRODUCTION FROM GREATER	

	SHREVEPORT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	104
F	APPENDIX F DIALOGUE FOR INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH STUDY AND REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION.....	106
G	APPENDIX G DIALOGUE FOR TELEPHONE FOLLOW UP WITH RESEARCH PARTICIPANT.....	108
H	APPENDIX H SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM PARTICIPATING FIRMS.....	110
I	APPENDIX I RESPONSE RATES OF PARTICIPATING FIRMS	115
J	APPENDIX J RESPONSE RATES FOR OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS.....	124

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Frequency Count of Independent Variables	45
Table 2: Univariate One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Variance for the Three OWEI Subscales for the Factor of Major Occupational Groups.....	53
Table 3: Mean OWEI Subscale Scores and Standard Deviations for Respondents Classified by Major Occupational Groups.....	53
Table 4: Fisher's Protected LSD Procedure for all Pairwise Comparisons of OWEI Subscale Means for the Factor of Major Occupational Groups.....	58
Table 5: Univariate One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Variance for the Three OWEI Subscales for the Factor of Level of Education.....	59
Table 6: Mean OWEI Subscale Scores and Standard Deviations for Respondents Classified by Level of Education.....	59
Table 7: Fisher's Protected LSD Procedure for all Pairwise Comparisons of OWEI Subscale Means for the Factor of Education	62
Table 8: Univariate One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Variance for the Three OWEI Subscales for the Factor of Age.....	63
Table 9: Mean OWEI Subscale Scores and Standard Deviations for Respondents Classified by Age.....	63
Table 10: Fisher's Protected LSD Procedure for all Pairwise Comparisons of OWEI Subscale Means for the Factor of Age.....	65

Table 11: Univariate One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Variance for the Three OWEI Subscales for the Factor of Gender.....	66
Table 12: Mean OWEI Subscale Scores and Standard Deviations for Respondents Classified by Gender.....	67
Table 13: Univariate One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Variance for the Three OWEI Subscales for the Factor of Years of Full-Time Work Experience	68
Table 14: Mean OWEI Subscale Scores and Standard Deviations for Respondents Classified by Years of Full-Time Work Experience.....	69
Table 15: Fisher's Protected LSD Procedure for all Pairwise Comparisons of OWEI Subscale Means for the Factor of Years of Work Experience.....	70

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In today's competitive job market it takes more than a great education to succeed; it also requires a strong work ethic. Work ethic is associated with a set of related characteristics that employers look for in current and potential employees. Some of the most common work ethic characteristics that employers look for are: (a) attendance, (b) communication, (c) attitude, (d) productivity, and respect (Bradley, 2007). A strong solid work ethic and the burning desire to succeed come from within and is often noticed immediately by employees (Gitmore, 2007). Employees with a solid work ethic are driven in their mind and hearts with a desire to achieve personal excellence, satisfaction and success through hard work while always being willing to put forth effort at all times (Gitmore).

Currently, Americans' lives are dominated by the work that they do (Curry, 2003). They have not worked so many hours each day since the Industrial Revolution (Curry). There is a gap between the need for workers with a strong work ethic and the availability of those who display positive work ethic attributes (Curry). Many of today's workers are not satisfied with their jobs because of company restructures and layoffs, often feel way insecure, discontented, and underappreciated (Curry). People are choosing to work longer hours because having material things seems to be more important than leisure (Curry). Compared to Europeans' six to seven weeks of vacation a year, Americans average about 10.2 days of vacation in a year not including holidays (Zuckerman, 2003).

Friedman (2005) has described a world that is “flat” because of the growth in technology and the political changes that have created a global web-based economic system. These developments have caused a sudden increase in prosperity for other countries that in turn has created a need for the United States to be more competitive. As something is being bought off the shelves in Shreveport, Louisiana another one is being made in China (Friedman).

Manufacturing of products has been moved around globally by companies seeking the lowest cost structure (Gerth & Rothman, 2007). New software and telecommunications tools have enabled global collaboration on an encompassing variety of work activities that would have never been possible before because technology was not available (Gerth & Rothman). Not only has there been an increased presence of a global workforce but also the size of the global workforce is incredibly larger with the emerging economies of India, China, and Eastern Europe (Gerth & Rothman). Businesses are able to take advantage of the new global demographic opportunities rather than be constrained by those in their own country (Gerth & Rothman).

Work ethic in the United States has a long history of evolution. Its foundation is built upon religious concepts that were influential on society during the Industrial Revolution (Hill, 1996). The occupational work ethic is displayed in an employee’s work behavior and is based on the employee's individual values and traditions (Hill). Work ethic is a culturally developed, work behavior influenced by a blend of family, religious, ethnic beliefs, and values (Hill). Work ethic has roots in the Lutheran and Calvinist theology that includes the belief that man has a moral duty to work diligently at whatever station in life he finds himself in (Bucholz, 1978). Work ethic is learned at home, in school from teachers, employers, and from coworkers (Berry & Glen, 2004). The need for work ethic has changed in the workplace because of the increasing foreign competition and management systems that focus on product quality and productivity (Berry &

Glen). In an effort to increase efficiency, management has begun to encourage and require greater worker participation in decisions affecting both the quality of the work environment and production processes (Naylor, 1988). The changing nature of the workplace is making work ethic a priority (Naylor).

Employers need workers who will show up on time, be dependable, and get along well with their coworkers. Employers need their employees to have some technical expertise, but they also want them to have a strong work ethic because it increases productivity (Berry & Glen, 2004). The fast pace of technological advancement has made it much less likely that workers will hold the same job throughout their working careers. The increasing economic pressures because of a global economy have made it far less likely that workers will begin and end their working lives at the same organization (Naylor, 1988).

Employees who value hard work while displaying personal qualities of honesty and integrity are very difficult to find in today's society (Naylor, Willimon, & Osterberg, 1996). Research by Petty (1995) found that the self-rated perception of work ethic does differ by occupations. For example, a job analysis for one occupation may differ from that needed for another occupation, one can expect the ideal work ethic for one occupation to be different from that needed for the other.

Some researchers have found a positive connection between education and work attitudes (Goodale, 1973) and some have found an unparallel relationship between the levels of education and one's work ethic (Tang and Tzeng, 1992). Within the last 25 years, people have veered away from the belief that a good education solidifies the attainment of employment or the longevity of employment (Tang and Tzeng).

Research has shown that employers see differences in the work ethic of employees grouped by their different ages. Research conducted by Blythe, Baumann, Zeytnoglu, Denton, Akhtar-Danesh, Davies & Kolotylo (2008), showed that nurses in the oldest age group experienced the greatest job satisfaction. For example, the nurses 50+ and 40-49 were more satisfied with their pay than the 20-29 age group. Nurses 50+ were significantly more satisfied with their promotion opportunities than those who were 30-34 and 40-49.

Differences have been shown in the work ethic between men and women. It was reported by Cherington (1980) that women scored higher than men with regard to pride in doing a job well and on being hard workers. Hill (1992) reported that women scored higher than men on all of the subscales of the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) in a workplace study. Lastly, Wentworth and Chell (1997) discovered that female students had higher Protestant Work Ethic (PWE) scores than male students when studying the work ethic among college students.

Hatcher's (1995) study showed that there were significant differences between employees that had more years of work experience versus an employee with less than five years of work experience. The study also inferred that even though work ethic is influenced by the length of work experience it could also be affected by what happens during that experience (Hatcher). Mulligan (1997) has stated that work experiences of individuals strongly influence the development of their work ethic. For example, if an employee was in an undesirable work situation they could possibly have negative feelings that might affect their work ethic.

Problem Statement

The impact of technology on work ethic is affecting today's workforce. Companies are having large turnovers because the current workforce is more concerned with productivity and time constraints than their work ethic. This study identified work ethic as determined by

occupation, education, age, gender, and work experience. This was done by using the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI). Hill's 1992 study was conducted to identify if there were any significant differences in work ethic of workers categorized by Standard Occupational Classification (SOC), level of education, age, gender, years of full-time work experience, or empowerment. Data was collected using the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI). If there were significant differences found, further analysis was done to determine how groups differed on the four dimensions of work ethic using the subscales of the OWEI. The four dimensions of the work ethic measured by the OWEI were dependable, ambitious, considerate, and cooperative.

Updated research regarding work ethic based on occupation, age, gender, education, and work experience is needed to provide employers with information on worker attributes. This type of research is also needed to inform educators who are preparing the future workforce. This information can be useful in vocational and technical education and higher educational institutions by revealing patterns of work ethic or prevalent patterns of work ethic deficiencies that might be addressed through educational interventions.

The current study examined work ethic attributes of being dependable, interpersonal skills, and initiative. These constructs were identified by Hill and Petty (1995) using a factor analysis procedure to extend their examination of work ethic as measured by the OWEI. The first factor, being dependable, described qualities that are related to fulfilling expectations and agreements in a work assignment. The second factor, interpersonal skills, consisted of items that relate to work related relationships. The items used to measure the third factor, initiative, represented characteristics that pointed toward a willingness to stay with a job even if it is not going well. Collectively these factors have been shown to be useful measures of work ethic as it is expressed in occupational settings (Hill, 1997).

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to gather current baseline data on work ethic using the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI), with employees from a random sample of public and private businesses and industries that were members of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce in Shreveport, Louisiana (Caddo Parish), whose occupations reflected the present occupational structure as described by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Major Occupational Groups (MOGs) (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008). The findings of this study were analyzed to determine if there were differences in the work ethic of people who work in one of the nine types of occupations, people with different levels of education, people of different ages and genders, and people with varying amounts of full-time work experience. Each respondent provided their job title on the survey and the researcher manually classified them into the nine occupational definitions provided by the Major Occupational Groups (MOGs). The nine categories were (a) professional, technical and related occupations; (b) executive, administrative, and managerial occupations; (c) sales occupations; (d) administrative support occupations, including clerical; (e) precision production, craft, and repair occupations; (f) machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors; (g) transportation and material moving occupations; (h) handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers; and (k) service occupations, except private household.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Does work ethic differ among respondents grouped by occupation?
2. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by level of education?
3. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by age?
4. Does work ethic differ between male and female workers?

5. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by years of full-time work experience?

Theoretical Perspective

The social learning theory of Bandura (1969) emphasized the role of observing and modeling behaviors, attitudes, and emotional reactions of others. Most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling; by watching others a person forms an idea of how new behaviors should be performed and then the coded information serves as a point for action.

If the behavior is reinforced, the behavior is likely to increase. If the behavior is punished, then the behavior will decrease. People are often rewarded for modeling the behavior of others. Bandura also believed that the environment reinforces modeling. Bandura illustrated this reinforcement by doing the BoBo Doll study (Bandura, 1969), where he made a film of one of his students (a woman) beating up a BoBo doll (an inflatable, egg-shape balloon creature with a weight in the bottom that makes it bob back up when you knock him down). The woman punched the clown, kicked it, and sat on it and hit on it with a hammer while shouting aggressive phrases. After the taping the film was shown to kindergartners who liked it a great deal. After watching the film the kindergartners were let out to the playroom with several observers, a brand new BoBo doll, and a few hammers. The observers recorded them beating up the BoBo Doll by imitating the behavior they saw on the film. These children changed their behavior without first being rewarded for their behavior. He called this reaction observational learning or modeling. This theory became known as the social learning theory for which Bandura is considered the leading theorist (Boree, 1998).

Social learning theory has cognitive roots in behavioral psychology. Bandura made a distinction between learning through observation and the actual imitation of what has been learned. Social learning theorists believe that attention is a critical factor in learning. As a result of being

reinforced people form expectations about the consequences of future behaviors. Bandura suggested that environment influences behavior but behavior can influence the environment as well. He labeled this concept reciprocal causation (the world and a person's behavior effect each other). In other words, the person, the behavior, and the environment can have an influence on each other. There are two different types of models. One is a live model which is an actual person demonstrating the behavior and the other is a symbolic model which is a person or action portrayed in another medium like television, videotape, or a computer program.

Significance of Study

The significance of this study was that the information gathered from this segment of research would provide higher education institutions and businesses with up-to-date information on the work ethic of the workforce. One of the most important points of this study was to discover where work ethic is the same and where it is different between workers in diverse categories of occupations. This study took into consideration the experience of an employee and how it might affect his or her work ethic by gathering data from respondents who work in diverse jobs and who have worked for various amounts of time.

Another part of this study was to examine potential differences in work ethic over five different age categories ranging from 19 or under to 55 and older to see if any new information could show that things have changed since previous studies were conducted that have found work ethic endorsement does not differ by age (Bucholz, 1978; Furnham, 1982). Lastly, it is very important for employers to be proactive in providing proper training to their employees. If they notice a new employee does not have an adequate work ethic, lacks *dependability*, interpersonal skills, or initiative, results of this study might inform those involved in the development of training.

The findings of this study examined the differences based on existing categorical attributes between work ethic and occupations from the Major Occupational Groups (MOGs), education, age, gender, and years of full-time experience.

Delimitations of Study

The following delimitations were taken into consideration with regard to interpretation of the results of this study:

1. The characteristics of work ethic examined in the study were restricted to those included in the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI).
2. The outcomes of this study were limited by the respondents' understanding of the items on the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) and their responses to those items.
3. The dimensions of the work ethic for this study were restricted to those measured by the three Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscales (*dependability*, *interpersonal skills*, and *initiative*).
4. The outcomes of this study were applicable to workers employed in businesses, industries, and government entities in Shreveport, Louisiana (Caddo Parish).

Definition of Terms

Work Ethic

For the purpose of this study, the term work ethic is defined as interpersonal skills, initiative, and being dependable as measured by the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) (Hill & Petty, 1995).

Occupation

An activity that comprises a person's primary source of livelihood or remuneration.

Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI)

A 50-item questionnaire designed to measure a worker's work ethic. The instrument was developed by Dr. Gregory C. Petty (1993) and included three subscales to measure the work ethic dimensions of interpersonal skills, initiative and being dependable. In (1995) Hill & Petty performed a factor analysis that produced a four-factor solution to help refine the description of the occupational work ethic. The factors identified were (a) interpersonal skills, (b) initiative, (c) being dependable; and (d) reversed items. In a reversed item the descriptors was stated negatively on the OWEI. They are included in the OWEI to prevent research participants from developing a response pattern based on quickly marking a rating on the Likert Scale without legitimately responding to the actual item. It was determined that it was a factor because the response to the items was reversed rather than the OWEI items that were grouped based on a construct of work ethic.

Major Occupational Groups (MOGs)

This particular occupational classification system is part of the occupational classification system manual created for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) field economist to help ensure correct occupational matters when collecting compensation data. These categories in this classification system were appropriate for use in this study because they collapse thousands of different occupations into nine categories. Respondents were asked to provide their actual job titles as well as select the closest category to their current job. The researcher used that information to convert each job title to its appropriate classification within the nine occupational definitions provided by the Major Occupational Groups (MOGs).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this literature review was to examine the theoretical and historical concepts related to work ethic. This chapter starts with a history of work ethic and its connection to the workplace. The review also includes the theories relevant to the study of work ethic. Multiple studies of work ethic were examined along with employers' expectations related to work ethic.

Historical Perspective on the American Work Ethic

History is defined as knowledge that deals with past events. In order to make wise decisions in the present it helps to know the history of the past (McCortney & Engels, 2003). Looking at the history of work ethic helps one understand the foundation it was built on and reveals the evolution work ethic has gone through over time. Work ethic has been influenced by the Bible, the Protestant era, and the Industrial Revolution (Hill, 1996). Changes in the views on work based on religion and society's perspective have affected how people feel about work. The American work ethic is ever evolving because of current events and their impact on society (McCortney & Engels).

In the era of the industrial revolution the assembly line required a great many worker hours to tighten bolts and push buttons, but many of these tasks have since been taken over by computerized robots (Pyszkowski, 1992). The automation of technology, computer terminals, and other new advances in technology have reduced the need for consumers to have contact with another human. Hill (1996) stated that at the close of the 20th century technology had been impacted by the development of the World Wide Web and expansion of cellular communications,

and that technology has continued to expand in many different areas of the work world. New technology is continuing to empower workers to be more productive. Many new technologies have amplified the discretion workers have regarding use of their time and the use of their employers' resources. These issues have made it more important to employers to have employees that have a good work ethic. Miller (1986) declared that jobs in the information age were high in discretion and required a great deal of thinking and decision-making from their employees. Industrial age jobs were in total contrast because they required obedience rather than the empowerment to make decisions (Azam, 2002).

According to Thomas Friedman, (2005) he believed the world became flat in the year 2000. The late 1990's was the beginning of information technology and politics playing a very important role in allowing people all over the world to work together. This flattening caused a global platform which allowed people to plug and play, collaborate and compete, and share knowledge and work, more than it had ever done in previous history (Friedman).

Ethics versus Work Ethics

There are many definitions for ethics and Compton (2007) defined ethics as a system of moral principles; rules of conduct recognized; the rightness and wrongness of certain actions. Ethical conduct starts at the head of an organization. Fraud, stealing, lying and cheating are some known unethical infringements. Ethics has become so important that companies and volunteer organizations are creating codes of conduct for their employees and members to follow (Compton). Johnson (2006) stated that because employers realize that ethical values are tied to the health of the organization they realize that ethics policies are needed. It is believed that practicing ethical behavior requires a desire to improve, the drive to not give up, and the determination to be

held accountable at all times; simply put moral standards and performance do go hand in hand (Johnson).

Ethics and work ethic are closely related because they both can be attained by observing or modeling other's behavior. From a sociological perspective, work ethic is taught through the process of socialization by modeling, reasoning, preaching, and teaching (Opp, 1979).

Communication, modeling, and reinforcement were just a few of the tactics that Johnson (2006) listed as a way to enforce ethics in the workplace. They both have norms or standards that guide a person in what is wrong and what is right. Work ethic is a standard of how someone carried themselves ethically concerning work (Asacker, 2004).

History of Work Ethic

Work ethic has been defined as a value associated with people who work hard, are productive, and who are usually successful due to their efforts (Berry & Glen, 2004). The Puritans believed that since God is the one who calls humans to work, then the human becomes a steward who serves God and that particular calling also honors all lawful work (Ryken, 2006).

Protestant Work Ethic

Max Weber believed that John Calvin and Martin Luther offered a very different unique ideology toward work (Weber, 1958). Calvin was convinced that all men must work because it was what God wanted (Weber). By serving God and having a purpose driven life one was destined to be shown favor. Martin Luther believed that work was a calling from God and that one served God by working hard in his or her daily labor (Cherrington, 1980). Hill (1992) cited biblical references that showed that distaste for work was not God's original plan for man, but happened because of a sin that took place in the Garden of Eden. Work ethic is a secularized construct with similar outcomes to Weber's 1904, 1905 Protestant work ethic (PWE) theory. The PWE asserted that

Calvinist theology encouraged the expansion of capital; it is widely used as an explanation for the success of capitalism in Western society. In the past years attitudes and beliefs that support hard work have fused into the norms of the western culture and are no longer connected to a particular religious sect (Lipset, 1990; Rodgers, 1978; Rose, 1985). The theory of the Protestant work ethic is Weber's effort to classify the individually held internal values and attitudes toward work.

According to previous research on the Protestant work ethic, some traits associated with a strong work ethic include asceticism, integrity, independence, diligence, motivation, loyalty, and *dependability* (Hill, 1996; Kern, 1998). This finding tends to reinforce the view that the work ethic is related to internally held values.

Early Influences of Louisiana

Louisiana was occupied by Native Americans before the European explorers arrived. The Spanish expedition that located the mouth of the Mississippi River in 1528 was the first European exploration. In 1682 the explorer LaSalle claimed all the land at the mouth of the Mississippi for France. He named the land Louisiana after Louis XIV. Europeans did not settle in Louisiana until 1699, when Pierre le Moyne, sieur d'Iberville, founded a settlement called Biloxi. Biloxi later became the seat of government for Louisiana. The government was later moved to Mobile in 1710 and that city became the capital of Louisiana. To increase the value of the colony, the French granted a monopoly of commercial privileges in 1712. New Orleans was founded in 1718 and the capital was transferred there in 1723. The French settlement had two purposes: to establish trade with the Spanish in Texas and to deter Spanish advances into Louisiana (Retrieved from <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/us/A0859363.html> on 04/21/06).

To keep the entire Louisiana territory from falling into the hands of the British, the French secretly gave up the area west of the Mississippi and the Isle of Orleans to Spain. The French

colonists that lived in the area that was surrendered to Spain initially resisted the Spanish rule but were finally subdued and Spanish trade was organized. During the Spanish years agriculture flourished with the cultivation of sugar cane and rice which led New Orleans to grow as a major port and trading center (Retrieved from <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/us/A0859363.html> on 04/21/06).

After Spain declared war on Great Britain Napoleon forced the retrocession of the territory to France known as the Treaty of San Ildefonso. After the treaty President Jefferson tried to purchase the Isle of Orleans from France but Napoleon decided to sell all Louisiana to the United States. This purchase doubled the size of the United States and made it a world power. It would be later that 13 states would come from this acquisition. After becoming a state, French and Spanish influence remained, not only in the Cajun and Creole cultures but also in the civil law and in the division of the state into parishes rather than counties. Five different ethnic groups have contributed to Louisiana culture: the Creoles, descendants of the original Spanish and French colonists, the Cajuns, the American cotton planters, African Americans and Islenos a distinct Spanish-descended group (Retrieved from <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/us/A0859363.html> on 04/21/06).

Settlers came from all the southern states and that increased the growth of sugar and cotton plantations. The state capital was moved several more times and finally landed in Baton Rouge in 1849. The first steamboat to travel down the Mississippi River arrived in the New Orleans Port in 1812. By 1840, New Orleans was the second largest port in the nation. Plantation owners controlled the politics as well as the state because of their large acquisition of land and slaves (Retrieved from <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/us/A0859363.html> on 04/21/06).

Louisiana broke off from the Union on January 26, 1861 and six weeks later joined the Confederacy. After the fall of New Orleans, Louisiana became the trial run for President Lincoln's moderate restoration program. Following President Lincoln's assassination, radical Republicans seized control causing great detriment to Louisiana during the Reconstruction. The Klu Klux Klan was active and a republican became governor with the help of federal troops. During reconstruction, the plantation system was replaced by farm tenants and sharecropping. Steamboat traffic declined with the increase of railroads and the opening of the Mississippi River for vessels that were able to travel through New Orleans to the ocean. Louisiana's economy was changed because of the discovery of oil and natural gas in the 1900's and industries begin to grow based on cheap fuel and labor (Retrieved from <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/us/A0859363.html> on 04/21/06).

The dominant culture in the state of Louisiana is seen in the south by the French, Spaniards, Germans, Irish, Africans and a diverse group of transplants from the Caribbean Islands. Many of these groups blended with the Louisiana Native American groups. Some of the Native Americans retain their own culture, virtually unchanged by the European contact in several ways. During the late 19th century, a large group of Midwesterners settled in the Cajun prairie to make a living in the developing rice industry and the railroad. Within a short time many absorbed the Cajun culture (Brasseaux, 1987). The French speaking black Creoles lived alongside the Cajuns and were sometimes free slaves and landowners. Even though they remained racially distinct from their Cajun neighbors, they shared many of their cultural traits; such as the food, Mardi Gras, Catholicism, music and the French or Creole language (Fontenot, 1994a, 1994b). Other communities have always been predominately English speaking. Fishing and shrimp catching became a very popular occupation along the Louisiana coast. There are many ethnic groups that

live in the state of Louisiana. There are quite a few in urban areas or university communities, while the rest are spread out in rural areas. Some ethnic groups are identified with certain occupations. For example, many independent, small town motels are owned and operated by East Indians. Other groups specialize in merchant trades. Lebanese peddlers followed the railroads and rivers and settled in many small towns as grocers. Chinese merchants can also be found in both large cities and small towns throughout Louisiana. Louisiana is also home to Africans, Greeks, Pakistanis, Iranians, Japanese, Koreans, Laotians and Vietnamese (Riquelmy, 1994).

On January 14, 2008, Governor Bobby Jindal stated in his inauguration speech that Louisiana had gotten away from being a state with a history of credibility. He wants to rebuild a Louisiana where the leaders and people get back to setting the highest standards and where every member of government is held to the highest accountability like previous Louisianans. He also mentioned that Louisiana has great workers with a solid work ethic that has always been part of its culture. Interpersonal skills are linked to working relationships including habits, attitudes, manners, appearance, and behaviors used around other people, which may have an effect on how one gets along with other people (Hill and Petty, 1995). These characteristics, including being considerate, friendly, and courteous, contribute to job performance in a setting where cooperation is important, are a representation of the type of actions being encouraged by the new state leadership.

In August of 2005, Hurricane Katrina struck and devastated southeastern Louisiana, while damaged levees flooded New Orleans. The city was closed mostly until October 2005. It is estimated that over two million people from the gulf region were displaced by the hurricane, with several storm fatalities. The next month, southwestern Louisiana was struck by Hurricane Rita (Retrieved from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/louisiana> on 04/21/2006).

Louisiana has nearly 100,000 job opportunities statewide and their unemployment rate is at its lowest point in the past 30 years. Louisiana is experiencing a gap in skills, where the training and education of its state citizens does not meet the requirements of available jobs. Due to the shortage of skilled workers there are economic opportunities being lost to the workforce and the state. One of the top obstacles to business growth for companies in Louisiana is finding qualified employees. Due to the lack of qualifications, Louisiana citizens have fewer opportunities to move up, earn more and provide for their families. The lack of mobility has discouraged many Louisianans from staying in the state. Louisiana has done a very poor job in preparing and training potential workers (Retrieved from <http://www.gov.louisiana.gov> on 05/29/2008).

Federal programs and other services are not well aligned or intertwined at the regional level. The state currently has limited capacity to address workforce issues that happen quickly as a result of employer and industry needs due to unpredictable events such as hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Louisiana recently created a community and technical college system. Economic projections show that over half of Louisiana jobs in 2014 will require more training than a high school diploma but less than a traditional four-year college degree (Retrieved from <http://www.gov.louisiana.gov> on 05/29/2008).

Early Influences of Shreveport

Shreveport, Louisiana was founded in 1836 by the Shreve Town Company. This company's sole purpose was to develop a town at the juncture of the newly passable Red River and the Texas Trail. The Red River had been cleared by Captain Shreve, so in his honor the company and the village were named Shreve Town. The village of Shreve Town was incorporated as the town of Shreveport on March 20, 1839. In 1871, Shreveport was incorporated as a city. Shreveport's original boundaries were limited within a parcel of land sold to the Shreve Town

Company by the Caddo Indians in 1835. In 1838, Caddo Parish was cut out of Natchitoches Parish and Shreve Town became the parish seat. To this day Shreveport remains the parish seat of Caddo Parish.

The original town of Shreveport consisted of 64 blocks divided by eight streets running west of the Red River and eight streets south from Cross Bayou. Today the 64-block area is the city's central business district and part of The National Register of Historic Places. Shreveport has a sister city that is connected by a bridge called Bossier City which was founded in 1884 and incorporated in 1907. The Red River remained navigable until 1914 when it was not used as much because the railroad was the preferred means of transportation. In the 1990's the Red River became navigable again to Shreveport. Presently, the port of Shreveport-Bossier City is again being developed as a shipping center.

Shreveport is considered north Louisiana and it is populated by English speaking British Americans and African Americans. Within north Louisiana, there are primarily two subcultures. They are the upland south hill and the lowland south plantation cultures (Roach-Lankford, 1984). Both cultures are primarily protestant but have significant differences. Shreveport is considered a lowland culture because it is along the Red river bottoms. This region is populated by the descendants of Englishmen and Scots from other southern states and New England. This group established plantations that farmed cotton along the bottoms of the Mississippi, Red and Ouachita rivers. Even with the Protestant influence most of these settlers were Methodist, Presbyterians or Episcopalians. Their plantations depended on a large slave population, which reflects the high concentration of rural blacks who inhabit the city and surrounding region today (Cash, 1941; Frantom1993; Roach-Lankford, 1984). North Louisiana is not just a British/African culture. Several variations and distinctive traits differentiate within the surrounding communities (Gregory,

1981). Shreveport, the largest city in north Louisiana is tied economically to the large plantations in the rich river delta. It is home to a culturally diverse mix of British Americans especially the Scotch-Irish, African Americans, Italians, Lebanese, Germans, Greeks, Chinese and Jews. In the past Shreveport was known for its large downtown community of Italian grocers, Chinese restaurants, Jewish merchants and German bakeries. While few of these merchants remain downtown today, Shreveport is still home to their descendants.

North Louisiana traditional crafts include skills that were used on farms and plantations. Some of these crafts are still vital and practiced today such as whip making, knife making, saddle making, trap making, split-oak basket making, and quilting. Whittling toys, blacksmithing, tatting, carving walking sticks, soap making and fashioning gourd birdhouses are some other crafts that are rare.

When an employee is taking the initiative to enhance their job skills it can be the same as a lifetime obligation to improving their character and skills. Initiative facilitated advancing on the job while not being satisfied with standard performance (Hill and Petty, 1995). The characteristics include being ambitious, enthusiastic and persistent. The idea of self-education connects with initiative since it categorizes people who are consistently striving to improve their skills and character.

Food traditions include a vast array of relishes, chow-chow, jellies, jams, preserves, vegetable crops, wild game, fish, hogs and cattle. Ritual traditions reflect the Protestant heritage. In many rural communities, on the fifth Sunday after church the members usually celebrate with Sunday dinners. Both black and white rural churches have gatherings such as Homecoming that brings together extended family and Memorial Day that honors the deceased. North Louisiana graveyards are not as adorned as south Louisiana. Some of the rural churches still conduct

baptisms in lakes or rivers with some of the African Americans using specially made baptismal robes.

Gospel music reflects the cultural background of north Louisiana. Quartets and choirs are heard on radio, TV and at festivals throughout the area. Shape-note singing which is a musical notation system using seven shapes to represent the musical scale is still practiced in north Louisiana. Other music traditions that are shared by British Americans include old time country and bluegrass (Tucker, Wilson, and Ferris, 1989). African Americans brought their traditional Delta blues and more recently rhythm and blues to the region and have become popular among many of the cultural groups. Country blues that comes from the field hollers and slave songs usually features a single musician and city blues is more structured and usually is accompanied by a band. Both forms of blues come from north Louisiana. Juke joints are usually in rural areas and blues clubs are usually in Shreveport (Beyer, 1980).

Cowboy culture is another trait that is shared in both north and south Louisiana. They are made up of British American, Cajun or Creole and they flourish from Monroe to Cameron Parish and from Shreveport to Hammond. Since Louisiana landscape is not like the west, adaptations had to be made by both north and south Louisiana cowboys. They used extra long reins to help the horses through the mud; they learned how to use spurs on rubber boots and herd cattle by boat. North Louisiana cowboys had to be strong so they could round up cattle in unattended wood in thickets and swamps by using Catahoula cars (Spitzer, 1977).

One tradition that is tied to the Italian-American ethnic identity is the St. Joseph altar, which has become popular within the last 30 years from Shreveport to New Orleans. The altar is where Catholics promise God that they will build an altar if a favor is granted, or in the hopes of being granted, a favor. The altar contains religious icons and foods for the community, including

special breads made in the form of catholic symbols, while guests are given fried fava beans for luck. Lastly, Louisiana has a large Native American population the largest in the eastern part of the United States. Louisiana tribes and bands have played a huge role in shaping the distinctive culture of the state, both north and south. The Shreveport work ethic was influenced by the influx of ethnic cultures that followed the Protestant work ethic in working hard and respecting the Sabbath.

Conditions in Shreveport, Louisiana demonstrate that the labor force and employment are on a steady increase and growing in the area. The Shreveport area has a large concentration of employment in the service providing industries. Factors such as temporary shutdowns, seasonal patterns, start up and completion projects have a huge influence on the movement of employment (Retrieved from www.LAWORKS.net on 05/29/08).

Work Ethic and Technology

The national ethics survey results indicated that employees' work ethic failed to meet the expectations of their employers (Ayers, 2005). The survey found that most of the respondents thought it was acceptable to play games and use company email for personal use. On the other hand those same respondents thought it was in bad form to steal software, blame errors on computer glitches, and use the company's equipment to search for another job (Ayers, 2005).

Technology has affected the work ethic of younger workforce by allowing them not to put as much focus on manual processes due to the newer sophisticated technology (Graves, 2007). As America's economy shifts from one of an industrialized economy to one of high technology, service based companies are out pacing product related businesses (Sherman, 1995). The use of technology has increased production and in some cases decreased quality (Sherman). Due to new technology fewer employees are needed to deliver goods and services.

Changes in Work Ethic

The workforce today is very diverse in terms of nationality, culture, religion, age, education, and socioeconomic status. On the job, employees face the task of making quick and smart decisions that may affect their salaries and job security. These pressures caused them to lookout for their own interests, with the risk of losing their personal and corporate integrity (Naylor, 1988). In the 21st century, America's labor force must gear itself to meet the needs of the workplace of tomorrow. Established patterns of pointless labor and assembly production have given way to employers empowering their employees (Pyszkowski,). Educators, employing comparable practices in the classroom, allowed teams of students to take charge of their own learning. Cooperative learning teaches skills of problem solving and decision-making, vital to work of the future (Pyszkowski).

In today's workplace, companies are creating positions for people who do nothing but make sure the company and the employee are held to the highest ethical standards. These companies have created hotlines where their employees can report unethical actions or get answers to questions about anything related to ethics (DiPiazza, 2001). Companies have hired people who do nothing but listen to tapes of phone conversations for business and personal reasons to make sure employees are treating their customers in an ethical manner as well as not divulging any company information. The IT departments have hired techs that do nothing but watch the computer systems making sure that the company computers and Internet are being used strictly for company business (DiPiazza). They make sure that no one can download anything that would make the company at risk to hackers. It all comes down to the fact that companies have decided it is very important to have a staff whose sole responsibility is checks and balances (DiPiazza).

Companies have always dealt with work ethic in the workplace but in today's workplace there are a great deal more diversified ethical challenges that companies are handling because of an increase in technology (Heinke, 2004). An example is Texas Instruments whose ethics handbook dates back to 1961. The company currently distributes their code of ethics on business cards to all employees. A well-stated code of ethics should be included in the employee policy manual. It should be given out at the beginning of the hiring process, annual updates should be distributed to employees. A larger printed form of the code of ethics should be posted in a common area (Heinke).

Social Influences

It is important to have awareness about the social influences and theories that can affect the development and the understanding of employees' work ethic. The most desirable and successful employees are those who could be described as having a positive attitude toward a strong work ethic. An employee's work ethic can affect one's self-esteem. A low self-esteem can cause low job satisfaction and motivation that could have a negative impact on an employee's work ethic (National Council on Vocational Education, 1991).

Organizational behavior is defined as the study of human behavior, attitudes, expectations, and performance within an organizational setting (Reece & Brandt, 2005). The belief is that the behavior of the individual is shaped by the organization (Reece & Brandt). Theorist's (Braude, 1975) has also indicated that the socialization and behavior occurring in the workplace can be instrumental in shaping an employee's attitude while having a significant impact on an employee's individual belief system.

Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory focuses on the learning that occurs within a social context. This theory considers that people learn from one another even while observing, imitating and modeling. In a modeling situation the observer learns by cognitively arbitrating information conveyed by a model and this process takes place within a larger social context (Walker, 1981). In the social learning theory, learning can occur without a change in behavior, so learning may not be necessarily shown in performance.

Another principal of social learning theory is how the environment reinforces and punishes using modeling. People are often reinforced for modeling the behavior of others. Bandura is considered the leading theorist for the social learning theory. Bandura (1969) believed that the environment reinforces modeling. Some of the ways are the observer is reinforced by the model, reinforced by the third person, and the imitated behavior itself leads to reinforcing consequences, and finally a model is reinforced for a response and then the observer shows an increase in the same response. Bandura illustrated this reinforcement by doing the BoBo Doll study (Boree, 1998).

Social learning theory has cognitive and behaviorist factors. Some of those factors are learning without performance, cognitive processing during learning, expectations, reciprocal causation and modeling. Bandura made a distinction between learning through observation and the actual imitation of what has been learned. Social learning theorists believe that attention is a critical factor in learning. As a result of being reinforced, people form expectations about the consequences of future behaviors. Bandura (1969) suggested that environment causes behavior but behavior causes environment as well. He labeled this concept reciprocal determinism (the world and a person's behavior cause each other). In other words, the person, the behavior, and the

environment can have an influence on each other. There are two types of models. One is a live model that is an actual person demonstrating the behavior and the other is a symbolic model such as a person or action portrayed in another medium like a television, videotape, and computer programs.

Many behaviors can be learned through modeling. Bandura (1969) mentioned four conditions that were necessary before an individual can successfully model the behavior of someone else. The conditions are: attention, retention, motor reproduction (ability to replicate), and motivation. First a person must pay attention to the actual model. Secondly in retention the observer must be able to remember the behavior that has been observed. This can be usually be done by using the technique rehearsal. Thirdly motor reproduction is the ability to replicate the behavior the model has just demonstrated. Lastly, the final ingredient needed for modeling was motivation, learners must want to demonstrate what they have learned. Modeling teaches new behaviors, influences the frequency of previously learned behaviors, encourages previously forbidden behaviors, and increases the frequency of similar behaviors. Social cognitive theory provides a framework for understanding, predicting, and changing human behavior. The theory identifies human behavior as an interaction of personal factors, behavior, and the environment. Individuals possess something inside of them to implement control over their thoughts, feelings, motivations, and actions (Bandura).

Self-efficacy is when people are more likely to engage in certain behaviors when they believe they are capable of executing those behaviors successfully. Self-efficacy could be viewed as self-confidence towards learning. The stronger the perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goal people set for themselves; and the stronger they commit to their goals. In self-efficacy when one see's people similar to oneself succeed by persistent effort it raises one's self-esteem that they to

have the same capabilities required to succeed. The impact of modeling on perceived self-efficacy is largely influenced by perceived similarity of the model. The greater the assumed similarities the more persuasive are the models successes and failures. People seek good models who express their same ideas and goals. Through behavior, solid models transmit knowledge and teach observers effective skills and strategies which raises perceived self-efficacy.

Social learning theorists also have suggested that individuals learn by watching the behavior of those around them (models) especially if the models are reinforced for their behavior. This theory is the theoretical framework for this study related to work ethic because the four characteristics of a worker are based on three subscales of the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory: *dependability*, interpersonal skills, and initiative, can all be considered social behaviors. According to Bandura's (1977) social learning theory these behaviors would best be taught through observation and modeling.

Work Ethic in the Workplace

Businesses are spending more time on training their employees on ethics and the policies of the organization. The training should use real life ethical situations (DiPiazza, 2001). A good organizational code of conduct should include policies that reward ethical behavior and impose consequences for unethical behavior. Most importantly, these policies should be reviewed every year by management and staff (DiPiazza).

Even with frequent changes in the workplace within the past century, employers are still looking for workers who exhibit a strong work ethic (Hill & Fouts, 2005). People who have a strong work ethic place an optimistic value on doing a superior job and illustrate work as having an essential value of its own (Cherrington, 1980; Yankelovich & Immerwah, 1984). In today's workplace employers seek employees who are dependable, have great interpersonal skills, and

demonstrate initiative. Prior research has associated these characteristics with a high level of work ethic (Hill & Petty, 1995).

A good work ethic in the workplace is guided by the company's mission statement. Employees are encouraged to align themselves with another employee who models the work ethic they would like to attain. Another example of a good work ethic in the workplace was the mirror test which is where the decision one makes reflects who they are as a person (Nelson, 2004).

Employers Expectations

Since the early 1980s, employers' expectations have changed because the employee's role has changed in the workplace. Employers are still interested in hiring individuals who have received occupational training in a specific area, but they also want employees with a strong academic foundation (Imel, 1989). Employers are looking for basic skills in reading, writing, math, communication skills, speaking, listening, problem solving, employability skills, reasoning skills, leadership skills, computer literacy, interpersonal skills, the ability to learn and collaborative skills (Imel).

Employers believe that in order to be successful in the workforce employees' need a strong work ethic, the ability to be adaptable, learn quickly, and look outside of the box, realistic salary expectations, computer fluency, and the ability to be a team player (Hiring Trends, 1997). One of the biggest challenges for employers is finding employees who understand what it takes to perform well on the job (Curtiss, 2000). In today's era, employers are trying to recruit workers who have a solid work ethic. Employer's are also examining their skills. It seems as if employees need to be trained on how to work, meaning punctuality and completing tasks on time (Curtiss). In order for companies to meet their demand of hiring employees with a solid work ethic, they are getting their workforce supply from the military (Hagenbaugh, 2007).

Predominant Influences on the Contemporary Work Ethic

Contemporary work ethic has been influenced by some predominant demographic changes in the workforce (Hill, 1997). One of the changes in occupations is more jobs are becoming service oriented. Second, the level of education in the workforce is growing. Third, employees are working longer because of a longer life span. Fourth, the number of women in the workforce is increasing. Finally, the level of work experience is growing because people are staying on their jobs longer.

Work Ethic and Occupations

There is evidence of work ethic in many occupations from athletes to farmers. An example is major league baseball players who put forth a very serious work ethic during spring training. Men and women in the military are considered to be conscientious, early for work, clean, with a smile, a great attitude, and the willingness to work hard (Hagenbaugh, 2007). Another occupation is nursing where individual and institutional ethics are one of the most important roles in nursing (Taylor, 2005).

There has been documented research that has found differences in work ethic by occupation. In Petty's work ethic research he classified groups by SOC (Standard Occupational Classifications) which were defined by the U.S. Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards. The six levels of classification were (a) professionals, (b) clerical, (c) service, (d) agriculture, (e) crafts, and (f) labor occupations (Petty, 1995a; Petty & Hill, 1994). Petty and Hill have found considerable differences in work ethic by occupational category. Hatcher (1995) did a study comparing work ethic of electrical apprentices and instructors; work experience and work ethic were not significantly correlated. Due to the rise in technology the labor force has had

an increase in information age jobs that have positions which are requiring employees to have a higher level of thinking and decision-making capability (Miller, 1986).

Work Ethic at Various Levels of Education

Due to the changes in the labor market high school, and college graduates need to be more marketable (Pyszkowski, 1992). Secondary educators are responding to the call of preparing their students for the workforce by implementing educational strategies such as cooperative learning. In cooperative learning students are encouraged to participate in learning experiences in the same way as employees are in the workplace (Pyszkowski). Sheey (1990) found college students to have poor work habits, a lack of sensitivity to business needs, and unrealistic expectations about the skills required in the workplace.

In comparing high school vocational students to full-time working adults, another study found that workers scored higher than students on initiative and being dependable. However, no statistical difference was found between the mean scores for the two groups on interpersonal skills (Hill, 1996). Another study did a comparison between high school vocational students and full-time working adults where the results found that the adult workers scored higher than students on initiative and being dependable: no statistical difference was found between the mean scores for the two groups on interpersonal skills (Hill).

Work Ethic and Age

It seems as if today's younger workers have an entirely different work ethic than the older generation (Rossi, 2006). They want to work faster and better than their peers or not at all. It seems that older and younger workers have a more difficult time relating to each other because of changes in society and technology. These changes have occurred over the past 20 years (Rossi). Due to the technological changes between the 1980s and 1990s there has been a huge impact on

how the younger generation communicates (Rossi). Older workers have more of an ability to learn new things and may not be as familiar with group training (Moseley & Dessinger, 2007). They tended to be self-directed learners who take responsibility for learning (Moseley & Dessinger). When the age variable is taken into consideration, mixed results can be found. Some studies have found differences in work ethic by age (Petty, 1995b; Sullivan, 1999), while others have not (Hatcher, 1995; Hill, 1997). Filipczak (1994) stated that employers are seeing distinctions in the work ethic of different age groups. Buchholz (1978) stated that when young people enter the workforce they are concerned about their individual self and value of work.

Work Ethic and Gender

Prior research has indicated differences in work ethic in regard to gender. Cherington (1980) reported women scored higher than men on pride in doing a job well and on working hard. There are also other studies that support differences in work ethic between men and women. Hill (1992) reported that women scored higher than men on all the subscales of the OWEI in a workplace study. Wentworth and Chell (1997) researched work ethic and college students and found female students had a higher Protestant Work Ethic (PWE) scores than male students.

Gender differences in work ethic can be explained based on Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT). Four variables that are important in SCCT are: self-efficacy, beliefs, outcome expectations, and personal goals (Lent & Brown, 1996). Gender is significantly intertwined in the cultural influences shaping all these issues. From the perspective of SCCT, belief in the ability to succeed by working hard, the expectation that hard work will bring good results, and commitment to personal goals provide a reasonable explanation for women scoring higher on work ethic assessments than men (Hill & Rojewski, 1999). Previous research that has used the OWEI has

found that females have a higher work ethic than males (Hill, 1996, 1997; Petty & Hill, 1994; Sullivan, 1999).

Work Ethic and Years of Experience

There have been survey reports that cited differences in high school graduates' and non-graduates professionalism and work ethic (Lewis, 2006). Examples of those deficiencies are their lack of skills in areas of teamwork, accountability, punctuality, time management, critical thinking, and communication.

Older workers bring a sense of stability and help provide balance to the younger employee in the workplace. Older workers tend to stay in jobs longer, and have lower absences (Gittlen, 2007). There are all positives for the employer because there are fewer turnovers (Gittlen).

Lastly, the variable work experience has been found in most work ethic research. When considering years of full-time work experience, Hill (1997) found that workers who had between two and eight years of full-time work experience had lower scores for interpersonal skills, initiative, and being dependable than workers with less than two years or more than eight years of full-time experience. Work experiences of individuals strongly influence the development of an employee's work ethic (Mulligan, 1997). Cherrington (1980) suggested that work ethic can be taught and influenced by work experience and socialization processes.

Work Ethic Research

Previous research on work ethic has found that work ethic differs for individuals on the variables of age, gender, occupation, and work experience. Hill and Petty (1995) study looked at employability skills while using the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) as the tool to measure work ethic. Factor analysis on this instrument has found that work ethic is made up of items characterized as interpersonal skills, initiative, and being dependable (Hill & Petty).

Hill and Petty (1995) did a study to condense the collective meanings of the 50 OWEI descriptors into a list of key themes, with the intent of providing a list of concepts for work ethic and employability skills instruction and to provide a basis for refining the OWEI itself. A factor analysis was done and a four-factor solution was identified. Interpersonal skills, initiative and being dependable were the three factors that were given labels that illustrated a key work ethic construct. The fourth factor consisted of reversed items (Hill & Petty).

As a follow-up study to Hill and Petty's (1995) study of workers, Hill (1996) used the OWEI to compare the work ethic attributes of high schools students in eight vocational programs to the sample obtained in the 1995 study. There was no major difference found between the mean scores for the student worker and employed worker on interpersonal skills. There were differences for initiative and being dependable. The employed workers scored higher than the student worker. Students' mean scores were lower than the workers on initiative and being dependable. Hill (1997) conducted a study of workers employed by public and private businesses and industries in one southeastern community.

Corporations are noticing that many baby boomers that are eligible to retire are choosing work over sitting at home (Harris, 2006). Due to a longer life span the number of retirees has decreased causing companies to retrain their employees. One of the elements of this study was to examine the difference in the work ethic typical of workers in the different age categories, ranging from 19 or under to over 55.

Petty and Hill (2005) did a study to compare the work ethic of supervisors with that of the employees they manage. The study investigated the occupational work ethic of both workers and their supervisors in a variety of businesses and industries to determine if there was a significant difference in the work ethic of these two groups measured by the Occupational Work Ethic

Inventory (OWEI). This study outlined the differences in self-rated perceptions of the work ethic between workers and supervisors. The study's results reflected that workers and supervisors differ in their self-rated perception of the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory. Human resource specialists wanting to advance employee performance could use the information as training ideas to be developed for the organization (Petty & Hill).

Hill and Fouts (2005) did a study that examined the differences in work ethic as measured by the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) for respondent jobseekers grouped by employment status, age, and gender of jobseekers. This study revealed that job-seeking individuals employed full-time have considerably lower work ethic scores than jobseekers unemployed less than three months then jobseekers unemployed due to layoff. While supervisors reported a considerable higher level of initiative then their workers did report a significant lower level of being dependable.

Work Ethic Instruments

Measurements of work ethic are used in range of applied and research settings for a number of diverse purposes. The Protestant Ethic Scale was developed by Milton Blood (1969). In this instrument, Blood's focus was on evaluating individual variations in work values. He believed that individuals who give credit to the Protestant ethic ideals would have greater job satisfaction than those individuals who do not give credit. Blood alleged that job satisfaction was directly related the Protestant Ethic Agreement. McHoskey (1994) conducted a factor analysis of the Protestant Ethic scale (Mirels and Garrett, 1971), which is used quite often as a measure of the Protestant Work Ethic. The problem with the study was that Mirels and Garret's PE scale provided a total score of overall work ethic endorsement, even though Weber conceived of the PW E as a multidimensional construct.

The Affective Work Competencies Inventory (Petty, 1993) included values, habits, and work attitudes as affective work competencies. The instrument described 15 various work competency clusters that used 95 different indicators. The 15 cluster areas were (a) accurate quality of work; (b) adaptable and resourceful; (c) ambitious; (d) careful, alert, and perceptive; (e) cooperative and helpful; (f) considerate and courteous; (g) dedicated, developed, loyal, honest, and conscientious; (h) dependable, punctual, reliable and responsible; (i) efficient quality of work, achieving, and speedy; (k) emotionally stable, judgmental, and poised; (l) follow directions, responsive; (m) independent and initiative; (n) neat, orderly, personal appearance, and manner; (o) preserving, patient, enduring, and tolerant; and (p) pleasant, friendly and cheerful (Petty).

The Becker Work Adjustment Profile assessed information about work habits, cognitive skills, broad adjustment skills, work performance skills, and attitudes of individuals participating in competitive work. This instrument used five categories of scores. The categories were cognitive skills, interpersonal skills, work habits and attitudes, work performance skills, and broad work adjustment. This instrument was geared toward disabled persons over 15 years old (Murphy, Conoley, and Impara, 1994).

The Survey of Work Values as developed by Wollack, Goodale, Witjting, and Smith in 1971 is commonly used as a gauge of Protestant Ethic attitudes. The survey consisted of six subscales measured by 54 items. The six subscales were divided into two categories: extrinsic, which asks reward related questions; and intrinsic, which focuses on work related activities. The focus of this instrument was not job specific; but was related to an individual's attitude about work in general, which made it unsuitable for this study (Herr & Cramer, 1996).

The Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) (Petty, 1993) focused on the distinctiveness of work ethic while a person is at work rather than around a more global

perspective. In this particular instrument respondents assessed their own work ethic using a seven-point Likert type scale. This instrument has been used in several studies including those conducted by Hatcher (1995), Hill (1992), Petty and Hill (1994), and Petty (1995). For the purposes of this research the OWEI was the most applicable survey because of the depth of measuring work ethic, the easiness in the management, and the unique subsets of work ethic. The OWEI included a fairly completed list of work ethic descriptors. Other inventories of work ethic tend to focus on a specific aspect of work ethic: family, leisure, money, and etc. The three subscales of the OWEI: initiative, *dependability*, and interpersonal skills are very modern and exclusive for assessing work ethic.

Occupational Work Ethic Inventory

The Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) was developed by Petty (1991a) to measured work ethic attributes as part of a research project at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville. In designing this instrument, Petty (1993) extended the line of research conducted by Kazanas (1978) and identified work ethic descriptors. The OWEI is a self-reporting inventory that contains 50 descriptors of work ethic that allows respondents to evaluate the affective component of their work ethic. The instrument provides the stem, “At work I can describe myself as...” with 50 single words or simple two-item statements for the reader to rate. The rating scale is from one (never) to seven (always) (Petty, 1995a).

An assessment of the research associated with the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) identified a core structure that was repeated, although it sometimes emerged by various names. This structure is best conceptualized in the work of Hill and Petty (1995). Consequently, work ethic is conceptualized as having three core dimensions: interpersonal skills, initiative, and being dependable. The instrument provides scores on a basis of three subscales that included *dependability*, initiative, and interpersonal skills. The subscales of the instrument were identified

through a factor analysis conducted to identify key themes (Hill and Petty). *Dependability* sub-scale descriptors include: punctual, careful, honest, reliable, following directions, following regulations, and dependable. Interpersonal skills descriptors include appreciative, emotionally stable, patient, likable, helpful, pleasant, cooperative, hardworking, cheerful, devoted, courteous, considerate, well groomed, friendly, loyal, and modest. Initiative sub-scale descriptors include resourceful, productive, dedicated, persistent, enthusiastic, orderly, persevering, conscientious, accurate, adaptable, efficient, perceptive, initiating, effective, ambitious and independent.

According to Hill and Petty (1995), the items that served as a basis for the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) would likely be desirable personal traits in any circumstance, but the instrument provides a clear connection between the items and work, making it useful in measuring employability skills.

Conclusion

To conduct a study of this nature it was necessary to explore literature from which to base the study. This chapter therefore presented literature that highlighted the history of work ethic to its present state while examining the differences between work ethic and demographics. Based on Bandura's (1977) social learning theory the behaviors of work ethic were best learned through observation and modeling.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a description of the sample selected for the study, the research design, the instrument used, independent and dependent variables, procedures followed in collecting data, and the methods of analyzing data.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to gather baseline data on work ethic using the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI), with employees from a random sample of public and private businesses and industries that were members of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce in Shreveport, Louisiana (Caddo Parish), whose occupations reflected the current occupational structure as described by the Bureau of Labor Statistics based on the Major Occupational Groups (MOGs) (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008).

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Does work ethic differ among respondents grouped by occupation?
2. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by level of education?
3. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by age?
4. Does work ethic differ between male and female workers?
5. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by years of full-time work experience?

Population and Sample

The population selected for this study consisted of workers employed in public and private businesses and industries located through the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, (Caddo Parish). Data obtained from the Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce indicated that the number of business and industries that are Chamber of Commerce members is 1,238. A table for determining random sample size for a given population (Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1970) was used to determine that a random sample of 291 locations was needed to allow inferences to the selected population. The 291 businesses were randomly selected using a free random number generator computer program (Retrieved from <http://www.pangloss.com/seidel/rnumber.cgi> on 01/11/08). The easiest way to have access to Caddo Parish workers was through their places of employment. Businesses and industries were identified and addresses and phone numbers were printed.

Participation by employees was requested by the researcher during a visit to each randomly selected business and industry. Once participation was secured, copies of the instrument were dropped off at each business and picked up by the researcher upon completion in order to maximize cooperation. The instruments were distributed and collected over a three-month time frame. The boundaries of the study were confined to a single geographic area due to limited resources and need for accessibility.

Research Design

An ex-post facto research design, with a univariate analysis of variance, was used to analyze data collected using the survey method. The instruments were delivered to randomly selected businesses and industries, completed by every available employee at each business, and

then picked up when completed. The intended sample included every participating employee of the randomly selected firms participating in the study.

Gathering data from one specific area limited the generalizability of the study (Babbie, 1999). Although the current study was modeled after Hill's 1992 study, direct comparisons or statements about change over time are limited because of the difference in the location. A listing of the types of companies included in the study is provided in Appendix H, however, and the reader can determine the extent to which results might be applied to other contexts.

Instrumentation

The instrument used for this study was the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) (see Appendix A). It was developed by Dr. Gregory Petty of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The OWEI was developed to provide a brief, but accurate measure of work ethic by workers (Petty, 1993). In constructing this instrument, Petty extended the line of research conducted by Kazanas (1978) and identified 50 work ethic descriptors that represent desirable affective attributes of workers. Permission was granted, from Petty to use the OWEI (see Appendix B).

The OWEI is comprised of 50 items. The stem of the instrument is "As a worker I can describe myself as:" for all 50 items. It also includes the list of work ethic descriptors. The stem was constructed to center the measure on attitudes at work. The instrument uses a Likert scale with the following labels: 1 = Never, 2 = Almost Never, 3 = Seldom, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Usually, 6 = Almost Always, and 7 = Always. There were 11 items that were reversed and all the items were assigned a random order in the design of the instrument.

The constructs examined in this study were derived from a factor analysis of data collected using the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI). Hill and Petty (1995) completed this

process and identified a four-factor solution that explained 48 of the 50 items and accounted for 38.86% of the total variance. During this research, initial factors were extracted using a principal-components analysis. Kaiser's criterion was applied to eliminate error variance from being included with common and specific variance, and then an orthogonal rotation was completed using a Varimax Procedure (Hill, 1997).

Of the four factors identified, three were labeled: interpersonal skills, initiative, and being dependable. The fourth factor consisted of those items that were reversed. This factor was attributed to response patterns that came from negative descriptors such as hostile, rude, and selfish, which were part of the instrument design. This particular factor was not labeled and was not considered to reflect a work ethic construct. Hill and Petty (1995) stated that in a reversed item the descriptors are stated negatively on the OWEI. They are included in the OWEI to prevent research participants from developing a response pattern based on quickly marking a rating on the Likert Scale without reading and legitimately responding to the actual item. Some researchers (Hill & Petty) have chosen to use the fourth factor to describe work ethic but for this particular study the factor was not used because it does not reflect a work ethic construct.

Other work ethic instruments were researched for use in this study but they were not as easy to complete or as direct as the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI). Few instructions needed to be provided to the participants and the instrument can be completed quickly. A minimal time requirement was an asset at the collection sites when working with employees since they completed the instrument during work with only some brief instructions. The OWEI has been used in other research studies to measure work attitudes and it has been shown to have high validity and reliability (Hill, 1992; 1997; Hill & Petty, 1995).

Independent Variables

The independent variables for this study were occupation, education, age, gender, and years of full-time work experience. All data were compared using the categories from the demographic information that was collected from respondents. Occupations were categorized using the Major Occupational Groups (MOGs) which displays how economists classified thousands of occupations into Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Major Occupational Groups (MOGs). These categories can be found on the U.S. Department of Labor website.

Education was divided into five levels (a) less than high school diploma, (b) high school degree or GED, (c) two years of college or Associate's degree, (d) a Bachelor's degree, and (e) some Graduate work. Age had five levels (a) 19 or under, (b) 20 to 26, (c) 27 to 35, (d) 36 to 55, and (e) over 55. Gender was indicated by (a) female and (b) male.

Age levels were categorized based on Erickson's identity and the life cycle theory (Erickson, 1980). Erickson's identity and life cycle theory included stage 1 (0-1) infant, stage 2 (2-3) toddler, stage 3 (3-6) preschooler, stage 4 (7-12) school age child, stage 5 (12-18) adolescence, stage 6 (the 20's) young adult, stage 7 (Late 20's to 50's) middle adult and stage 8 (50's and older) old adult. Erickson believed that development is primarily quantitative because changes are stage like, but also qualitative as one's identity becomes stronger and one's convictions solidify (Erickson, 1980).

Work experience had three levels (a) less than two years, (b) two to eight years, and (c) eight or more years (Hill, 1997). Bracuchle and Azam's 2004 research showed that employees that had eight or more years of continued full-time employment may find themselves in a better position to grow on the job while gaining more responsibility. On the other hand employees with

two to eight years have some experience but could use more. Less than two years of experience means that these employees may be rather fresh from school or workforce and do not have enough experience in working with other people.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables for this study consisted of three dimensions of occupational work ethic measured by the subscales of Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI). The subscales that were used were labeled *dependability*, interpersonal skills, and initiative.

The researcher requested permission from the University of Georgia's Institutional Review Board to survey human subjects. A statement regarding the University's IRB policy was included in the cover letter. Individual participation results were confidential and the researcher agreed not to release results in any individually identifiable form without the participant's prior consent, unless otherwise required by law. Permission was granted by Petty to use the OWEI (see Appendix B).

Data Collection Procedures

A written explanation of the research project for those who were a part of the sample was given before data was collected (see Appendix C). In addition the researcher made appointments with the President of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce and Chancellor of Bossier Parish Community College. During individual meetings with each of these leaders the research was explained and letters of introduction were requested and received. Photocopies of these letters (see Appendix D and Appendix E) were available to all research participants. The randomly selected businesses and industries where data were collected were located throughout Caddo Parish, Shreveport.

The researcher drove to each of the workplaces, introduced herself, and asked to speak with the manager, Human Resource Director, or owner. Upon meeting with that person, an explanation

of the research was provided and participation was requested. The actual wording of the initial introduction letters was slightly different depending on the type of workplace, but Appendix F showed the explanation and request for assistance used for each workplace.

When the contact person agreed to the request, copies of the letter explaining the research and the letters of introduction were presented along with copies of the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI). Instructions for completing the instrument were explained and it was reiterated that individual responses were confidential. If the contact person at a workplace did not refuse, the researcher asked how many instruments should be left at the workplace and when they should be contacted for a pickup of the completed instruments. The materials required for data collection were left, along with a 9 x 12 manila envelope for the completed questionnaires to be placed in. After the researcher left the workplace, information regarding the date and time was recorded for picking up completed instruments, the number of respondents, and the name or title of the person that said the workplace would participate in the research project.

Every workplace was contacted regarding the pickup date. The statement that was made over the telephone during this conversation is provided in Appendix G. When the instruments were ready, the researcher picked them up. If they were not ready, the researcher asked when she should call again. The date given was recorded and a follow up call was made.

When instruments were completed and collected from the different workplaces, the number of Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI's) received was recorded and the random number that was assigned for that particular workplace was written on the right corner of each questionnaire. This facilitated an accurate tabulation of the response rate. When respondents left an item blank for the independent variable demographic responses but completed the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI), the response category for the variable was coded as missing data.

These instruments were included for statistics on other independent variables where responses were provided. counted as part of the frequency. The frequency counts did vary for the different independent variables (see Table 1).

Table 1

Frequency Count of Independent Variables

Independent Variables	n	Missing
a. Occupation	1105	100
b. Education	1190	15
c. Age	1190	15
d. Gender	1176	29
e. Years of Full-Time Work Experience	1187	15

Data Analysis

Following data collection, a univariate analysis of variance was used for each independent variable, occupation, education, age, gender, years of experience to determine if significant differences were shown for the dependent variables using scores for each Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscale. Once the univariate analysis F was computed, the analysis was completed for Fishers independent variables having only two categories. For independent variables having more than two categories, additional analyses were needed if overall differences were significant based on the univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) calculations.

For independent variables with more than two classifications Major Occupational Groups (MOGs, education, age, and years of work experience) a Fisher's Protected Least Significance Difference (LSD) procedure was used to perform all-pairwise comparisons and to determine which mean subscale scores were significantly different from others (Keppel & Wickens, 2004).

Although Zwick (1993) has suggested that Fisher's Protected Procedure test does not control type I error rate, Newton and Rudeston (1999) reported other noted researchers who recommend the Fisher's Protected LSD be used for planned comparisons when the numbers of comparisons are not large (Howell, 1997; Seaman, Levin JR, & Serlin RC. 1991). Since this study only compared three subscales, Fisher's Least Significant Difference test was adequate for this study.

Fisher's Protected LSD procedure consists of running a Fisher's Protected LSD test only after the *F*-test for treatments, or level of independent variable, has been shown to be significant. The experiment-wise error rate for the Fisher's Protected LSD procedure is controlled at an approximate level equal to the alpha for the *F*-test (Keppel & Wickens, 2004). Correlation coefficients and the results of all statistical procedures were accepted as being significant at the $p < .05$ levels. In order to know if an observed difference has a statistical significance as well as importance, the effect size has to be calculated. The effect size describes the magnitude for effect. Since all effect sizes are calculated as a common scale it allows a researcher to compare the effectiveness of different situations on the same outcome. The effect size was calculated for this study using Cohen's guide for effect size (*d*): small = 0.2; medium = 0.5; and large = 0.8 (Huck, 2004).

Aside from procedures to analyze data collected, it was important to consider those who chose not to participate in the study although they were included in the selected random sample. Miller and Smith (1983) stated that several procedures could be used for controlling nonresponse errors. The procedures are to ignore nonrespondents, compare respondents to the population, and compare respondents to nonrespondents and to double dip nonrespondents. These authors believed that a nonresponse error would be a concern for all response rates as high as 90%. Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) suggested that if an appropriate follow-up procedure has been carried out then a

random sample of 20 nonrespondents should be contacted (double-dipped) to be surveyed. Then the responses should be compared with each item of the instrument to determine if the nonresponse error is a problem.

For purposes of this study the procedures used to examine potential nonresponse error was to compare late responders to early responders. During the week of August 20, approximately 4,935 surveys were delivered to 291 randomly sampled businesses and industries over a 10 day period, 1,000 were collected during the week of September 10. A follow up was conducted during the week of September 17 where an additional 205 surveys were collected during the week of October 1. A comparison of early respondents (n=1,000) to late responders (n=205) indicated no significant differences in *dependability*, interpersonal skills, and initiative. These results suggested that nonresponse bias did not significantly affect the results of the study. Whipple and Muffo (1982) suggested that in order to assess the presence of nonresponse bias that late responders be compared to nonresponders. They found that late responders are similar to nonresponders, and if they do not differ on the dependent variables measured that would indicate that nonresponse bias is not a factor. A comparison of independent variables in this study showed no significant differences in *dependability*, interpersonal skills and initiative. These results suggested that nonresponse bias did not significantly affect the results of the study.

To determine the nonresponse error rate a *t*-test was done to assess the presence of nonresponder bias by comparing late responders to nonresponders. The *t* test determine that the independent variables showed no significant difficulties in *dependability*, interpersonal skills and initiative suggesting that nonresponse bias did not significantly affect the results of the study.

CHAPTER 4

DATA RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to gather baseline data on work ethic using the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI), with employees from a random sample of public and private businesses and industries that were members of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce in Shreveport, Louisiana (Caddo Parish), whose occupations reflected the current occupational structure as described by the Bureau of Labor Statistics based on the Major Occupational Groups (MOGs) (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2008). Chapter 4 presents background information and the results of the statistical analysis described in Chapter 3. Results of the analysis are presented as related to the five research questions:

1. Does work ethic differ among respondents grouped by occupation?
2. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by level of education?
3. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by age?
4. Does work ethic differ between male and female workers?
5. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by years of full-time work experience?

Background Information

To provide data for this study, a total of 4,935 copies of the OWEI were delivered to 291 businesses and industries in Shreveport, Louisiana (Caddo Parish). A total of 1205 instruments were returned for an overall response rate of 24.4%. A wide variety of businesses and industries were represented by the data collected (see Appendix H). Of all participating industries and businesses, the mean of the response rates for individual firms was 35% (see Appendix I).

Although the response rate achieved was less than optimal, it was within the range that is typical for real-world research within the business community because of the complexity involved in reaching respondents, and persuading them to participate in the survey (Tarnai and Paxson, 2004). A number of factors are involved in the decision about whether or not to reply to a survey. Willimack, et al (2002) suggested that the respondent burden as perceived by the respondent is the major factor, and that data collection mode is one of the considerations taken into account by likely respondents.

The original list of 1,238 business and industries was compiled from the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce (Caddo Parish) membership, from which the random list was used for this study. Of the 291 businesses and industries randomly selected for the study, none were double listed, located outside of Shreveport, Louisiana (Caddo Parish), nor out of business. None of the firms who were contacted declined to participate in the study or to provide the survey to their employees.

Background information collected using The Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) included occupational category, levels of educational achievement, age, gender, and number of years of full-time work experience. Respondents were asked to provide their actual job titles as well as select the closest category to their current job. The Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) developed by Petty (1993) has six categories. These six categories were originally based on Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system that is no longer in use. The federal government is now using an occupational classification system that is part of the occupational classification system manual created for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) field economist to help ensure correct occupational matters when collecting compensation data. These categories in this classification system were appropriate for use in this study because they collapse

thousands of different occupations into nine categories. Respondents were asked to provide their actual job titles as well as select the closest category to their current job. The researcher used that information to convert each job title to its appropriate classification within the nine occupational definitions provided by the Major Occupational Groups (MOGs).

The researcher used that information to convert each job title to its appropriate classification within the nine occupational definitions provided by the Major Occupational Groups (MOGs). Of the 1205 instruments collected, 1105 (91.7%) provided occupational category information as follows (a) professional, technical, and related occupations (34 = 3.0%); (b) executive, administrative, and managerial occupations (74 = 6.6%); (c) sales occupations (72 = 6.5%); (d) administrative support occupations, and clerical (110 = 9.9%); (e) precision production, craft, and repair occupations (31 = 2.8%); (f) machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations (41 = 3.7%); (g) transportation and material moving occupations (43 = 3.8%); (h) handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations (163 = 14.7%); and (k) service occupations, except private household (537 = 48.5%). There was a good distribution of respondents across the nine categories, with more being in the service professions than in any other category. This reflected the shift toward service sector jobs that has transpired over the past decades.

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of educational achievement by selecting from five levels. Of the 1205 instruments collected, 1190 (98.8%) provided educational attainment information as follows (a) less than high school diploma (185 = 15.4%), (b) high school diploma or GED (335 = 27.8%), (c) two years of college or Associate's degree 388 (32.2%), (d) a Bachelor's degree (193 = 16.0%), and (e) some graduate work (89 = 7.4%).

Respondents were asked to indicate their age level by selecting from five levels. Of the 1205 instruments collected, 1180 (97.9%) provided age information as follows (a) 19 or under (247=20.5%), (b) 20 to 26 (333=27.6%), (c) 27 to 35 (321=26.6%), (d) 36 to 55 (214=17.8%), and (e) over 55 (65=5.4%).

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were male or female. Of the 1205 instruments collected, 1176 (97.6%) provided information for gender as follows: female (704=58.4%) and male (472=39.2%).

Respondents were asked to indicate their years of full-time work experience by selecting from three levels. Of the 1205 instruments collected, 1187 (98.5%) provided work experience information as follows (a) less than two years (365=30.3%), (b) two to eight years (504=41.8%), and (c) more than eight years (318=26.4%).

Chronbach's alpha statistics were computed to examine reliability based on internal consistency, and the alpha was high on all of them. The alpha coefficients for the three subscales were .929 for *dependability*, .906 for interpersonal skills, and .819 for initiative. The reliability coefficient of each subscale on an instrument or scale should be higher than a minimum level of .70 (Nunnally, 1978). All reliability coefficients for the three subscales were satisfied with the criterion being larger than .70.

To show practical significance of the results, effect sizes were calculated. The effect size statistics are used as an aid to interpret the results of a single study from a practical point of view (Gall et al., 2003). Eta-squared (η^2) was chosen to calculate the effect size since Cohen's (d) is usually used for research where there are two groups. However, the magnitude of an effect size is influenced by other factors. Gall et al. (2003) described that these factors are the measures used:

the absolute indifference among group means, the shape of the score distribution, and the individuals included in the sample.

Findings Related to Research Question #1

The background section provided on the back of the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) included an item that asked each respondent to indicate the category his or her occupation best fit. Nine choices were provided, based on the aggregate groupings included in the Major Occupational Groups (MOGs). The nine choices were (a) professional, technical, and related occupations; (b) executive, administrative, and managerial occupations; (c) sales occupations; (d) administrative support occupations, and clerical; (e) precision production, craft, and repair occupations; (f) machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations; (g) transportation and material moving occupations; (h) handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers; and (k) service occupations, except private household. Of the 1205 instruments collected, 1105 (91.7%) were completed for this item.

Using a univariate analysis of variance to test for significant differences in responses for each Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscale (see Table 2), it was determined that the aggregate Major Occupational Groups (MOGs) differed for each of the following dimensions of work ethic (a) *dependability* with $F = 7.512^*$, and $\text{sig} = .000$ (b) *interpersonal skills* with $F = 7.943^*$, and $\text{sig} = .000$, and (c) *initiative* with $F = 6.334^*$, and $\text{sig} = .000$ when grouped by occupation.

Table 2

Univariate One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Variance for the Three OWEI Subscales for the Factor of Major Occupational Groups

Source	df	SS	F	Sig.
Dependability	10	6272.812	7.512*	.000
Interpersonal Skills	10	2485.227	7.943*	.000
Initiative	10	8573.860	6.334*	.000

*P<.05

The means for subscales scores by respondents from each Major Occupational Groups (MOGs) are provided in Table 3.

Table 3

Mean OWEI Subscale Scores and Standard Deviations for Respondents Classified by Major Occupational Groups

Variable	n ^a	Mean Score	SD
Dependability			
a. Professional, technical, and related occupations	34	36.7143	9.41704
b. Executive, administrative, and managerial occupations	74	31.9634	9.28618
c. Sales occupations	72	37.0649	8.41574
d. Administrative support occupations, including clerical	110	39.1579	9.88212
e. Precision production, craft, and repair occupations	31	35.0690	10.37487
f. Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	41	33.6923	7.35266

Variable	n ^a	Mean Score	SD
g. Transportation and material moving occupations	43	40.6818	6.52285
h. Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	163	35.9408	8.25970
i. Service occupations, except private household	537	33.4859	9.49407

Interpersonal Skills

a. Professional, technical, and related occupations	34	79.6286	15.94676
b. Executive, administrative, and managerial occupations	74	68.2692	17.39658
c. Sales occupations	72	81.1842	15.52521
d. Administrative support occupations, including clerical	110	83.0789	18.32168
e. Precision production, craft, and repair occupations	31	79.0000	19.64419
f. Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	41	80.0455	13.71991
g. Transportation and material moving occupations	43	88.2727	11.16965
h. Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	163	79.3176	15.5853
i. Service occupations, except private household	537	73.9062	18.87463

Initiative

a. Professional, technical, and related occupations	34	84.2647	14.94699
---	----	---------	----------

Variable	n ^a	Mean Score	SD
b. Executive, administrative, and managerial occupations	74	74.8846	17.68996
c. Sales occupations	72	83.3947	15.22549
d. Administrative support occupations, including clerical	110	87.9735	17.45477
e. Precision production, craft, and repair occupations	31	82.5000	18.19044
f. Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	41	86.1500	15.42136
g. Transportation and material moving occupations	43	91.5581	12.10923
h. Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	163	85.0843	15.00037
i. Service occupations, except private household	537	79.4324	18.17277

^aTotal n = 1105

Since the frequency grouping factor of Major Occupational Groups (MOGs) had more than two levels, however, a pairwise comparison was needed to establish which population means differed significantly for each dimension of the work ethic measured by the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscale responses.

A Fisher's Protected LSD was used to provide a pairwise comparison for each Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscale. The results of the Fisher's Protected LSD analysis are reported using a summary diagram in Table 4. In the summary diagram, letters for each aggregate group are arranged by mean score, from smallest to largest. Groups for which the LSD analysis did not detect significant pairwise differences are connected with a common

underline. The LSD analysis did detect significant differences in scores for *dependability* and the *F*-test in the analysis of variance was significant. There were also differences in the mean scores of *interpersonal skills* and *initiative*. On *dependability* group c (sales occupation), group a (professional, technical, and related occupations), group h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations), group e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations), group f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations), group i (service occupations, except private household) and group b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations) scored lower than group g (transportation, and material moving occupations). Groups g (transportation, and material moving occupations) and group d (administrative support, including clerical occupations) mean scores were higher than groups e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), and c (sales occupation). Also groups g (transportation, and material moving occupations) and group d (administrative support, including clerical occupations) mean scores were higher than groups groups b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations), i (service occupations, except private household) and f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations). Groups c (sales occupation), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations), and e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations) mean scores were higher than groups b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations), i (service occupations, except private household) and f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations).

For *interpersonal skills*, group g (transportation, and material moving occupations) scored higher than group d (administrative support, including clerical occupations) and they both scored higher than groups c (sales occupation), f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors

occupations), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers), e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations), and i (service occupations, except private household). Groups i (service occupations, except private household), e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations) and c (sales occupation) mean scores were higher than group b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations) and lower than groups d (administrative support, including clerical occupations) and g (transportation, and material moving occupations).

Groups g (transportation and material moving occupations), d (administrative support, including clerical occupations), f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), c (sales occupation) and e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations) mean scores were higher than group i (service occupations, except private household) and group b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations) for *initiative*. Group i (service occupations, except private household) mean scores were lower than groups e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations), c (sales occupations), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations), f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations), d (administrative support, including clerical occupations) and g (transportation and material moving occupations) but higher than group b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations). Group b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations) mean scores were lower than all the other groups.

Table 4

Fisher's Protected LSD^a Procedure for all Pairwise Comparisons of OWEI Subscale Means for the Factor of MOGs Grouping

OWEI Subscale	MOGs Aggregate Groups ^b								
Dependability	<u>b</u>	<u>i</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>h</u>	<u>a</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>g</u>
Interpersonal Skills	b	<u>i</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>h</u>	<u>a</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>c</u>	d	g
Initiative	b	i	<u>e</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>a</u>	<u>h</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>g</u>

^aControlling Type I comparisonwise error rate at .05 significance level.

P<.05

^bMOGs Groups (a) professional, technical, and related occupations; (b) executive, administrative, and managerial occupations; (c) sales occupations; (d) administrative support occupations, and clerical; (e) precision production, craft, and repair occupations; (f) machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations; (g) transportation and material moving occupations (h) handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers occupations; (i) service occupations, except private household.

In relation to question one the Eta squared (η^2), sum of squares divided by the sum of total was used to calculate effect sizes for *dependability* = .12, *interpersonal skills* = .49, and *initiative* = .37. Referring to Huck's (2004) criteria of effect size (η^2): small = .01; medium = .06; large = .15; the occupation variable has a high size for all subscales as measured by the OWEI using data on work ethic gathered from selected employees in Shreveport, LA.

Findings Related to Research Question #2

As part of the background information on the OWEI, respondents were asked to identify level of education. Five levels of educational achievement were provided for them to choose from

(a) less than high school diploma, (b) high school degree or GED, (c) two years of college or Associate's degree, (d) a Bachelor's degree, and (e) some graduate work.

Using a univariate analysis of variance to test for significant differences in responses for each Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscale (see Table 5) it was determined that the respondents grouped by level of education differed for each of the following dimensions of work ethic (a) *dependability* with $F = 13.519^*$ and $\text{sig} = .000$, (b) interpersonal skills with $F = 10.675^*$ and $\text{sig} = .000$, and (c) initiative with $F = 7.951^*$ and $\text{sig} = .000$ were shown to meet the established level of significant results used in this study.

Table 5

Univariate One-Way Analysis of Variance for the Three OWEI Subscales for the Factor of Level Of Level Education

Source	df	SS	F	Sig.
Dependability	4	4558.562	13.9519*	.000
Interpersonal Skills	4	13659.761	10.675*	.000
Initiative	4	9521.765	7.951*	.000

* $P < .05$

The mean subscale scores for respondents grouped by level of education are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Mean OWEI Subscale Scores and Standard Deviations for Respondents Classified by Level of Education

Variable	n ^a	Mean Score	SD
Dependability			
a. Less than high school diploma	185	32.4500	8.35074

Variable	n ^a	Mean Score	SD
b. High school degree or GED	335	36.2054	10.03177
c. 2 years college/Associate's degree	388	36.0551	8.61025
d. Bachelor's degree	193	31.8021	9.07249
e. Some graduate work	89	37.5632	10.05531
Interpersonal Skills			
a. Less than high school diploma	180	73.8500	15.94666
b. High school degree or GED	335	78.9021	19.67597
c. 2 years college/Associate's degree	388	78.0842	17.22192
d. Bachelor's degree	193	69.6398	16.79943
e. Some graduate work	89	79.5882	19.67370
Initiative			
a. Less than high school diploma	185	80.0795	17.07210
b. High school degree or GED	335	82.9686	18.81302
c. 2 years college/Associate's degree	388	83.1227	15.56222
d. Bachelor's degree	193	76.0162	17.26534
e. Some graduate work	89	86.2907	19.15685

^aTotal n = 1190

Five different levels of education were used to group respondents so a pairwise comparison was computed using a Fisher's Protected (LSD) procedure to determine which population means differed significantly for each of the three dimensions of the work ethic measured by the OWEI subscale responses with significant (.05) *F*-values.

The Fisher's Protected LSD analysis did detect differences in mean scores for *dependability*, *interpersonal skills* and *initiative* (see Table 7). Groups e (some graduate work), b (high school degree or GED) and c (2 years college or Associate's degree) mean scores were higher for *dependability* than groups a (less than high school diploma) and d (Bachelor's degree). For *interpersonal skills* mean scores for group e (some graduate work), b (high school degree or GED) and c (2 years college or Associate's degree) were higher than group a (less than high school diploma) and group d (Bachelor's degree). Group a (less than high school diploma) mean score were higher than group d (Bachelor's degree) but lower than groups c (2 years college or Associate's degree), b (high school degree or GED) and e (some graduate work).

The mean score for respondents in group e (some graduate work) were higher for *initiative* than the mean scores for groups c (2 years college or Associate's degree) and b (high school degree or GED). Group e (some graduate work) mean scores were higher than group a (less than high school diploma), and group d (Bachelor's degree). Groups b (high school degree or GED) and c (2 years college or Associate's degree) mean scores were higher than group a (Bachelor's degree) but lower than group e (some graduate work). Group a (less than high school diploma) mean scores were higher than group d (Bachelor's degree) but lower than groups b (high school degree or GED), c (2 years college or Associate's degree) and group e (some graduate work). Group d (Bachelor's degree) mean scores were lower than the other four groups.

Table 7

Fisher's Protected LSD^a Procedure for all Pairwise Comparisons of OWEI Subscale Means for the Factor of Education

OWEI Subscale	Education ^b				
Dependability	<u>d</u>	<u>a</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>e</u>
Interpersonal Skills	d	a	<u>c</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>e</u>
Initiative	d	a	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	e

^aControlling Type I comparisonwise error rate at .05 significance level.

P<.05

^bLevel of Education (a) less than high school diploma; (b) high school degree or GED; (c) 2 years of college or Associate's degree; (d) Bachelor's degree; (e) some graduate work.

In relation to question two the Eta squared (η^2), sum of squares divided by the sum of total was used to calculate effect sizes for *dependability* = .16, *interpersonal skills* = .49, and *initiative* = .34. Referring to Huck's (2004) criteria of effect size (η^2): small = .01; medium = .06; large = .15; the education variable has a high effect on all subscales: *dependability*, *interpersonal skills*, and *initiative* on work ethic among employees in Shreveport, LA.

Findings Related to Research Question #3

The Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) background information included an item for each respondent to indicate age. Five age categories were chosen from (a) 19 or under, (b) 20-26, (c) 27-35, (d) 36-55, and (e) over 55. Of the 1205 instruments collected 1180 (97.9%) were completed for this item.

The results of the univariate analysis of variance were used to test for significant differences in response for each Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscale indicated that the respondents grouped by age differed for the dimensions of (a) *dependability* with $F = 5.5958^*$ and $\text{sig.} = .000$, and (b) interpersonal skills with $F = 4.799^*$ and $\text{sig.} = .001$. For initiative, the F -value computed was significant at the accepted level chosen for this study (.05) with $F = 2.946^*$ and $\text{sig.} = .019$ (see Table 8).

Table 8

Univariate One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Variance for the Three OWEI Subscales for the Factor of Age

Source	df	SS	F	Sig.
Dependability	4	2050.582	5.958*	.000
Interpersonal Skills	4	6274.866	4.799*	.001
Initiative	4	3585.762	2.946*	.019

* $p < .05$

The mean subscale scores for respondents grouped by age are shown in Table 9. Five different levels of age were used to group respondents so to determine which population means differed significantly for the factors of *dependability* and interpersonal skills, and initiative.

Table 9

Mean OWEI Subscale Scores and Standard Deviations for Respondents Classified by Age

Variable	n ^a	Mean Score	SD
Dependability			
a. 19 or under	244	34.6885	8.84162
b. 20-26	325	35.2246	9.73802

Variable	n ^a	Mean Score	SD
c. 27-35	313	33.1821	9.05479
d. 36-55	211	36.7488	9.26737
e. Over 55	63	37.3016	9.58095
Interpersonal Skills			
a. 19 or under	244	77.2083	17.00081
b. 20-26	325	78.4523	17.98049
c. 27-35	313	72.6378	18.52330
d. 36-55	211	77.4327	18.34388
e. Over 55	63	77.7302	19.45732
Initiative			
a. 19 or under	244	82.2532	17.20598
b. 20-26	325	82.6266	17.10434
c. 27-35	313	78.9159	17.40184
d. 36-55	211	83.6029	17.75710
e. Over 55	63	83.0159	19.15934

^aTotal n = 1180

A pairwise comparison was computed using a Fisher's Protected LSD procedure. The Fisher's Protected LSD analysis did detect differences in mean scores for *dependability*, *interpersonal skills*, and *initiative* and the F test in the analysis of variance was significant (see Table 10). The LSD analysis indicated that respondents grouped by age in groups e (over 55), d (36-55), b (20-26) and group a (19 or under) mean scores were higher than group c (27-35) on

dependability. On *interpersonal skills* groups a (19 or under), d (36-55), e (over 55) and b (20-26) mean scores were higher than group c (27-35). For *initiative* groups d (36-55), e (over 55), b (20-26) and a (19 or under) mean scores were higher than group c (27-35).

Table 10

Fisher's Protected LSD^a Procedure for all Pairwise Comparisons of OWEI Subscale Means for the Factor of Age

OWEI Subscale	Age ^b
Dependability	c <u>a b d e</u>
Interpersonal Skills	c <u>a d e b</u>
Initiative	c <u>a b e d</u>

^aControlling Type I comparisonwise error rate at .05 significance level.

P<.05

^bLevel of Age (a) 19 or under; (b) 20-26; (c) 27-35; (d) 36-55; (e) Over 55.

In relation to question three the Eta squared (η^2), sum of squares divided by the sum of total was used to calculate effect sizes for *dependability* = .17, *interpersonal skills* = .52, and *initiative* = .30. Referring to Huck's (2004) criteria of effect size (η^2): small = .01; medium = .06; large = .15; the age variable has a high effect on all subscales: *dependability*, *interpersonal skills*, and *initiative* on work ethic among employees in Shreveport, LA.

Findings Related to Research Question #4

Respondents indicated their gender as part of the background information requested on the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI). For this item, 1176 (97.6%) of the 1205 instruments were completed and could be used. There were more female respondents than male. The data indicated that 704 (58.4%) were female and 472 (39.2%) were male.

The results of univariate analysis of variance used to test for significant differences in responses for all three Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscales indicated that the respondents grouped by gender on *dependability* and initiative subscales did not meet the established level (.05) for significant results used in this study (see Table 11). The *F*-values computed for each of the items are as follows (a) *dependability* with $F = .287$ and $\text{sig.} = .592$, and (c) initiative with $F = 3.236$ and $\text{sig.} = .072$ did not meet the criteria for a significant difference, however (b) *interpersonal skills* with $F = 5.892^*$ and $\text{sig.} = .015$ did show significance.

Table 11

Univariate One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Variance for the Three OWEI Subscales for the Factor of Gender

Source	df	SS	F	Sig.
Dependability	1	25.181	.287	.592
Interpersonal Skills	1	1935.809	5.892*	.015
Initiative	1	991.252	3.236	.072

* $p < .05$ Frequency missing = 18

Females scored higher than the males on the *interpersonal skills* subscale for respondents grouped by gender shown in Table 12. The *F*-value for the *interpersonal skills* Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscale did meet the established level for significant results used in this study, however the independent variable gender had only two levels meaning no follow-up test was needed.

Table 12

Mean OWEI Subscale Scores and Standard Deviations for Respondents Classified by Gender

Variable	n ^a	Mean Score	SD
Dependability			
a. Female	704	35.0664	9.28724
b. Male	472	34.7642	9.46727
Interpersonal Skills			
a. Female	704	77.4126	17.72208
b. Male	472	74.7624	18.70597
Initiative			
a. Female	704	82.4201	17.16338
b. Male	472	80.5033	18.00324

^aTotal n = 1176

In relation to question four the Eta squared (η^2), sum of squares divided by the sum of total was used to calculate effect size for *interpersonal skills* = .66. Referring to Huck's (2004) criteria of effect size (η^2): small = .01; medium = .06; large = .15; the gender variable has a high effect on the subscale: *interpersonal skills* on work ethic among employees in Shreveport, LA.

Findings Related to Research Question #5

The Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) background information indicated the number of years of full-time work experience a respondent had completed. Three levels were provided for this independent variable: (a) less than two years, (b) two to eight years, and (c) more than eight years. Of the 1205 instruments collected, 1187 (98.5%) were completed for this item.

Of the total pool of respondents, 318 (26.4%), had worked full-time for more than eight years, and 504 (41.8%) of the total research participants, had worked full-time for two to eight years, slightly over 30% (30.3%) of respondents ($n=365$) had worked full-time for less than two years.

The univariate analysis of variance tests provided significant F -values for all three of the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscales (see Table 13). It was, therefore, determined that years of full-time work experience was a significant factor in the work ethic dimensions of interest in this study. The F -values computed for each OWEI subscale were as follows (a) *dependability* with $F = 1.929^*$ and $\text{sig.} = .000$, (b) *interpersonal skills* with $F = 1.623^*$ and $\text{sig.} = .000$, and (c) *initiative* with $F = 1.041^*$ and $\text{sig.} = .003$.

Table 13

Univariate One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Variance for the Three OWEI Subscales for the Factor of Years of Full- Time Work Experience

Source	df	SS	F	Sig.
Dependability	2	1957.818	11.302*	.000
Interpersonal Skills	2	5498.954	8.391*	.000
Initiative	2	3477.938	5.704*	.003

The mean subscale scores for respondents grouped by years of full-time work experience are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Mean OWEI Subscale Scores and Standard Deviations for Respondents Classified by Years of Full-Time Work Experience

Variable	n ^a	Mean Score	SD
Dependability			
a. Less than 2 years	358	35.6201	8.72941
b. 2-8 years	504	33.5121	9.53072
c. More than 8 years	318	36.5323	9.58680
Interpersonal Skills			
a. Less than 2 years	365	78.7793	17.45001
b. 2-8 years	504	73.8934	18.10070
c. More than 8 years	318	77.5469	18.83012
Initiative			
a. Less than 2 years	365	83.4207	16.82746
b. 2-8 years	504	79.6721	17.13502
c. More than 8 years	318	82.9109	18.65304

^aTotal n = 1187

Three different levels of work experience were used to group respondents, therefore, a Fisher's Protected LSD procedure was needed to determine which population means differed significantly. The Fisher's Protected LSD analysis (see Table 15) indicated that the mean scores for respondents who had more than eight years and less than two years of work experience mean scores were higher than those who had two to eight years of full-time work experience for the

work ethic subscale of *dependability*. For *interpersonal skills* the mean scores for respondents who had less than two years and more than eight years of full-time work experience were higher than those who had two to eight years of full-time work experience. For *initiative* the mean score for respondents with less than two years and more than eight years of full-time work experience were higher than those with two to eight years of full-time work experience.

Table 15

Fisher's Protected LSD^a Procedure for all Pairwise Comparisons of OWEI Subscale Means for the Factor of Years of Full-Time Work Experience

OWEI Subscale	Years of Full-time Work Experience ^b	
Dependability	b	<u>a</u> _____ <u>c</u>
Interpersonal Skills	b	<u>c</u> _____ <u>a</u>
Initiative	b	<u>c</u> _____ <u>a</u>

^aControlling Type I comparisonwise error rate at .05 significance level.

P<.05

^bYears of Full-Time Work Experience (a) less than 2 years, (b) 2-8 years, (c) more than 8 years.

In relation to question five the Eta squared (η^2), sum of squares divided by the sum of total was used to calculate effect sizes for *dependability* = .18, *interpersonal skills* = .50, and *initiative* = .30. Referring to Huck's (2004) criteria of effect size (η^2): small = .01; medium = .06; large = .15; the work experience variable has a high effect on all subscales: *dependability*, *interpersonal skills*, and *initiative* on work ethic among employees in Shreveport, LA.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides a summary of this study, a summary of the findings, conclusions drawn from findings, recommendations for future research on work ethic, and description of contributions of the study.

Summary of Research Study

The purpose of this study was to gather baseline data on work ethic using the OWEI (Occupational Work Ethic Inventory). The study included employees from a random sample of public and private businesses and industries that are members of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce in Shreveport, Louisiana (Caddo Parish), whose occupations reflect the present occupational structure as described by the Major Occupational Groups (MOGs). The demographic differences in the work ethic of the respondents were also examined. Data were analyzed to determine whether there were significant differences in the work ethic of the respondents based on occupation, education, age, gender, and years of full-time work experience.

This study was based on Bandura's social learning theory that human behavior is a combination of both social and cognitive psychology. Bandura's work as well as subsequent research based on his work has shown that role models and peer behavior play a significant role influencing behavior (Bandura, 1969). Work ethic and behavior in the workplace based on work ethic become significant in light of this theory since it is a large determinant of individual and corporate work performance (Bandura).

The significance of this study was that the information gathered from this segment of research will provide higher education institutions and businesses with information on the workforce's work ethic. The study was designed to revisit research done 16 years ago by Hill (1992) and was needed to show how work ethic attributes might have changed during that period of time. Friedman (2005), in using his metaphor of a flat world, would place the research conducted by Hill in the era of Globalization 2.0 and the present work in the era he labeled Globalization 3.0. With work ethic being a significant factor in global competitiveness, it is essential that ongoing research be conducted to learn of shifts and changes in the work ethic of working adults. To that end, this study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Does work ethic differ among respondents grouped by occupation?
2. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by level of education?
3. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by age?
4. Does work ethic differ between male and female workers?
5. Does work ethic differ among workers grouped by years of full-time work experience?

The population for this study included employees of public and private businesses that were members of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, (Caddo Parish). There were 1238 business and industries that were members of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce. A table for determining random sample size for a given population (Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1970) was used to determine that a random sample of 291 businesses and industries was needed to represent the selected population.

After the data was collected using the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI), it was compiled and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Frequency counts were tabulated for respondent groups according to levels of six independent variables (a)

Major Occupational Groups (MOGs), (b) level of education, (c) age, (d) gender, and (e) years of full-time work experience. A one-way analysis of variance was used for each independent variable to determine if significant differences were shown for the dependent variables using scores for each OWEI subscale. Once the univariate analysis was computed, the analysis was completed for independent variables having only two categories. For independent variables having more than two categories, an additional analysis was needed if overall differences were shown to be significant by the univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) calculations. For independent variables with more than two classifications (occupation, education, age, and years of work experience) a Fisher's Protected (LSD) procedure was used to perform all-pairwise comparisons and to determine which mean subscale scores were significantly different from others (Keppel & Wickens, 2004).

Although Zwick (1993) has suggested that Fisher's Protected Procedure test does not control type 1 error rate, Newton and Rudeston (1999) report other noted researchers who recommend the Fisher's Protected LSD be used for planned comparisons when the numbers of comparisons are not large (Howell, 1997; Seaman, Levin JR, & Serlin RC. 1991). Since this study only compared three subscales, Fisher's Least Significant Difference test was adequate for this study.

Summary of Findings

The statistical tests used to determine how workers differed when categorized by each of the independent variables, produced the following findings based on the research questions.

1. The LSD analysis did detect significant differences in scores for *dependability* and the *F*-test in the analysis of variance was significant. There were also differences in the mean scores of *interpersonal skills* and *initiative*. On *dependability* group c (sales occupation), group a (professional, technical, and related occupations), group h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations), group e (precision production, craft, and repair

occupations), group f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations), group i (service occupations, except private household) and group b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations) scored lower than group g (transportation, and material moving occupations). Groups g (transportation, and material moving occupations) and group d (administrative support, including clerical occupations) mean scores were higher than groups e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), and c (sales occupation). Also groups g (transportation, and material moving occupations) and group d (administrative support, including clerical occupations) mean scores were higher than groups b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations), i (service occupations, except private household) and f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations). Groups c (sales occupation), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations), and e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations) mean scores were higher than groups b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations), i (service occupations, except private household) and f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations).

For *interpersonal skills*, group g (transportation, and material moving occupations) scored higher than group d (administrative support, including clerical occupations) and they both scored higher than groups c (sales occupation), f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers), e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations), and i (service occupations, except private household). Groups i (service occupations, except private household), e (precision production, craft, and repair

occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations) and c (sales occupation) mean scores were higher than group b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations) and lower than groups d (administrative support, including clerical occupations), and g (transportation, and material moving occupations).

Groups g (transportation and material moving occupations), d (administrative support, including clerical occupations), f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers), a (professional, technical, and related occupations), c (sales occupation) and e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations) mean scores were higher than groups i (service occupations, except private household) and b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations) for *initiative*. Group i (service occupations, except private household) mean scores were lower than groups e (precision production, craft, and repair occupations), c (sales occupation), group a (professional, technical, and related occupations), h (handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers occupations), f (machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors occupations), d (administrative support, including clerical occupations) and g (transportation and material moving occupations) but higher than group b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations). Group b (executive, administrative, and managerial occupations) mean scores were lower than all the other groups.

2. The Fisher's Protected LSD analysis did detect differences in mean scores for *dependability*, *interpersonal skills* and *initiative*. Groups e (some graduate work), b (high school degree or GED) and c (2 years college or Associate's degree) mean scores were

higher for *dependability* than groups a (less than high school diploma) and d (Bachelor's degree). Groups c (2 years college or Associate's degree) and b (high school degree or GED) mean scores were lower than group e (some graduate work) but higher than groups a (less than high school diploma) and group d (Bachelor's degree). For *interpersonal skills* mean scores for group e (some graduate work), b (high school degree or GED) and c (2 years college or Associate's degree) were higher for group a (less than high school diploma) and group d (Bachelor's degree). Group a (less than high school diploma) means score were higher than group d (Bachelor's degree) but lower than groups c (2 years college or Associate's degree), b (high school degree or GED) and e (some graduate work). Group d (Bachelor's degree) means score were lower than groups a (less than high school diploma), b (high school degree or GED) and e (some graduate work).

The mean score for respondents in group e (some graduate work) were higher for *initiative* than the mean scores for group c (2 years college or Associate's degree) and group b (high school degree or GED). Group e (some graduate work) mean scores were higher than group a (less than high school diploma), and group d (Bachelor's degree). Group a (less than high school diploma) means scores were higher than group d (Bachelor's degree) but lower than groups b (high school degree or GED), group c (2 years college or Associate's degree) and group e (some graduate work). Group d (Bachelor's degree) mean scores were lower than the other four groups.

3. The Fisher's Protected LSD analysis did detect differences in mean scores for *dependability*, *interpersonal skills*, and *initiative* and the F test in the analysis of variance was significant. The LSD analysis indicated that respondents grouped by age in groups e (over 55), d (36-55), b (20-26) and group a (19 or under) mean scores were higher than

group c (27-35). Group c (27-35) mean scores were lower than groups a (19 or under), b (20-26), d (36-55) and e (over 55) on *dependability*. On *interpersonal skills* groups a (19 or under), d (36-55), e (over 55) and b (20-26) mean scores were higher than group c (27-35). Group c (27-35) mean scores were lower than groups a (19 or under), d (36-55), e (over 55) and b (20-26). Groups e (over 55), d (36-55), and a (19 or under) mean scores were higher than group c (27-35) and lower than group b (20-26). For *initiative* groups d (36-55), e (over 55), b (20-26) and a (19 or under) mean scores were higher than group c (27-35). Group c (27-35) mean scores were lower than groups a (19 or under), b (20-26), e (over 55), and d (36-55). Groups e (over 55), b (20-26) and a (19 or under) were higher than group c (27-35) and lower than group d (36-55).

4. Females scored higher than the males on the *interpersonal skills* subscale for respondents grouped by gender. The *F*-value for the *interpersonal skills* Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) subscale did meet the established level for significant results used in this study, however the independent variable gender had only two levels meaning no follow-up test was needed.
5. The Fisher's Protected LSD analysis indicated that the mean scores for respondents who had more than eight years and less than two years of work experience mean scores were higher than those who had two to eight years of full-time work experience for the work ethic subscale of *dependability*. The mean score for respondents who had two to eight years was lower than the respondents who had more than eight years and less than two years. For *interpersonal skills* the mean scores for respondents who had less than two years and more than eight years of full-time work experience the mean score were higher than those who had more than two to eight years of full-time work experience. The mean score for

respondents who had two to eight years was lower than the respondents who had less than two years and more than eight years. For *initiative* the mean score for respondents with less than two years and more than eight years of full-time work experience were higher than those with two to eight years of full-time work experience. The mean score for respondents who had two to eight years was lower than the respondents who had less than two years and more than eight years.

Conclusions

Several conclusions were formulated, based on the analysis of data collected using the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI). These conclusions are exact, with the limitations specified for this study, and to the degree that data and findings were valid and reliable.

Hill's 1992 study demonstrated a difference in work ethic between workers grouped by occupation. It also showed that education is not a strong indicator of a person's work ethic. Work ethic was relatively homogenous across all age categories. Womens' responses indicated that they would be characterized by a stronger work ethic than men. It was also concluded that when workers are new to the workforce or have been working more than eight years, they tend to express higher levels of work ethic than those who have worked from two to eight years.

To respond to the five research questions that are related to demographic differences in work ethic 1,105 were collected for occupation; 1190 were collected for education; 1180 were collected for age; 1176 were collected for gender and 1187 were collected for years of experience and analyzed using one-way ANOVAs. The surveys that had missing data were taken out. Previous research by Petty (1995) suggested that since all jobs require different skills and knowledge, the work ethic of one occupation can be expected to be different from that of another. This conclusion is in line with Hill's (1992) and Petty's (1995) studies that showed there were

significant differences related to occupation. Things have not changed since the first examination of this study 16 years ago because the workforce is continuing to have a shift in demographics, technology and economic globalization (Karoely and Pannis, 2004).

Employees who were in the transportation group showed more dependability than all the other occupational groups. This conclusion was not a surprise because *dependability* is required in the transportation industry and the lack of it is bad for business which ultimately causes a trickledown effect.. It was concluded that the level of education demonstrated is a powerful indicator of a person's work ethic. The Fisher's Protected LSD analysis detected differences in mean scores for *dependability*, *interpersonal skills*, and *initiative*. Respondents that had some graduate work scored higher for *dependability*, *interpersonal skills*, and *initiative*. Employers want employees with a strong academic foundation (Imel, 1989). It was no surprise that members of the workforce who had just high school diplomas and Associate degrees had higher mean scores for *dependability* because they may be glad to have a job and are willing to do everything possible to hold on to it.

There are differences that were detected in the work ethic of workers in Shreveport (Caddo parish) grouped by age, especially for *dependability*, *interpersonal skills* and *initiative* subscales. The over 55 workers showed a stronger work ethic than the 27-35 one's for *dependability* and *interpersonal skills*. The 36-55 age group was stronger for *initiative*. These results may reflect that people are living longer and because they are older and need to work they tend to hold on to their jobs longer. The average life expectancy is now above 80, and it is common to find people living to age 90 or even 100 (McMahan and Sturz, 2006).

In this current study even though females' mean scores on each of the subscales were slightly higher than males, only one had a significant p value. This conclusion is in line with the

findings of Pierson and Holmes (2006). Gilligan (1982) argued that women and men may possess fundamentally different moral orientations. One could suggest that justice describes a man's view of morality and that women operate from a framework of caring as a primary moral orientation.

For *initiative* the mean score for respondents with less than two years and more than eight years of full-time work experience were higher than those with two to eight years of full-time work experience. As well as respondents who had more than eight years of full-time work experience had a mean score significantly higher than those who had two to eight years of full-time work experience for the subscale initiative. This finding, is in line with Brauchle and Azam (2004) who argued that employees with continued full-time employment may find themselves in a better position on the job while continuing to grow even more responsible. The results are the same as the Hill (1992) study done 16 years ago.

Together, all the conclusions presented here offer substantial baseline information pertaining to work ethic, for workers classified by occupation, education, age, gender, and full-time work experience. In addition, a reasonable basis has been set for continued work ethic research.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations for further research on work ethic and the subscales of work ethic on the Occupational Work Ethic Inventory (OWEI) are based on the findings and conclusions from this study:

1. Further research should be conducted to see how employees perceive their value on the job has any effect on their work ethic. Literature has shown that perceived self-efficacy is defined as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives (Bandura, 1969).

This knowledge will help employers know how to bring about a solid work ethic from their employees through on the job work ethic training; while offering a comparison between occupation, education, age, gender, and years of work experience between the southern and northern regions.

2. A replication of this study should be conducted using a sample population from southern Louisiana to see if there is a difference in the work ethic of the workforce from different regions of the same state. This information would allow the Louisiana state Labor Department access to information that will guide workforce training that includes work ethic. It would also help state educators and director of workforce programs know where training is needed in work ethic.

Contributions of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide a second look at the research completed by Hill (1992). Friedman (2005) argued that Globalization 3.0 has the planet shrinking. He state that economic stability is not a feature of the flat world and in order to be competitive the workforce needs to change from the culture of lifetime employment to lifetime employability. The findings of this study will make northern Louisiana workforce more attractive to potential businesses and industries considering locating to the state as well as potential employers looking to hire potential employees because employers have stated that they need employees who have a solid work ethic. It will also allow educators in northern Louisiana to help in preparing the future workforce in having a strong work ethic.

REFERENCES

- Asacker, T. (2004). *Ethics in the workplace; The best strategy: start with honesty with others*. The Free Library. Retrieved on January 01, 2009 from [http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Ethics in the workplace; The best strategy: start with honesty with...-a0126076175](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Ethics+in+the+workplace;+The+best+strategy:+start+with+honesty+with...-a0126076175).
- Azam, M.S. (2002). *A study of supervisor and employee perceptions of work attitudes in information age manufacturing industries*. (Unpublished master's thesis, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois, 2002).
- Ayers, L. (2005). *I Poll*. Retrieved January 01, 2009 from www.pccomputing.com
- Babbie, E. (1999). *The basics of social research*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Bandura, A. (1969). *Principles of behavior modification*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Berry, L. R., & Glenn, R. E. (2004). The ABC's of a good work ethic. *Education Digest*, 69(8), 4.
- Beyer, J. (1980). *Baton Rouge blues: A guide to Baton Rouge bluesman and their music*. Baton Rouge: Arts and Humanities Council of Greater Baton Rouge.
- Blood, M. R. (1969). Work values and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 53, 456-459.
- Blythe, J., Caumann, A., Zeytnogla, I. U., Denton, M., Akhtar-Dunesn, N., Davies, S., & Kolotylo, C. (2008). Nursing generations in the contemporary workplace. *Public Personnel Management*. Retrieved October 14, 2008 from <http://www.allbusiness.com/labor-employment/human-resources-personnel-management/>
- Boeree, C. G. (1997). Erik Erikson. Retrieved January 05, 2009, from

<http://www.ship.edu/~cgboer/erikson.html>

Boeree, C. G. (1998). *Albert Bandura*. Retrieved January 01, 2009, from

<http://www.ship.edu/~cgboeree/bandura.html>

Bradley, C. (2007). *Work Ethics: It takes more than skill to be successful in today's job market*.

Retrieved on January 1, 2009 from <http://www.associatedcontent.com>

Brasseaux, C. (1987). *The founding of New Acadia: The beginning of Acadian life in*

Louisiana, 1765-1803. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.

Braude, L. (1975). *Work and workers: A sociological analysis*. Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Buchholz, R. A. (1978). An empirical study of contemporary beliefs about work in American society. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 219-227.

Buchholz, R. A. (1978). The work ethic reconsidered. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 31(4), 450-459.

Bureau of labor statistics Retrieved January 1, 2009 from

<http://www.bls.gov/ncs/ocs/ocsm/commain.htm>.

Cash, W. (1941). *The mind of the south*. New York: Vintage Books.

Cherrington, D. J. (1980). *The work ethic: Working values and values that work*. New York: American Management Association.

Compton, M. (2007). The ethical employee. *Women in Business*, 59(3).

Curry, A. (2003). Why we work. *U. S. News & World Report*, 134(6), 48.

Curtiss, C. E. (2000). Addressing the shortage of qualified workers. *Foundry Management & Technology*, 128(10), 32.

DiPiazza Jr., S. A. (2001). The value of the corporate ethics officer. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 712-717.

- Educational and Psychological Measurement*, (1970). Sage Publication.30(1).
- Filipczak, B. (1994). It's just a job: Generation X at work. *Training*, 31(4), 21-30.
- Fontenot, W. (Ed.). (1994a). *Malaki festival: A community reunion to celebrate rural African American traditions*. Opelousas, LA: Wannamuse Institute for Arts, Culture, and Ethnic Studies.
- Frantom, M. (1993). Special Issue: African-American Folklife in Louisiana. *Louisiana Folklife*, 17. Natchitoches, LA: Northwestern State University, Louisiana Folklife Center.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Furnham, A. (1982). The protestant work ethic and attitudes toward unemployment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 55, 277-286.
- Galbraith, S. and H.B. Stephenson. 1993. "Decision rules used by male and female business students in making ethical value judgments: Another look." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12, 227-233.
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Gall, M.D., Gall, J.P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gerth, A., & Rothman, S. (2007). The future IS organization in a flat world. *Information Systems Management*, 24(2), 103-111.
- Gilligan, C. 1977. "In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality." *Harvard Educational Review* 47: 481-517.
- _____. 1982. *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge,

MA: Harvard University Press.

Gitlen, S. (2007). Battle of the ages: How CIOs can avoid generational clashes among their IT

staff. *Management Careers*. Retrieved January 1, 2009, from

<http://www.networkworld.com/careers/2007/020507-careers-generations.html>

Gitmore, J. (2007). One thing hasn't changed—hard work pays off. *Des Moines Business*

Record, 25(46), 33.

Goodale, J. (1973). Effects of personal background and training on work values of the hard-core

unemployed. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 1-9.

Graves, D. (2007). Part II: Tradition in transition: Ye olde work ethic. *MLO: Medical Laboratory*

Observer, 39(4), 4, 10.

Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce Directory. (2007). Retrieved January 1, 2009, from

<http://www.shreveportchamber.org/index2.php>

Gregory, H. (1981). *Doing it right and passing it on: North Louisiana crafts*. Alexandria, LA.:

Alexandria Museum of Art.

Hagenbaugh, B. (2007). More employers recruit the military work ethic. *USA Today*, 01b.

Harris, P. (2006). "Beware of the boomer brain drain!". *Training & Development*.

FindArticles.com. Retrieved January 01, 2009 from

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m4467/is_200601/ai_n21407456

Hatcher, T. (1995). From apprentice to instructor: Work ethic in apprenticeship training. *Journal*

of Industrial Teacher Education, 33(1), 24-45.

Heinke, M. I. (2004). Design practice policies to encourage ethical behavior. *DVM*

Newsmagazine, 32.

Herr, E. L., & Cramer, S. H. (1996). *Career guidance and counseling through the lifespan*:

Systematic approaches (5th ed.). New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Hill, R. B. (1992). *The work ethic as determined by occupation, education, age, gender, work experience, and empowerment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Hill R. B. (1996). Work ethic differences in vocational education students and full-time employed workers. *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 21(3), 13-29.

Hill, R. B. (1997). Demographic differences in selected work ethic attributes. *Journal of Career Development*, 24(1), 3-23.

Hill, R. B. (1997). The design of an instrument to assess problem solving activities in technology education. *Journal of Technology Education*, 9(1), 31-46.

Hill, R. B., & Fouts, S. (2005). Work ethic and employment status: A study of jobseekers. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 42(3), 48-65.

Hill, R. B., & Petty, G. C. (1995). A new look at selected employability skills: A factor analysis of the occupational work ethic. *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 20(4), 59-73.

Hill R. B., & Rojewski, J. W. (1999). Double jeopardy: Work ethic differences in youth at risk of school failure. *Career Development Quarterly*, 47, 267-279.

Hiring Trends. (1997). *Techniques: Making education and career connections*, 72(3), 30.

Howell, D.C. (1997). Statistical Methods for Psychology (4th edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Huck, S. W. (2004). *Reading statistics and research*. (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.

Imel, S. (1989). *Employers' expectations of vocational education*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED312454).

Infoplease Retrieved on January 1, 2009 from <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/us/A0859363.html>

- Johnson, C. (2006). *Ethics in the workplace: Tools and tactics for organizational transformation*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Karoly, L.A. & Pannis, C. W. A. (2004) *The 21st Century at Work: Forces Shaping the Future Workforce and Workplace in the United States*. United States Dept. of Labor, Rand Corporation.
- Kazanas, H. C. (1978). *Affective work competences for vocational education*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University ERIC Clearinghouse for Vocational and Technical Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 166420)
- Keppel, G., & Wickens, T. D. (2004). *Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.
- Kern, C. (1998). Mentoring work values. Implications for counselors. *Educational Gerontology*, 24, 349-358.
- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (1996). Social cognitive approach to career development: An overview. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 44, 310-321.
- Lewis, A.C. (2006). Necessary basic skills. *Techdirections*, 6-8.
- Lipset, S. M. (1990). The work ethic - then and now. *Public Interest*, 61-69.
- Louisiana Retrieved on January 01, 2009 from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louisiana>
- Louisiana Workforce Commission Retrieved on January 09, 2009 from www.LAWORKS.net
- McCortney, A. L., & Engels, D. W. (2003). Revisiting the work ethic in America. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 52, 132-137.
- McHoskey, J. W. (1994). Factor structure of the protestant work ethic scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 17(1), 49-52.
- McMahan, S., & Sturz, D. (2006). Implications for an aging workforce. *Journal of Education for*

Business, 82(1), 50-55.

Miller, W. F. (1986). Emerging technologies and their implications for America. *USA Today*, 60-65.

Miller, L. E., & Smith, K. L. (1983). Handling nonresponse issues. *Journal of Extension*, 21(5), 45-60.

Mirels, H. L., & Garrett, J. B. (1971). The protestant ethic as a personality variable. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 36, 40-44.

Moseley, J. L., & Dessinger, J. C. (2007). *Training older workers and learners: Maximizing the workplace performance of an aging workforce*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mulligan, C. B. (1997). *Work ethic and family background*. University of Chicago, IL: Employment Policies Institute.

Murphy, L. L., Conoley, J. C., & Impara, J. C. (Eds.). (1994). *Tests in print IV* (Vol. 1 & 3). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

National Council on Vocational Education. (1991). *Rediscovering our national vision: Building positive self-esteem and a strong work ethic*. Washington, DC: National Consortium for Product Quality in Vocational Education.

Naylor, M. (1988). *Vocational education and the work ethic in a changing workplace*. Columbus, OH: Eric Clearinghouse on Adult Career and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED299457)

Naylor, T. H., Willimon, W. H., & Osterberg, R. (1996). *The search for meaning in the workplace*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Nelson, T. R. (2004). *How do your work ethics measure up?* Retrieved January 01, 2009 from [http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0303/p16s01\)-wmge.html](http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0303/p16s01)-wmge.html)

- Newton, R. R., & Rudestam, K. E. (1999). *Your statistical consultant: Answers to your data analysis questions*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Office of the Governor Retrieved on January 01, 2009 from <http://www.gov.louisiana.gov>
- Opp, K.D. (1979). The emergence and effects of social norms. A confrontation of some hypotheses of sociology and economics. *Kyklos*, 32, 775-801.
- Packer, A. "The End of Routine Work and the Need for a Career Transcript." Paper presented at the Hudson Institute's Workforce 2020 Conference, Indianapolis, Indiana, October 1998.
- Petty, G. C. (1991a). *Development of the occupational work ethic inventory*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Petty, G. C. (1993),. *Development of the occupational work ethic inventory*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Vocational Association, Nashville, TN.
- Petty, G. C., & Hill, R. B. (1994). Are women and men different? A study of the occupational work ethic. *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 19(1), 71-89.
- Petty, G. C. (1995a). Adults in the workforce and the occupational work ethic. *Journal of Studies in Technical Careers*, 15(3), 133-140.
- Petty, G. C. (1995b). Vocational-technical education and the occupational work ethic. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 32(3), 45-58.
- Petty, G. C., & Hill, R. B. (1996). *Essential elements of work: A factor analysis of the occupational work ethic*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Human Resource Development Conference, Minneapolis, MN.
- Petty, G. C., & Hill, R. B. (2005). Work ethic characteristics: Perceived work ethics of supervisors and workers. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 42(2), 1-16.

- Pierson, P. N., & Holmes, G. H. (2006). *Perceptions of work ethic among college seniors: A comparative study*. Retrieved May 12, 2006, from <http://www.collegevalues.org/articles.cfm?id=603&a=1>
- Pyskowski, I. S. (1992). Restoring work ethic in America education. *Education*, 113(1), 127-132.
- Random Number Generator*. Retrieved January 01, 2009, from <http://www.pangloss.com/seidel/rnumber.cgi>
- Reece, B. L., & Brandt, R. (2005). *Effective human relations personal and organizational applications* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Riquelmy, C. (Ed.). (1994). *Documenting selected Louisiana ethnic groups: A theme issue of LLA bulletin 57:1*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana Library Association.
- Roach-Lankford, S. (1984). *Gifts from the Hills*. Ruston: Louisiana Tech Art Gallery.
- Rodgers, D. T. (1978). *The work ethic in industrial America, 1850-1920*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Rose, M. (1985). *Reworking the work ethic: Economic values and socio-cultural politics*. London: Schocken.
- Rossi, J. (2006). Twenty-somethings in training. *Training and Development*, 51-53.
- Ryken, L. (2006). The original puritan work ethic. *Christian History Biography*, 89, 32-37.
- Schminke, M. 1997. "Gender differences in ethical frameworks and evaluation of others' choices in ethical dilemmas." *Journal of Business Ethics* 16, 55-65.
- Seaman MA, Levin JR and Serlin RC. (1991). New Developments in pairwise multiple comparisons: Some powerful and practicable procedures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110:577-586.

- Sheey, J. W. (1990). New work ethic is frightening. *Personnel Journal*, 69, 28-36.
- Sherman, B. (1995). The end of work as we know it? *New Statesman & Society*, 8(376), 27-30.
- Spitzer, N. (1977). Cajuns and creoles: The French gulf coast. *The long journey home: Folklife in the south*. Chapel Hill, NC: Southern Exposure.
- Sullivan, I. D. (1999). *A comparison of work ethic between post-secondary trade and industry program graduates*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.
- Tang, T. L., & Tzeng, J. Y. (1992). Demographic correlates of the protestant work ethic. *The Journal of Psychology*, 126(2), 163-170.
- Taylor, C. (2005). Ethics in nursing. *Australian Nursing Journal*, 12(6).
- Tucker, S., Wilson, C. R., & Ferris, W. (Ed.). (1989). Rock and Roll. *Encyclopedia of southern culture*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- U. S. Department of Labor. (2008). *Women's Bureau*. Indianapolis, IN: JIST Works, Inc.
- Yankelovich, D. & Immerwahr, J. (1984). Putting the work ethic to work. *Society*, 21(2), 58-76.
- Walker, J. E. (1981). The social context of modeling. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 9(2), 129-137.
- Weber, M. (1958). *The Protestant ethic and spirit of capitalism* (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Scribner Press. (Original work published 1904)
- Wentworth, D. K., & Chell, R. M. (1997). American college students and the Protestant work ethic. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 137(3), 284-297.
- Whipple, T & Muffo, J. (1982). Adjusting for nonresponse bias: The case of an alumni survey. Paper presented at the 22nd annual meeting of the Association for Institutional Research., Denver, CO.

Willimack, D. K., Nichols, E., & Sudman, S. (2002) Understanding unit and item nonresponse in business surveys, In R. M. Groves et al. (Eds.) *Survey Nonresponse*. New York: Wiley.

Zuckerman, M. B. (2003). All work and no play. *U. S. News & World Report*, 135(7), 86.

Zwick, R. (1993). A handbook of data analysis in the behavioral sciences. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

APPENDIX A
SAMPLE OWEI

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS:

Please check the appropriate response for each item. Completion of this inventory acknowledges your understanding that this data will be used for research purposes only and will be kept completely confidential.

(1)Job Title: _____

(2)Category your occupation best fits:

- _____ administrative, engineering, scientific, teaching, and related occupations, including creative artists
- _____ technical, clerical, sales, and related occupations
- _____ service occupations, including military occupations
- _____ farming, forestry, fishing, and hunting occupations
- _____ precision production, craft and repair
- _____ operators, fabricators, and laborers

(3)Years of full-time work experience:

- _____ less than 2 yr.
- _____ 2 - 8 yr.
- _____ more than 8 yr.

(4)Sex:

- _____ female
- _____ male

(5)Level of education:

- _____ less than high school diploma
- _____ high school degree or GED
- _____ 2 years of college or Associate's degree
- _____ a Bachelor's Degree
- _____ some Graduate work

(6)Age:

- _____ 19 or under
- _____ 20 - 26
- _____ 27-35
- _____ 36-55
- _____ over 55

(7)Country of citizenship: _____

OCCUPATIONAL WORK ETHIC INVENTORY

© 1991 by G. C. Petty

The purpose of this inventory is to obtain information about desirable characteristics of working individuals. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and your name is not required on this form. It is important for you to answer each item as truthfully as possible.



DIRECTIONS:

For each work ethic descriptor listed below, CIRCLE THE NUMBER that most accurately describes your standards for that item. There are seven possible choices for each item:

Never Almost Never Seldom Sometimes Usually Almost Always Always
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS. There also is no time limit, but you should work as rapidly as possible. Please respond to every item on the list.

At work I can describe myself as:

Descriptors	Never				Always		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. dependable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. stubborn.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. following regulations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. following directions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. independent.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. ambitious.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. effective.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. reliable.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. tardy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. initiating.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. perceptive.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. irresponsible.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. adaptable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. careful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. appreciative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. accurate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. emotionally stable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. conscientious.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

At work I can describe myself as:

Descriptors	Never				Always		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. depressed.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. patient.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. punctual.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. devious.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. selfish.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. negligent.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. persevering.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. likeable.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. helpful.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. apathetic.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. pleasant.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. cooperative.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. hard working.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. rude.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. orderly.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. enthusiastic.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. cheerful.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. persistent.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. hostile.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. dedicated.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. devoted.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. courteous.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. considerate.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. careless.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45. productive.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46. well groomed.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47. friendly.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. loyal.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. resourceful.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50. modest.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX B
PERMISSION TO USE OWEI

From : Petty, Gregory C <gpetty@utk.edu>
Sent : Thursday, January 25, 2007 5:28 PM
To : "Kimberly Harvell" <kimberly4232@msn.com>
Subject : RE: Permission

Kimberly,

Sorry for not responding to your previous email. It is possible that it got caught in the software problems we've had here at UT.

I understand you are currently working on your doctorate under the supervision of Dr. Roger Hill. Consider this correspondence my permission for you to use the OWEI instrument for your research. I only ask that you share your raw data with me when you have completed your study. Good luck with your study.

Sincerely,
Gregory C. Petty, Ph.D., Professor
Health and Safety Programs
College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences
369 HPER Building
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-2710
Voice 865-974-4663
Fax 865-974-6439

APPENDIX C

EXPLANATION OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT FOR THOSE WHO ARE
PART OF THE SAMPLE

University of Georgia

January 30, 2009

Dear Research Participant:

Business industry and educational leaders are concerned about producing not only skilled workers but one's with a good work ethic. You and other employees of your company have been selected at random as one of the participants in this study of the work ethic of Louisiana workers.

The inventory that you are asked to complete will only take a few minutes of your time. It is designed to gather information on the occupational work ethic along with some background information.

The information collected here will be used by only me to identify the work habits, attitudes and values of workers from diverse occupational areas. Results of this study will enhance the education and training of future worker's. Your assistance in this effort is very important.

All replies will be kept confidential. Your name is not required on the questionnaire, but I do need the background information on the last page of the inventory.

Your prompt attention to this inventory is essential to the completion of my study. Your participation is vital and your responses are extremely important. I would like to thank you in advance for your help. If you have any questions, please email or call. I may be reached at (318) 678-6147 or (318) 207-6069 (cell) or by email at Kimberly4232@msn.com.

Sincerely,

Kimberly D. Harvell
Researcher
Occupational Work Ethic Study

APPENDIX D

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION FROM BOSSIER PARISH
COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHANCELLOR

BOSSIER PARISH COMMUNITY COLLEGE

6220 East Texas St.
Bossier City, Louisiana 71111



(318) 678-6000
tcarleton@bpcc.edu

Tom Carleton
Chancellor

April 26, 2006

Dear Chamber Member:

Kimberly D. Harvell is a doctoral student at the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia. She has been a faculty member in the Division of Business & Computer Sciences at Bossier Parish Community College for more than two years.

As part of her dissertation, Ms. Harvell is planning to collect research on the study of the work ethic of the Bossier and Shreveport workforce. She will be using a random sample of businesses and industries in both cities to collect data. This research will be beneficial not only to Bossier Parish Community College, but also to local businesses on what can be done to improve work ethic. The research will be conducted in a manner designed to protect the confidentiality of individuals and the firms they work for. You can be assured that the results reported will be categorized in such a way that association with any individual business or industry will not be possible.

I want to thank you for your consideration of this request to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Tom Carleton
Chancellor

Tc/ms

APPENDIX E

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION FROM GREATER SHREVEPORT

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE



400 Edwards Street
Shreveport, LA 71101
(318) 677-2500, (800) 448-5432, Fax: (318) 677-2541
www.shreveportchamber.org

January 31, 2007

Dear Chamber Member:

It is my pleasure to introduce you to Ms. Kimberly DeShan Harvell. Ms. Harvell is an impressive educator currently teaching business and computer science at Bossier Parish Community College (BPCC). She is also working on her doctorate and we request that you assist her as she works to achieve that goal. Her dissertation focuses on the work ethic of employees in our area. Completion of this project will be beneficial for BPCC, as well as the Chambers in both Shreveport and Bossier. A productive workforce is important for our existing companies as well as the companies considering locating a facility in our area.

Information gathered during this study will be used to strengthen and improve our workforce as required. All of this work will be done in a confidential manner to insure that the identities of companies and employees are protected. A random sample of companies will be chosen, and if selected, we hope that your company and employees will participate. The time involved in completing documents will be minimal.

Thank you for assisting Ms. Harvell in completion of her doctorate and for providing us with valuable information concerning our workforce.

Very truly yours,

Richard H. Bremer
President

RHB/ec



APPENDIX F

DIALOGUE FOR INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH STUDY AND
REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION

Introduction and Request for Assistance

My name is Kimberly Harvell. I am working on a research project at the University of Georgia in Athens, and conducting a study on work ethic. I have a random sample of places in Shreveport (Caddo Parish), Louisiana where people work and your company is on that list.

I am here to ask if I could leave a questionnaire for each person who works here to fill out and then come back at a later date to pick them up.

APPENDIX G

DIALOGUE FOR TELEPHONE FOLLOW UP WITH RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

Telephone Follow Up

Hello, this is Kimberly Harvell with the University of Georgia Work Ethic Research Project. I left (number of inventories) work ethic questionnaires a few days ago to be completed by your employees and I am calling to see if they are ready to be picked up.

APPENDIX H

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM PARTICIPATING FIRMS

<u>Type of Industry</u>	<u>#Firms</u>	<u>#Avail.</u>	<u>#Resp.</u>
AC & Heating	1	8	1
Accountant	3	27	10
Advertising	4	24	10
Animal Food Manufacturer	1	60	5
Apartment	6	24	11
Appraisal	1	4	2
Architect	1	21	5
Art Framing	1	5	2
Arts	1	5	1
Association	1	13	3
Attorney	1	5	2
Auto	1	24	8
Auto Dealership	2	50	14
Auto Repair	4	24	15
Automobile Preventive	1	6	3
Awning	1	6	1
Bakery	1	7	2
Bank	3	86	16
Beverage	2	38	12
Blood Bank	1	18	4
Boutique	1	1	2
Building Material	1	8	2
Buses	2	26	9
Camera Equipment	1	3	1
Car Wash	2	24	8
Carpet	1	10	3
Church	2	12	4
Cleaning Service	2	36	12
Clinic	4	46	10
Clothing	1	13	5
Club	1	12	3
Coffeehouse	1	8	5
Coffee Supply	1	10	4
Coin Dealer	1	2	1
Communication	1	7	2
Computers	1	7	5
Construction	5	70	16
Consulting	1	6	2
Contractor	7	66	14
Convenience	1	7	5
Counseling	1	6	2
Credit Union	2	45	18

Dental	2	12	4
Department Store	1	150	47
Document Scanning	1	10	3
Dry Cleaners	2	2	2
Electrical Equipment Supplies	2	9	3
Elevator Service	1	9	2
Employment Agencies	1	5	2
Engineer	3	30	12
Environmental	1	10	4
Equipment Material	2	13	6
Financial Planner	1	14	8
Fire Protection	1	9	1
Fitness	3	21	9
Florists	1	7	3
Foundation	1	8	3
Fruit & Vegetable Distributor	1	26	6
Funeral Home	1	5	1
Furniture	1	10	4
Garage	1	5	1
Garden	1	15	5
Gift Shops	1	2	1
Glass	1	85	1
Government	2	11	2
Grant Writing	1	8	1
Graphic Design	1	4	1
Grocers	1	34	5
Hardware	1	7	3
Hearing Aids	1	3	1
Home Construction	1	13	2
Home Healthcare Service	4	217	42
Hearing Aids	2	3	2
Hospitality	1	2	2
Hospitals	2	350	21
Hotels	2	22	8
Import	1	2	1
Industrial	1	10	5
Insulation	1	10	7
Insurance	5	49	18
Internet	1	13	4
Investment	2	17	4
Janitorial Services	1	16	8
Jeweler	1	4	3

Landscape Contractors	2	8	5
Limousine Services	1	5	1
Liquor	1	10	1
Logistics	2	17	2
Machine Shop	1	9	2
Magazine	1	11	4
Manufacture	4	43	15
Mardi Gras	1	200	3
Mattresses	1	4	2
Meat	1	10	3
Media	1	12	6
Medical	2	40	15
Metal	2	28	1
Metal Buildings	1	11	2
Mortgage	4	24	13
Motion Pictures	1	25	1
Moving	1	15	5
Newspaper	2	29	10
Not for Profit	12	248	103
Nursing Rehabilitation	1	30	7
Office	1	10	2
Office Equipment	1	4	1
Office Supplies	1	8	2
Oil & Gas	8	93	35
Packaging	2	11	3
Paint	1	10	4
Pawn Shop	1	2	1
Pest Control	1	8	4
Pharmaceutical	2	55	11
Photography	2	4	3
Physicians	3	21	11
Plumbing	3	17	6
Podiatry	1	8	3
Property Coatings	1	6	1
Property Management	1	4	2
Pump Equipment	1	4	2
Radio	1	20	3
Real Estate	10	49	25
Rehabilitation	2	40	10
Rentals	2	22	9
Research	2	18	2
Restaurant	15	233	54
River Cruise	1	32	23
Roofing	1	9	3
Savings & Loans	1	12	6

School	7	615	111
Security Products	2	22	7
Self Storage	1	2	1
Senior Services	1	18	6
Shipping Services	1	6	1
Shoes	2	13	2
Shopping Center	1	200	19
Signs	1	6	2
Social Services	3	40	16
Software Training	1	10	2
Special Events	1	7	5
Specialty Chemical	2	22	4
Sporting	1	9	3
Steel	1	15	1
Swimming Pools	1	6	2
Technology	1	8	5
Telephone	2	22	11
Television	1	28	4
Tile	1	13	7
Tobacco Products	1	4	1
Training	1	10	4
Transportation	2	69	2
Trophies	1	3	1
Truck	2	40	8
Utilities	2	37	9
Vending	1	30	2
Video Production	1	12	3
Warehouse	1	35	6
Water Migration	1	10	2
Website Development	1	12	3
Total	291	4935	1205

APPENDIX I
RESPONSE RATES OF PARTICIPATING FIRMS

Sample Listing by Random Number
Shreveport, Louisiana Business & Industry
Participating Firms Only

Firm Number	Available	Responses	Percent	City
1	5	4	.80	Shreveport
2	10	4	.40	Shreveport
3	17	7	.41	Shreveport
4	8	5	.63	Shreveport
5	11	2	.18	Shreveport
6	3	3	1.00	Shreveport
7	12	7	.58	Shreveport
8	32	23	.72	Shreveport
9	17	5	.29	Shreveport
10	7	2	.29	Shreveport
11	8	3	.38	Shreveport
12	15	5	.33	Shreveport
13	8	5	.63	Shreveport
14	2	1	.50	Shreveport
15	29	9	.31	Shreveport
16	4	1	.25	Shreveport
17	12	3	.25	Shreveport
18	8	2	.25	Shreveport
19	25	2	.08	Shreveport
20	8	5	.63	Shreveport
21	10	7	.70	Shreveport
22	6	3	.50	Shreveport
23	200	19	.10	Shreveport
24	8	5	.63	Shreveport
25	3	2	.67	Shreveport
26	10	5	.50	Shreveport
27	17	7	.41	Shreveport
28	6	5	.83	Shreveport
29	10	4	.40	Shreveport
30	5	4	.80	Shreveport
31	6	1	.17	Shreveport
32	7	5	.71	Shreveport
33	24	12	.50	Shreveport
34	12	8	.67	Shreveport
35	5	2	.40	Shreveport

36	4	2	.50	Shreveport
37	5	2	.40	Shreveport
38	7	5	.71	Shreveport
39	10	8	.80	Shreveport
40	12	6	.50	Shreveport
41	10	7	.70	Shreveport
42	25	5	.20	Shreveport
43	40	15	.38	Shreveport
44	150	48	.32	Shreveport
45	7	4	.57	Shreveport
46	5	4	.80	Shreveport
47	4	2	.50	Shreveport
48	9	2	.22	Shreveport
49	20	8	.40	Shreveport
50	6	3	.50	Shreveport
51	5	1	.20	Shreveport
52	10	4	.40	Shreveport
53	27	10	.37	Shreveport
54	7	5	.71	Shreveport
55	1	2	2.00	Shreveport
56	5	3	.60	Shreveport
57	20	8	.40	Shreveport
58	25	7	.28	Shreveport
59	8	2	.25	Shreveport
60	13	2	.15	Shreveport
61	2	1	.50	Shreveport
62	30	5	.17	Shreveport
63	4	2	.50	Shreveport
64	5	1	.20	Shreveport
65	15	2	.13	Shreveport
66	10	3	.30	Shreveport
67	8	1	.13	Shreveport
68	8	3	.38	Shreveport
69	6	5	.83	Shreveport
70	4	3	.75	Shreveport
71	3	1	.33	Shreveport
72	16	8	.50	Shreveport
73	25	1	.04	Shreveport
74	7	3	.43	Shreveport
75	6	2	.33	Shreveport
76	15	3	.20	Shreveport

77	9	4	.44	Shreveport
78	2	1	.50	Shreveport
79	11	5	.45	Shreveport
80	10	3	.30	Shreveport
81	2	1	.50	Shreveport
82	17	6	.35	Shreveport
83	2	1	.50	Shreveport
84	10	3	.30	Shreveport
85	10	4	.40	Shreveport
86	7	2	.29	Shreveport
87	15	5	.33	Shreveport
88	9	1	.11	Shreveport
89	10	2	.20	Shreveport
90	6	2	.33	Shreveport
91	15	1	.06	Shreveport
92	8	2	.25	Shreveport
93	12	6	.50	Shreveport
94	10	2	.20	Shreveport
95	5	1	.20	Shreveport
96	8	1	.13	Shreveport
97	125	25	.20	Shreveport
98	9	3	.33	Shreveport
99	10	4	.40	Shreveport
100	5	2	.40	Shreveport
101	5	5	1.00	Shreveport
102	5	1	.20	Shreveport
103	12	5	.42	Shreveport
104	35	6	.17	Shreveport
105	18	6	.33	Shreveport
106	13	2	.15	Shreveport
107	4	3	.75	Shreveport
108	5	2	.40	Shreveport
109	5	1	.20	Shreveport
110	6	2	.33	Shreveport
111	3	2	.67	Shreveport
112	3	2	.67	Shreveport
113	4	2	.50	Shreveport
114	200	10	.05	Shreveport
115	8	3	.38	Shreveport
116	18	2	.11	Shreveport
117	8	3	.38	Shreveport

118	25	8	.32	Shreveport
119	28	4	.14	Shreveport
120	18	4	.22	Shreveport
121	11	4	.36	Shreveport
122	6	4	.67	Shreveport
123	2	1	.50	Shreveport
124	12	3	.25	Shreveport
125	6	2	.33	Shreveport
126	9	2	.22	Shreveport
127	150	70	.47	Shreveport
128	30	1	.03	Shreveport
129	9	2	.22	Shreveport
130	7	2	.29	Shreveport
131	1	1	1.00	Shreveport
132	200	3	.01	Shreveport
133	60	5	.08	Shreveport
134	22	7	.32	Shreveport
135	7	5	.71	Shreveport
136	13	4	.31	Shreveport
137	9	3	.33	Shreveport
138	30	6	.20	Shreveport
139	5	2	.40	Shreveport
140	10	3	.30	Shreveport
141	8	3	.38	Shreveport
142	5	4	.80	Shreveport
143	10	4	.40	Shreveport
144	15	4	.27	Shreveport
145	6	2	.33	Shreveport
146	7	1	.14	Shreveport
147	10	3	.30	Shreveport
148	10	2	.20	Shreveport
149	13	4	.31	Shreveport
150	18	6	.33	Shreveport
151	26	6	.23	Shreveport
152	69	2	.02	Shreveport
153	10	2	.20	Shreveport
154	11	1	.09	Shreveport
155	300	60	.20	Shreveport
156	8	4	.50	Shreveport
157	10	2	.20	Shreveport
158	17	3	.18	Shreveport

159	12	5	.42	Shreveport
160	2	1	.50	Shreveport
161	6	1	.17	Shreveport
162	85	1	.01	Shreveport
163	9	2	.22	Shreveport
164	25	5	.20	Shreveport
165	2	2	1.00	Shreveport
166	6	2	.33	Shreveport
167	30	7	.23	Shreveport
168	10	1	.10	Shreveport
169	28	1	.03	Shreveport
170	8	2	.25	Shreveport
171	4	1	.25	Shreveport
172	10	6	.60	Shreveport
173	5	1	.20	Shreveport
174	25	5	.20	Shreveport
175	36	6	.17	Shreveport
176	4	2	.50	Shreveport
177	6	4	.67	Shreveport
178	10	1	.10	Shreveport
179	8	3	.38	Shreveport
180	4	1	.25	Shreveport
181	95	15	.16	Shreveport
182	6	2	.33	Shreveport
183	5	1	.20	Shreveport
184	13	2	.15	Shreveport
185	8	3	.38	Shreveport
186	5	1	.20	Shreveport
187	4	1	.25	Shreveport
188	15	3	.20	Shreveport
189	28	8	.29	Shreveport
190	5	1	.20	Shreveport
191	8	1	.13	Shreveport
192	6	2	.33	Shreveport
193	13	6	.46	Shreveport
194	8	2	.25	Shreveport
195	6	2	.33	Shreveport
196	8	3	.38	Shreveport
197	20	7	.35	Shreveport
198	18	5	.28	Shreveport
199	6	1	.17	Shreveport

200	30	4	.13	Shreveport
201	9	3	.33	Shreveport
202	3	1	.33	Shreveport
203	5	1	.20	Shreveport
204	4	2	.50	Shreveport
205	8	3	.38	Shreveport
206	6	2	.33	Shreveport
207	4	1	.25	Shreveport
208	11	2	.18	Shreveport
209	10	5	.50	Shreveport
210	7	2	.29	Shreveport
211	15	5	.33	Shreveport
212	6	2	.33	Shreveport
213	2	1	.50	Shreveport
214	40	5	.13	Shreveport
215	15	6	.40	Shreveport
216	8	2	.25	Shreveport
217	7	2	.29	Shreveport
218	6	2	.33	Shreveport
219	60	10	.17	Shreveport
220	8	3	.38	Shreveport
221	10	6	.60	Shreveport
222	15	1	.06	Shreveport
223	6	4	.67	Shreveport
224	18	2	.11	Shreveport
225	10	4	.40	Shreveport
226	9	2	.22	Shreveport
227	6	3	.50	Shreveport
228	29	5	.17	Shreveport
229	45	8	.18	Shreveport
230	26	6	.23	Shreveport
231	6	3	.50	Shreveport
232	6	2	.33	Shreveport
233	3	1	.33	Shreveport
234	75	5	.06	Shreveport
235	4	2	.50	Shreveport
236	12	6	.50	Shreveport
237	4	1	.25	Shreveport
238	20	6	.30	Shreveport
239	10	3	.30	Shreveport
240	6	2	.33	Shreveport

241	8	2	.25	Shreveport
242	13	7	.54	Shreveport
243	10	2	.20	Shreveport
244	13	4	.31	Shreveport
245	6	1	.17	Shreveport
246	3	1	.33	Shreveport
247	150	12	.08	Shreveport
248	10	1	.10	Shreveport
249	7	3	.43	Shreveport
250	12	4	.33	Shreveport
251	19	3	.16	Shreveport
252	5	1	.20	Shreveport
253	4	1	.25	Shreveport
254	1	1	1.00	Shreveport
255	10	5	.50	Shreveport
256	2	1	.50	Shreveport
257	6	1	.17	Shreveport
258	4	1	.25	Shreveport
259	5	1	.20	Shreveport
260	20	3	.15	Shreveport
261	13	3	.23	Shreveport
262	17	2	.12	Shreveport
263	10	1	.10	Shreveport
264	25	8	.32	Shreveport
265	30	2	.06	Shreveport
266	7	3	.43	Shreveport
267	6	2	.33	Shreveport
268	2	2	1.00	Shreveport
269	9	3	.33	Shreveport
270	10	3	.30	Shreveport
271	8	2	.25	Shreveport
272	7	1	.14	Shreveport
273	30	3	.10	Shreveport
274	10	2	.20	Shreveport
275	34	5	.15	Shreveport
276	22	8	.36	Shreveport
277	3	1	.33	Shreveport
278	9	3	.33	Shreveport
279	5	1	.20	Shreveport
280	18	8	.44	Shreveport
281	22	7	.32	Shreveport

282	5	1	.20	Shreveport
283	7	3	.43	Shreveport
284	6	2	.33	Shreveport
285	6	1	.17	Shreveport
286	7	2	.29	Shreveport
287	7	2	.29	Shreveport
288	6	1	.17	Shreveport
289	7	2	.29	Shreveport
290	6	2	.33	Shreveport
291	6	3	.50	Shreveport
Total	4935	1205	10270.93	

APPENDIX J

RESPONSE RATES FOR OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATIONS

Major Occupational Groups (MOGs)	Number of Persons in each Occupational Group	Percentage of Respondents
A. Professional, Technical and Related Occupations	34	3.0%
B. Executive, Administrative, and Managerial Occupations	74	6.6%
C. Sales Occupations	72	6.5%
D. Administrative Support Occupations, Including Clerical	110	9.9%
E. Precision Production, Craft , and Repair	31	2.8%
F. Machine Operators, Assemblers, and Inspectors	41	3.7%
G. Transportation and Material Moving Occupations	43	3.8%
H. Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers, and Laborers	163	14.7%
K. Service Occupations, Except Private Household	537	48.5%