

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9008321

**High school employment experiences and work related attitudes
of college students**

Goslen, Mary Anne, Ph.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1989

Copyright ©1989 by Goslen, Mary Anne. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

HIGH SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCES
AND WORK RELATED ATTITUDES
OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

Mary Anne Goslen

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
the University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
1989

Approved by

Rebecca M. Smith

Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser Rebecca M. Smith

Committee Members Walter Johnson
Sarah M. Hoffner
Nina R. Starr

May 4, 1989
Date of Acceptance by Committee

May 4, 1989
Date of Final Oral Examination

© 1989 by Mary Anne Goslen

GOSLEN, MARY ANNE. Ph.D. High School Employment Experiences and Work Related Attitudes of College Students. (1989) Directed by Dr. Rebecca Smith. 114 pp.

This study investigated the effects of high school employment experiences on six work related attitudes of college students. It was expected that there would be significant differences in work related attitudes of college students between those who had worked in high school and those who had not, levels of jobs held, and time worked per week.

The sample was comprised of 248 college students ranging from 18 to 24 years of age who were enrolled in basic classes in a medium-sized university. The dependent variables were these work related attitudes: social commitment, work orientation, reliance on self, intrinsic value of work, extrinsic value of work, and cynicism about work.

Multivariate analyses of covariance (MANCOVAs) were carried out to determine if high school employment, time worked weekly, and level of high school job significantly affected work related attitudes. Sex, race, class in college, college grade point average, and college residence were used as covariates. Each covariate had significant overall effects in at least one of the analyses.

None of the major independent variables had a significant effect on the six work related attitudes together, but there were significant effects ($p=.05$) for

level of high school job on two variables in univariate analyses: cynicism about work and social commitment. College students who had worked at medium level jobs were higher on cynicism, and students who had worked at low level jobs were higher on social commitment. When time worked weekly was taken into account, these significant effects were found: students who had worked high hours at medium level jobs were higher on cynicism ($p=.05$); students who had worked low hours at low level jobs were higher on social commitment ($p=.001$) and higher on work orientation ($p=.05$).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my committee chair, Dr. Rebecca M. Smith, Professor of Child Development and Family Relations, and my committee members, Dr. Mildred Johnson, Professor of Home Economics in Education and Business, Dr. Sarah Shoffner, Assistant Professor of Child Development and Family Relations, and Dr. Nina Starr, Lecturer in Counseling and Specialized Educational Development, for their excellent guidance in the formulation and completion of this study.

For expert assistance with statistics, I am grateful to Dr. David Herr, Associate Professor of Mathematics, and Dr. Ann Calhoun, Statistical Consultant. I also wish to thank Dr. Deborah Godwin, Associate Professor of Family Economics at the University of Georgia, who generously assisted with advice at different stages of this study.

My appreciation is expressed to Judy Fulbright for assistance in developing the coding system, to Patti Hanna for help in transferring data from the questionnaires to the coding sheets, and to Martitia Kivett for assistance with data entry. I am grateful to the students who participated in this study and to their instructors who gave them the opportunity to do so.

This study was partially supported by the North Carolina Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, through Project 16076--"Rural Adolescent Employment, Academic Achievement, Psychological Maturity and Occupational Aspirations." The literature review and the instrument development process as well as the results of this study are in turn contributions to Project 16076.

I wish to thank each member of my family for their support and encouragement throughout this project. I am especially grateful to my husband, Frank Goslen, and to my daughter, Katie Jo Goslen, not only for their support and encouragement but also for their help along the way whenever they were asked. My family created the environment that enabled me to persevere and complete this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Background of the Study	3
Hypotheses.	6
Limitations of the Study.	6
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	8
High School Employment.	9
Amount of Time Worked	11
Level of High School Job.	12
Work Related Attitudes.	13
College Students and Work	13
III. METHODS	17
Subjects.	18
Questionnaire	24
Procedure for Data Collection	25
Procedure for Data Analysis	27
Independent Variables	30
High School Employment.	30
Time Worked Weekly.	31
High School Job Level	32
Covariates.	33
Dependent Variables	34
Social Commitment	36
Work Orientation.	38
Reliance on Self.	39
Extrinsic Value of Work	41

	Page
Cynicism about Work	44
Intrinsic Value of Work	45
IV. RESULTS.	50
Hypothesis Testing	50
High School Employment	51
Time Worked Weekly	55
High School Job Level.	58
High School Job Level by Time Worked Weekly	62
Discussion	64
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . .	71
Summary.	71
Conclusions.	72
Recommendations.	74
VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY.	76
VII. APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE	80
VIII. APPENDIX B. INITIAL WORK RELATED ATTITUDE SCALES: ITEMS AND FACTOR ANALYSES.	104

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographic Characteristics of the Study Sample	19
2. Frequencies for High School Work Behaviors . . .	29
3. Factor Analysis of Final Social Commitment Scale	37
4. Factor Analysis of Final Work Orientation Scale.	40
5. Factor Analysis of Reliance on Self (Subscale of Initial Self-Reliance Scale). . .	42
6. Factor Analysis of Extrinsic Value of Work (Subscale of Initial Materialism Scale)	43
7. Factor Analysis of Final Cynicism Scale.	46
8. Factor Analysis of Intrinsic Value of Work (Subscale of Initial Cynicism Scale). . .	47
9. Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of Responses to Work Related Attitude Scales. . .	49
10. MANCOVA of Work Related Attitudes for High School Employment	52
11. Least Square Mean Comparisons of Work Related Attitudes by High School Employment	53
12. MANCOVA of Work Related Attitudes for Time Worked Weekly	56
13. Least Square Mean Comparisons of Work Related Attitudes by Time Worked Weekly.	57
14. MANCOVA of Work Related Attitudes for High School Job Level.	59

15.	Least Square Mean Comparisons of Work Related Attitudes by High School Job Level.	61
16.	MANCOVA of Work Related Attitudes for Job Level by Time Worked Weekly	63
17.	Least Square Mean Comparisons of Work Related Attitudes for Job Level by Time Worked Weekly.	65
B-1.	Individual Items that Comprised Initial Work Related Attitude Scales.	105
B-2.	Factor Analysis of Acceptance of Unethical Business Practices Scale.	109
B-3.	Factor Analysis of Initial Social Commitment Scale.	110
B-4.	Factor Analysis of Initial Work Orientation Scale	111
B-5.	Factor Analysis of Initial Self-Reliance Scale	112
B-6.	Factor Analysis of Initial Materialism Scale	113
B-7.	Factor Analysis of Initial Cynicism Scale	114

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The process by which youth become productive, employed citizens of society has been a matter of interest and concern to educators, counselors, researchers, and others. Much has been written about occupational socialization and how it occurs for different people. Meanwhile, high school students have been going into the work force in record numbers, taking jobs which cause them to work long hours in addition to the time that they spend in school. To what extent this actual participation in the work force has been influencing their attitudes about work went largely unnoticed until Greenberger and Steinberg and their associates reported their landmark studies in the early 1980s.

Because this society believes in the work ethic and associated values, there have been many voices raised in praise of the virtues of early work experience for adolescents. In 1974 the President's Science Advisory Committee, Panel on Youth came out with the influential report, Youth: Transition to Adulthood, in which they recommended that work experiences be integrated into the educational framework of adolescents' lives so that they would have more than formal education to prepare them for

participation in the adult work force. The advisory committee recommended a change in minimum wage and increases in work-study and cooperative education programs in order to encourage greater participation by youth in the work force.

Counterbalancing these voices that encouraged greater participation by adolescents in the work force, the Greenberger and Steinberg studies (1981, 1986) raised serious questions about how intensive employment in the jobs available to high school students during the school year was affecting young people. They suggested that along with the positive socializing aspects of early work experience for adolescents, there also may be negative aspects (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1981). The research team investigated all aspects of the occupational socializing effect of high school employment including attitudes which are related to work. They developed a series of scales to test attitudes and found that there were some differences for those high school students who were working in naturally occurring jobs as opposed to government sponsored jobs (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981).

The question that presents itself is, what happens to work related attitudes when students who have worked in high school go on to college? If the early work experiences during the school year had a socializing

effect, will college students who worked during high school show differences in work related attitudes from college students who did not work? Will college students who worked different amounts of time during high school have different work related attitudes from each other or from those who did not work? Will college students who worked at different levels of jobs during high school have different work related attitudes from each other or from those who did not work? Will college students who worked at different levels of jobs and worked for different amounts of time during high school have different work related attitudes from each other or from those who did not work?

The purpose of the present research was to assess the relationship between the high school employment experiences of college students and their attitudes toward working. What kind of effect, if any, does high school employment have on the occupational socialization of college students?

Background of the Study

When Steinberg and associates began challenging the popular notion that work is a positive character-building experience for adolescents no matter what the job, they pointed to the paucity of studies examining the effects on teenagers of working at naturally occurring jobs (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981). Many of

the generalizations that had been made about the enduring, positive aspects of early work experience were based on government sponsored or school sponsored educational and training programs. The naturally occurring jobs that teenagers were finding on their own were ignored by policymakers and researchers alike. The few studies that were conducted focused on the relationship between early employment and subsequent employment and earnings. The socialization aspect of such employment was ignored.

Greenberger, Steinberg, and associates produced a number of studies that helped to fill the research gap for high school students. They examined the relationship between employment during the school years and school performance (Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, & McAuliffe, 1982), family and peer relationships (Greenberger, Steinberg, Vaux, & McAuliffe, 1980), occupational deviance (Ruggiero, Greenberger, & Steinberg, 1982), involvement in nonwork activities and relationships (Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, Ruggiero, & Vaux, 1982), and social understanding (Steinberg, Greenberger, Jacobi, & Garduque, 1981). Their publications in the last ten years have given a clearer picture of the effect of high school employment on different aspects of high school students' lives.

There has not been a parallel research emphasis for college students, however. Those studies that have been

done with college students have focused on the effect of college jobs on a few dimensions of college students' lives (Healy & Mourton, 1987; Heller & Heinemann, 1987). Major areas of concern have been the effect of college students' working on their academic achievement, persistence in college, and postcollege outcomes (Ehrenberg & Sherman, 1986; Healy & Mourton, 1987).

Heller and Heinemann (1987) did investigate school related attitudes, but their major interest was how work-study jobs affected such attitudes. They did not examine the effects of high school work even though they stated that the majority of the students in their sample had worked in high school and some even in junior high school. Their study is just one example of research with college students and work that pays virtually no attention to the impact that early work experience might have had on variables of interest. It is as if college students are pristine and untouched by the world of work in which they had participated when they were high school students.

There is a need for the type of investigation pioneered by the Greenberger and Steinberg research team with college students. If, indeed, as Greenberger and Steinberg have proposed, there is a socializing effect of high school employment, then there should be some evidence of it in the attitudes of college students. Socialization

is a process that continues building on earlier experiences as an individual matures. This study attempted to begin filling in the research gap about the socializing effects of high school employment on college students.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study were:

1. Working while attending high school will have a significant effect on the work related attitudes of college students.

2. The amount of time a student worked while attending high school will have a significant effect on the work related attitudes of college students.

3. The level of job a student held while attending high school will have a significant effect on the work related attitudes of college students.

4. College students who worked longer hours at low level jobs will have less desirable work related attitudes than those who worked fewer hours and worked at higher level jobs.

Limitations of Study

The scope of this study was limited in that the high school jobs of interest are those during the academic year and not summer jobs. Previous research in this area has been restricted to school year jobs because of the time constraints that students who work have to deal with along

with the competing claims of the educational system. Working during the summer does not present the same problems and challenges to students because they have the free time to work. D'Amico (1984) discussed some of the reasons that his study and others focus on jobs during the school year. The present study followed the pattern set by previous researchers in the field.

Another limitation of this study was that it was cross-sectional rather than longitudinal. This limited the degree to which causality can be attributed.

The study was limited in its generalizability because the sample was a convenience sample rather than a randomly selected sample. The findings were also limited in generalizability because it was conducted at one university with students taking courses in one school of the university.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE.

The movement of adolescents into the workplace while they are still primarily students in high school has taken place quickly, quietly, and with the encouragement of American society. In 1974 the Panel on Youth report decried the lack of involvement of students in the work force and recommended policy changes to address the situation (President's Science Advisory Committee, 1974). By 1980, researchers noted the increased participation in the part-time labor force by adolescents who were students and the need to study the effects of this phenomenon on various dimensions of adolescent life (Steinberg & Greenberger, 1980). They cited statistics to illustrate the increased number of youth in the part-time work force and estimated that approximately 50% of all high school seniors and juniors and 40% of all students in 9th and 10th grades were working at some time during the school year.

More recent studies have indicated that the numbers have continued to increase. In 1985 a survey of 28,000 high school seniors revealed that 75% were in the labor force and that they worked, on the average, 16.4 hours per week (Gordon, 1985). The 75% employment figure for high

school seniors was cited again in 1987, and the figure for time spent working in hours per week was 20 hours for one-third of the males and one-fourth of the females (Bachman, Johnston, & O'Malley, 1987).

There also have been increases in the percentage of college students who are employed, but the increases have not been as great as those for high school students, according to some surveys. In 1974, 37% of full-time college students were working, but by 1981, this figure had increased slightly to 40% (Applied Systems Institute, 1983). Christoffel's (1985) article summarized other surveys which gave higher figures but pointed out that there is not a clear answer about how many college students work. One of these surveys found that in 1981 over 75% of part-time college students but only 52% of full-time students were likely to be working (Christoffel, 1985).

High School Employment

Steinberg and Greenberger (1980) were among the first researchers to note the increased participation of high school students in the part-time labor force and to study the effects of this phenomenon on adolescent socialization. When they started on their project, the area of part-time employment of high school students was basically unresearched. They set out a research agenda for what they were planning to do (1980), and by the time the research

project was completed in California, they and their associates had investigated a variety of areas of adolescent socialization that could have been affected by teenage employment (Greenberger & Steinberg, 1986; Ruggiero et al., 1982; Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, & McAuliffe, 1982; Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, Ruggiero, & Vaux, 1982).

Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, and McAuliffe (1982) pointed out that much of the research that had been done on the effects of part-time work during school years had focused on future employment prospects and success. They felt that it also was important for studies to focus on the immediate costs and benefits of working while going to school. Ruggiero, a member of the research team, focused her research on the costs of adolescent employment in naturally occurring jobs and the idea that adolescents were being socialized into occupational deviance by certain workplace conditions (Ruggiero, 1984; Ruggiero et al., 1982). Her results partially supported the theory that some adolescents do take advantage of opportunities for occupational deviance provided to them by the workplace.

The entire series of studies by the Greenberger and Steinberg team indicated that whether or not a high school student is employed during the school year has effects on different aspects of adolescent socialization. Other

researchers also have found that working while attending high school has effects on aspects of adolescent life (Bachman, Bare, & Frankie, 1986; D'Amico, 1984; Lewis, Gardner, & Seitz, 1983). Effects can be negative or positive (D'Amico, 1984; Lewis et al., 1983), and it's important to determine what conditions create the different outcomes.

Amount of Time Worked

In addition to simple work status, the amount of time spent working has proven to be an important variable through the Greenberger and Steinberg studies. They found that working long hours depresses school performance (Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, & McAuliffe, 1982), has a negative effect on family life, and leads to greater use of alcohol, marijuana, and cigarettes (Greenberger, 1983).

Bachman et al. (1986) looked at work hours of seniors in high schools and had mixed results. They found, like Greenberger, that working longer hours was positively correlated with deviant behaviors such as drug use and increased reported job stress. They found no relationship between work intensity and general work attitudes, however. On the positive side, longer work hours were associated with job benefits such as acquiring and developing skills. D'Amico (1984) also found that amount of time spent working had some positive effects,

notably on high school achievement. His results suggested that moderate levels of work intensity could be beneficial to high school students who are employed.

Level of High School Job

Greenberger and Steinberg (1981) stressed that all jobs are neither alike nor on the same level, even though policymakers tend to discuss work for teenagers as if jobs were alike. Their research team has done some study of the environments of teenage jobs and found that many of them lack elements of positive occupational socialization (Greenberger, Steinberg, & Ruggiero, 1982). Even though the research team found differences in job environments, Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, Ruggiero, and Vaux (1982) felt that there was not enough overall evidence that type of job had an effect on adolescents to use as an independent variable in their study.

Healy and Mourton (1987), on the other hand, found that type of job did have an effect when studying the effects of certain variables on college students. They found that type of job was an important mediating variable, and their results bolstered their belief that higher-level jobs have the ability to strengthen assets that increase career and academic achievement. The lack of effect found by the Greenberger team may be a result of the way in which

type of job was categorized (Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, Ruggiero, and Vaux (1982).

Work Related Attitudes

Work related attitudes are considered an important dimension of a worker's occupational socialization (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981). Several scales have been developed to measure attitudes about work and work related areas for use with employed students. Ruggiero (1984; Ruggiero et al., 1982) developed measures of materialism, cynicism about work, and acceptance of unethical business practices that were used in the California studies. Other scales developed by Greenberger and associates (Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1975) have been used to measure psychosocial maturity. Work orientation and social commitment scales are two of the subscales from the psychological maturity measure that were used in the adolescent work studies (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, and Ruggiero, 1981).

Bachman et al. (1986) also examined work attitudes of high school students. They asked questions about jobs that high school seniors were holding rather than using general work attitude measures. Other researchers have not been as interested in work attitudes as in topics such as academic achievement.

College Students and Work

Most of the research that has been done in the area of college students and work has focused on the effect of work on academic achievement. The impetus for research on the effect of work on academic achievement came about as a result of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which encouraged the establishment of cooperative education and work-study programs (Hay & Lindsay, 1969). The purpose of that research was to determine the negative effects of working on academic achievement, but the results repeatedly have indicated no negative effect of part-time work on academic achievement (Apostal & Doherty, 1972; Barnes & Keene, 1974; Kaiser & Bergen, 1968).

Researchers have been interested also in the effect of work on the persistence in school of college students (Ehrenberg & Sherman, 1986). Van de Water and Augenblick (1987) found that there was no significant effect of work on academic performance and very little effect on persistence. Their research study centered around work-study jobs, and they made no attempt to control for off-campus jobs. This assumption that work means work-study jobs has pervaded much of the research on college students and work (Apostal & Doherty, 1972; Barnes & Keene, 1974; Hay & Lindsay, 1969; Henry, 1969).

There have been some studies that have looked at the effect of work on attitudes of college students. Heller and Heinemann (1987) examined the impact of college work on school related attitudes of college students. Astin (1977) examined college students' attitudes about a variety of topics but only casually touched on work related attitudes. He stated that every year attitude items have been part of surveys administered to college freshmen, but the only category that was work related was under business interests. The area of work related attitudes of college students seems to have been relatively unexplored.

Not only have work related attitudes of college students been ignored by researchers, employment backgrounds have also been treated as if they were nonexistent. When studies are conducted on aspects related to college students and work, it is almost as if students have never held a job before arriving on campus. An exception is the study by Augustin (1985) in which he compared adult students with younger students on the process of selecting a major field of study. He found that previous work experience was a major influence in choice of major for 38% of the adult students but only for 18% of the younger students.

The experiences of students working part-time while attending high school rarely have been considered of

interest. In spite of the extensive research by Greenberger and Steinberg in the realm of high school employment and the implications of that for college students' work related attitudes and behavior, nothing has been done to examine comparable questions in college.

There are those who believe that work experience has an impact on adolescent socialization which persists over time (Hamilton & Crouter, 1980). If so, then college students who worked while being students in high school should demonstrate evidence of that socialization. One benefit of work for young people is supposed to be the development of adult work attitudes (Hamilton & Crouter, 1980); therefore, the effect of high school employment on the work related attitudes of college students should be evident.

Past research has indicated that not only employment but also the amount of time worked weekly and the level of job held can have an impact on work related attitudes. If it is true, as Behn, Carnoy, Carter, Crain, and Levin (1974) assert, that the workplace offers alienating environments to young people, it would be expected that those who have worked at low level jobs should show evidence of the negative effects on work related attitudes. This should be especially true if they work long hours at low level jobs. It was the purpose of this research to examine these possibilities.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of high school employment during the academic year on the work related attitudes of college students. The type of research was cross-sectional ex post facto. The study was conducted in three parts: (a) developing a self-report questionnaire, (b) refining the attitude scales, and (c) testing the hypotheses.

The methods for designing the study and for developing and refining the instruments are presented in this chapter. The description of the sample and the final instrument for measuring the variables are also included. Although the method for data analysis and testing hypotheses are described in this chapter, the results of the analyses are presented in Chapter IV. The independent variables were high school employment, time worked per week, and the level of job. The dependent variables were six work related attitude scales. Due to their possible effect on work related attitudes, sex, race, class in college, college grade point average (GPA) by self-report, and college residence were used as covariates.

Subjects

The sample consisted of undergraduate students in a medium-sized state university in the Southeast, who were enrolled in five sections of basic classes in one school. One parameter for the sample was that students could not have been out of college for a full academic year since graduating from high school. This ensured that the sample included only those individuals who had continued to be students and had not taken time out to work full-time. Because of this parameter, questionnaires from 43 students could not be used in the analysis, leaving a total sample of 248 subjects.

Subjects ranged in age from 18 to 24 with a mean age of 19.6 years old (see Table 1). They represented 27 majors, with 40% majoring in one of five departments in human environmental sciences, 23% majoring in business related subjects, and 13% majoring in education. The others represented nearly all departments across the university. The number of semester hours they were carrying ranged from 6 to 22, with the largest percentage (39%) enrolled in 15 semester hours; 15% were carrying 12 semester hours, and 15% were carrying 16 semester hours.

The sample was comprised of 86% female students, which was higher than the female proportion (68%) for the student body. The sample also had a higher proportion of

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Study Sample

Characteristics	<u>n</u>	%
Age		
18	62	25.0
19	64	25.8
20	57	23.0
21	42	16.9
22	16	6.5
23	5	2.0
24	2	.8
Sex		
Female	214	86.3
Male	34	13.7
Race		
White	209	84.3
Black	39	15.7
Marital status		
Never married	237	95.6
Married	11	4.4
Class		
Freshman	90	36.3
Sophomore	55	22.2
Junior	56	22.6
Senior	47	19.0
College living arrangements		
On campus	163	65.7
Off campus	85	34.3
College grade point average (GPA)		
A average	27	10.9
B average	74	29.9
C average	130	52.4
D average	17	6.9

Table 1, continued

Characteristics	<u>n</u>	%
High school residence		
Rural farm	25	10.1
Rural nonfarm	61	24.6
Town	60	24.2
Small city	50	20.2
Large city	52	21.0
Parents' marital status		
Married	187	75.4
Divorced/separated	50	20.2
Widowed	9	3.6
Never married	2	.8
Family income		
\$19,000 or less	17	6.8
\$20,000 - \$29,999	26	10.5
\$30,000 - \$39,999	45	18.1
\$40,000 - \$49,999	49	19.8
\$50,000 - \$59,999	30	12.1
\$60,000 - \$69,999	21	8.5
\$70,000 - \$79,999	20	8.1
\$80,000 or over	34	13.7
No answer	6	2.4
Father's education		
Partial high school or less	11	4.4
High school graduate or equivalent	55	22.2
Some college or specialized training	82	33.1
College graduate	59	23.8
Graduate degree	38	15.3
No answer	3	1.2
Mother's education		
Partial high school or less	7	4.4
High school graduate or equivalent	70	28.2
Some college or specialized training	95	38.3
College graduate	60	24.2
Graduate degree	16	6.5

Table 1, continued

Characteristics	Level of occupation ^a	<u>n</u>	%
Father's occupational level			
Executives, large business proprietors, major professionals	9	41	16.5
Administrators, medium business & farm proprietors, lesser professionals	8	36	14.5
Small business & farm proprietors, managers minor professionals	7	60	24.2
Semi-professionals, technicians	6	35	14.1
Clerical, sales	5	10	4.0
Skilled manual workers, craftsmen, noncom officers	4	29	11.7
Machine operators, semiskilled workers	3	26	10.5
Unskilled laborers	2	4	1.6
Farm laborers, menial service workers	1	1	.4
No answer		6	2.4

^a

Levels of occupation from Hollingshead (1975).

Table 1, continued

Characteristics	Level of occupation ^a	<u>n</u>	%
Mother's occupational level			
Executives, large business proprietors, major professionals	9	2	.8
Administrators, medium business & farm proprietors, lesser professionals	8	31	12.5
Small business & farm proprietors, managers minor professionals	7	44	17.7
Semi-professionals, technicians	6	67	27.0
Clerical, sales	5	39	15.7
Skilled manual workers, craftsmen, noncom officers	4	16	6.5
Machine operators, semiskilled workers	3	22	8.9
Unskilled laborers	2	0	0.0
Menial service workers	1	1	.4
Housewives	No rank	26	10.5

N=248

^a

Levels of occupation from Hollingshead (1975).

blacks (15%) than did the student body (10%). Approximately 36% of the sample were freshmen, 22% were sophomores, 23% were juniors, and 19% were seniors (see Table 1).

Subjects came from families that were relatively well-educated, affluent, and stable. Seventy-five percent of the parents were married, and the mean family income for the sample was in the \$40,000 to \$49,000 range. The mean educational level for both mothers and fathers was some college or technical training; however, 15% of the fathers and 7% of the mothers held graduate degrees. The median occupational level for fathers was characterized as minor professional or manager, whereas the median for mothers was one level below fathers (Hollingshead, 1974).

While in college, 54% of the sample had held jobs during the academic year. This figure varied according to the class with a larger percentage of students holding jobs each year: freshmen, 40%; sophomores, 47%; juniors, 68%; seniors, 74%. A larger percentage of blacks (59%) than whites (54%) and of males (62%) than females (53%) had held jobs during the academic year in college. The reasons given most often for working while in college were to have money for extras (29%), to meet financial obligations such as making car payments (27%), and to pay educational expenses (17%). The reason given most often for not having

a job was that it would take too much time away from studying (60%).

Among students who worked during the academic year in college, the mean hours spent on the job were 18 per week, and the mean pay per hour was \$4.80. Eighty percent indicated that they were almost never absent from their job, but if there were a conflict between their job and attending class, 87% indicated that they would choose to attend class. When asked the greatest benefit of working, 47% stated that it was the money. Thirty-two percent found that managing their time was the greatest problem they had with working, and 29% ranked keeping up their grades as their number one problem.

Questionnaire

The complete questionnaire given to the subjects in this study was a modification of the questionnaire used by Ellen Greenberger and her colleagues at the University of California at Irvine to study adolescent work and occupational competence and deviance (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981; Greenberger & Steinberg, 1986). A major part of that original questionnaire, with some additional items appropriate for college students, was tested in a pilot study with students enrolled in a junior level course at a southeastern university. These 59 students filled out the initial questionnaire and wrote

marginal comments about the items and their reactions to them. They also suggested questions which they believed should be included to give a more comprehensive picture of college students and their work experiences.

Based on the pilot study, the questionnaire was modified. Some items were eliminated, some items were added, and other items were changed to address issues of face validity. There were 60 randomly placed items in the final attitude portion of the questionnaire. The goal of the modifications was to produce a questionnaire that would give a comprehensive view of college students' experiences in the world of work and could be administered in a 50-minute class period.

The resultant questionnaire produced more data than was used in this study. Three major parts contributed to this study: demographic information, work history, and work related attitudes. The final questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix A. A full description of the refining of the instrument to measure work related attitudes is presented at the end of this chapter.

Procedure for Data Collection

The researcher approached instructors of basic classes and requested permission to give the revised questionnaires to students in the classes. This was done after the researcher had submitted the research proposal with

safeguards for the rights of subjects to the Human Subjects Review Committee and gained approval for the project.

Instructors of the classes gave permission for the researcher to invite the students to participate in the project during a class period.

At the beginning of a designated class period, the researcher described the research project to each class and explained their participation including their rights not to participate if they so chose. If they chose to participate, they were asked to read and sign consent forms attached to the questionnaire (see Appendix A). Then they were instructed how to fill them out and told that they could write in the margins any comments they had about items that might clarify their answers. The researcher remained in the room during the time they were filling out the questionnaires in order to answer any questions that they had. When the students completed the questionnaires, they turned them in and were free to leave.

Consent forms were removed from the questionnaires, and an ID number was assigned to each questionnaire. No information was left on the questionnaires that would connect a particular student with a questionnaire, therefore assuring anonymity. All data on the questionnaires were changed to numbers and transferred to IBM sheets to be entered into the computer.

Procedure for Data Analysis

Four separate one-way multivariate analyses of covariance (Pillai's trace) were computed to test the four hypotheses. The first three hypotheses of this study were: Work related attitudes of college students will be affected significantly by (a) having worked while attending high school, (b) the amount of time a student worked while attending high school, and (c) the level of job a student held while attending high school. The fourth hypothesis was directional: College students who worked longer hours at low level jobs will have less desirable scores on work related attitudes.

The major dependent variables comprising the work related attitudes were social commitment, work orientation, reliance on self, intrinsic value of work, extrinsic value of work, and cynicism about work. The major independent variables were high school employment, time worked weekly, and level of job held. There were two categories of high school employment (employed, not employed), three categories of time worked weekly (high, low, no job), and three categories of job level (medium, low, no job). Independent variables used as covariates were sex, race, class in college, college grade point average by self-report, and college residence. There were two categories each for sex,

race, and college residence, and there were four categories each for class in college and college GPA.

It was agreed prior to initiating the study that the questionnaire would be administered until there was a minimum of 20 subjects in each of the four cells made from job level (medium and low) by time worked (high and low) for high school employment. This requirement was met and exceeded (see Table 2). For the job level by time worked cells, the smallest number of subjects in any one cell was 41, and the largest was 58. The numbers in the cells were remarkably similar for there not to have been random assignment to equalize the cells.

The multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was selected as the appropriate data analysis procedure, because there was an assumption that the dependent variables were correlated. To compute separate analyses of covariance for each of the dependent variables would have risked making a Type I error and rejecting a true null hypothesis. MANCOVA is robust for modest violations of normality, and this robustness is increased by having sample sizes larger than 20 in each cell. Use of Pillai's trace as the test statistic also improves the robustness of the test.

Table 2

Frequencies for High School Work Behaviors

	Frequencies	
	<u>n</u>	%
Independent variables		
1. High school employment		
yes	191	77.0
no	57	23.0
2. Time worked weekly		
high	99	39.9
low	90	36.3
no job	57	23.0
missing data	2	0.8
3. High school job level		
medium	83	33.5
low	107	43.1
no job	57	23.0
missing data	1	0.4
4. High school job level by time worked weekly		
medium job/high hours	41	16.5
low job/high hours	58	23.4
medium job/low hours	41	16.5
low job/low hours	49	19.8
no job	57	23.0
missing data	2	0.8

N=248

Independent Variables

The three major independent variables of the study were (a) whether or not the subject was employed during the school year while in high school, (b) the time worked weekly, and (c) the level of job held during the last year worked. Other independent variables (college GPA, high school GPA, sex, race, family socioeconomic status, age, class in college, college residence) were suspected to have a significant effect on the dependent variables and were tested with a regression-type analysis. Five had significant effects and were used as covariates.

High School Employment

This independent variable was whether or not the subjects had worked during any school year while in high school. The data for this variable came from item 16, Section II of the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The item itself allowed subjects to indicate the exact year or years that they worked, but the data were collapsed into two categories: one category was whether they had worked any year, and the other category corresponded to the "never" response in the item. In the research design, this was a categorical variable with the two categories being "employed" and "not employed." When the frequencies were run on the high school employment variable, it was found

that 77% were in the employed category and 23% were in the not employed category (see Table 2).

Time Worked Weekly

Time worked weekly was the second major independent variable in the study. Item 27, Section II of the questionnaire (see Appendix A) supplied the data for this variable. The data were compiled first as hours worked weekly. If the subjects worked at only one job, the hours worked weekly was the number they filled in for Job 1. If the subjects worked at two jobs simultaneously, the hours worked weekly was the total of the number for Job 1 and Job 2. If the total hours seemed too high, responses to the questions about the jobs where they worked (items 25 and 26) were checked to be sure that the subject was holding two jobs at the same time. For those giving data for consecutive jobs, an average of the hours worked was used.

When the average hours for the jobs were computed, frequencies were used to determine how to divide the hours into categories of time worked weekly. Since "no job" was also a category of the time worked weekly, it was decided to divide the actual hours worked into two categories (high and low) to make a three-level categorical variable. The median was 19.5 hours per week, and the mode was 20 hours per week. The categories used in the analysis were "low" for those who worked under 20 hours a week and "high" for

those who worked 20 hours and above weekly. The frequencies for time worked weekly were as follows: 39.9%, high; 36.3%, low; 23%, no job; and 0.8%, missing data (see Table 2).

High School Job Level

Data for the high school job level came from responses to items 25 and 26 under Section II in the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The scale of job levels developed by Hollingshead (1975) was used to determine what level to assign for the jobs. The levels ranged from a low of "1" for menial service workers to a level of "9" for major professionals. The Hollingshead levels were described in the demographic section when discussing parental occupational levels (see Table 1). As expected, none of the high school jobs held were in the top levels.

For the major analyses, the job levels were collapsed into two categories. The "low" category was for job levels "4" and lower. This included jobs such as working at fast food restaurants, school bus drivers, and factory workers. The "medium" category jobs were those at level "5" and higher. Typical jobs in this category were clerical jobs, salesclerks in department stores, and cashiers. A third category of the variable was "no job." The frequencies for the high school job levels are presented in Table 2.

Almost 34% held medium level jobs, 43% held low level jobs, 23% held no jobs, and 0.4% had missing data.

Covariates

Because the sample was not randomly selected, there was the possibility that the subjects differed significantly on the dependent variables due to variables other than those of primary interest to the study. In order to control for these possible differences, several variables were considered as possible covariates. The data for the potential covariates came from Section I and Section VI of the questionnaire (see Appendix A). Socio-economic status was computed using the Hollingshead (1975) method.

Regression-type analyses were conducted for the potential covariates to see if they had a significant effect on the dependent variables. The analyses indicated that sex, race, class in school, college GPA, and place of residence during college did have a significant effect on the dependent variables, and they were used as covariates. Surprisingly, parental socio-economic status did not, but this may have been because overall the parental socio-economic status was relatively high.

There were two categories each of the sex and race variables (male/female, black/white), and four categories of the class variable (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior). Place of residence during college was collapsed

into two categories: on campus and off campus. College GPA was collapsed into four categories: A average, B average, C average, and D/F average.

Dependent Variables

In order to gain greater construct validity for the underlying dimensions of work related attitudes, a factor analysis was carried out. The six dependent variables for this study were the dimensions of work related attitudes measured by scales derived through factor analyses of the 60 items used by Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, and Ruggiero (1981). After the factor analyses, 29 of the 60 items were retained in six work related attitude scales. The six work related attitudes were (a) social commitment, (b) work orientation, (c) reliance on self, (d) intrinsic value of work, (e) extrinsic value of work, and (f) cynicism about work.

The 60 items to which subjects responded were on a four-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The items were in Section VII of the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The items that comprised each of the original scales are listed in Table B-1 (see Appendix B).

In order to have data from variables with adequate construct validity, each of the initial scales was independently submitted to a factor analysis. If more than

one factor with an eigenvalue greater than 1.00 emerged, the items that loaded on each factor were studied for conceptual cohesion. At this point in the process, written comments by subjects about individual items were taken into account to help assess face validity. In some analyses, items loaded on more than one factor, and these items were studied to determine into which factor, if either, they seemed to fit best conceptually. The size of the loadings was also taken into consideration in determining what to do about the split items.

The process of arriving at the final attitude scales involved computing factor analyses and reliability analyses on combinations of items in the subscales to arrive at the optimal combination of items with adequate loadings (greater than .45) and acceptable reliabilities (no less than .5). One other criterion for making a decision about using a factor was based on the skewness of the distribution of that factor. A z-score falling between +3.00 and -3.00 was considered acceptable.

The initial scales were social commitment, cynicism about work, self-reliance, work orientation, materialism, and acceptance of unethical business practices (see Table B-1, Appendix B). With the exception of acceptance of unethical business practices, items from all the initial scales were used in the scales on which the MANCOVAs were

computed. When the factor analysis was done on that initial scale, the items loaded on four factors with eigenvalues greater than one (see Table B-2, Appendix B). It was difficult to make conceptual sense of the four factors, therefore the decision was made not to use any items from that initial scale. After the factor analysis was completed, six scales made up the dependent variables. "Social commitment," "work orientation," and "reliance on self" were retained in concept. One factor of materialism became "extrinsic value of work." Cynicism about work became two scales, "cynicism about work" and "intrinsic value of work." Each of the new scales is described below.

Social Commitment

Social commitment is a measure that focuses on an individual's willingness to use time and energies to benefit others as well as self. The original scale was part of a psychological maturity measure developed by Greenberger and her associates (Greenberger et al., 1975). Six social commitment items were included in the initial scale, but only four items were retained in the final scale (see Table 3).

The factor analysis of the initial scale is included in Appendix B (Table B-3). The wording of two of the items (59, 23) from the initial scale was changed slightly to focus on the workplace rather than the neighborhood. Item

Table 3

Factor Analysis of Final Social Commitment Scale

Items	Factor loading	Communality
(59) I would rather use my time at work for my own advancement than for the advancement of the work group.	.71	.50
(11) It is much more satisfying to work for your own good than to work for the good of a group you belong to.	.68	.46
(23) It's not really my problem if my coworkers are in trouble and need help.	.67	.44
(29) Time you spend helping others get what they want would be better spent trying to get what you want.	.58	.34
Eigenvalue	1.74	
Percent of variability retained by factor	43.4	
Cronbach's alpha	.56	
Test for skewness	z= -.95	

six was dropped from the final scale as a result of comments about its meaning from subjects. Item 51 was shifted to another scale (cynicism about work) after it loaded on that factor in a final factor analysis of all retained items.

The final social commitment measure was made up of four items with loadings that ranged from .58 to .71 and communalities that ranged from .34 to .50 (see Table 3). The eigenvalue for the factor was 1.74, and the percent of variability in the original items explained by the factor was 43.4. The reliability was low but acceptable, and the test for skewness indicated that the skewness was within the acceptable limit.

Work Orientation

The work orientation scale also originated in the psychological maturity measure developed by Greenberger and associates (Greenberger et al., 1975) and was refined for the study of adolescent work experiences (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981). In its initial form, it consisted of 10 items having to do with the ability to work with competence, persistence, enjoyment, and resistance to distraction. A factor analysis was computed for the initial scale which resulted in two factors (see Table B-4, Appendix B). A series of factor analyses were computed for sets of items to determine the optimal

combination for a scale that would measure the concept as defined. It was found that when item eight and item nine were included in the scale, they tended to load on a separate factor; therefore, these two items were excluded from the final scale.

Eight items comprised the final work orientation scale, and they had loadings from .51 to .70 (see Table 4). The communalities ranged from .26 to .48. The percent of variability retained by the factor was 39.6, and the eigenvalue was 3.17. Cronbach's alpha was .77, and the test for skewness was within acceptable bounds.

Reliance on Self

Reliance on self began as part of a 10-item self-reliance scale that originated with the psychological maturity measure (Greenberger et al., 1975) and was used in the Greenberger studies (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981). When the initial self-reliance measure was factor analyzed, it loaded on two factors (see Table B-5, Appendix B). Several items loaded on both factors. An examination of the items that comprised each of the factors led to the conclusion that one factor measured the extent to which other people influence one's decisions and the other factor tapped an attitude about the influence of luck in one's life. The items that loaded on both factors did not seem to fit clearly in either factor.

Table 4

Factor Analysis of Final Work Orientation Scale

Items	Factor loading	Communality
(31) I often don't finish work I start.	.70	.48
(52) I tend to go from one thing to another before finishing any one of them.	.69	.48
(41) I find it hard to stick to anything that takes a long time to do.	.68	.46
(46) I hate to admit it but I give up on my work when things go wrong.	.64	.41
(54) I believe in working only as hard as I have to.	.61	.37
(4) Very often I forget work I am supposed to do.	.61	.37
(27) I often leave my homework unfinished if there are a lot of good TV shows on that evening.	.57	.32
(21) I seldom get behind in my work.	.51	.26
Eigenvalue	3.17	
Percent of variability retained by factor	39.6	
Cronbach's alpha	.77	
Test for skewness	z= -2.21	

The subscale that was decided upon was the one having to do with the influence of people over one's decisions. The other subscale was not used because the z-score for skewness indicated that the scale was skewed beyond the limits set for acceptance. The final scale, labeled "reliance on self," was composed of four items with factor loadings ranging from .64 to .73 (see Table 5). Communalities were high with a range of .41 to .53. Eigenvalue was 1.94, percent of variability retained by the factor was 48.5, and reliability was .65. Test for skewness was within the acceptable range.

Extrinsic Value of Work

The measure of extrinsic value of work was derived from the initial scale of materialism developed by Ruggiero (1984). It had 10 items that loaded on three factors (see Table B-6, Appendix B). Two items split between factors, and one loaded on all three factors. An examination of the items making up those factors revealed that they covered various attitudes about the importance and use of money. Three items seemed to tap an attitude about the importance of the money aspect of work, and these items became the scale to measure the extrinsic value of work.

The three items that made up the measure of extrinsic value of work had loadings that ran from .56 to .82 (see Table 6). Communalities went from .31 to .67. The

Table 5

Factor Analysis of Reliance on Self (Subscale of Initial
Self-Reliance Scale)

Items	Factor loading	Communality
(22) I feel very uneasy if I disagree with what my friends think.	.73	.53
(12) I don't know whether I like a new outfit until I find out what my friends think.	.72	.52
(30) It is best to agree with others, rather than say what you really think, if it will keep the peace.	.69	.48
(58) In a group I prefer to let other people make the decisions.	.64	.41
Eigenvalue	1.94	
Percent of variability retained by factor	48.5	
Cronbach's alpha	.65	
Test for skewness	z = -1.68	

Table 6

Factor Analysis of Extrinsic Value of Work (Subscale of
Initial Materialism Scale)

Items	Factor loading	Communality
(28) My goal in life is to make a lot of money and buy a lot of things.	.82	.67
(15) It's more important for a job to pay well than for a job to be very interesting.	.74	.55
(39) Adults who have honestly acquired a lot of wealth really have my respect and admiration.	.56	.31
Eigenvalue	1.53	
Percent of variability retained by factor	50.8	
Cronbach's alpha	.51	
Test for skewness	z= .38	

eigenvalue for the scale was 1.53, and the percent of variability retained by the factor was 50.8. The test for skewness indicated a very slight departure from normality, and the reliability was acceptable.

Cynicism about Work

Cynicism about work was a subscale of the original cynicism scale developed by Ruggiero (1984). The original scale was described as measuring "the degree to which the adolescent saw work as intrinsically unrewarding, pointless, and meaningless" (Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, & Ruggiero, 1981, p. 411). A factor analysis was computed for the nine items that made up the initial scale, and the items loaded on three factors (see Table B-7, Appendix B). Three items split between factors. An examination of the items comprising the three factors indicated that there were at least two separate concepts that could be measured by scales containing the items. One was the cynicism about work concept, and the other was an attitude about the intrinsic value of work. The latter became the intrinsic value of work scale discussed in that section.

After working with the items to find the optimal combination for cynicism, five items seemed to meet the criteria. When an overall factor analysis was computed for all the items making up the final scales for the study, however, item 51 loaded on cynicism rather than on social

commitment. Conceptually that item seemed to fit the cynicism scale, and it was included as part of the final scale.

The final measure of cynicism consisted of six items with loadings ranging from .56 to .70 (see Table 7). The communalities went from .31 to .48. The percent of variability retained by the factor was 37.1, and the eigenvalue was 2.22. The test for skewness indicated that the amount of skewness was within the acceptable range, and the reliability was .65.

Intrinsic Value of Work

As described above, the measure of intrinsic value of work was part of the initial cynicism scale developed by Ruggiero (1984). It was a subscale that emerged as a factor from the initial factor analysis of the cynicism scale (see Table B-7, Appendix B). The attitude it measured was considered part of the overall attitude about work being essentially meaningless and unrewarding.

The intrinsic value of work scale tapped an attitude about the positive rewards of work other than money. Unlike the other scales, all four items in this scale were stated positively (e.g., "Work gives a person a feeling of self-respect"). The factor loadings for the items went from .47 to .71, and the communalities ranged from .22 to .50 (see Table 8). The eigenvalue for the factor was 1.64,

Table 7

Factor Analysis of Final Cynicism Subscale

Items	Factor loading	Communality
(26) There's no such thing as a company that cares about its employees.	.70	.48
(36) Most people today are stuck in deadend, go-nowhere jobs.	.62	.38
(42) Hard work really doesn't get you much of anything in this world.	.61	.37
(51) Why work for something that others will enjoy if you won't be alive to enjoy it too?	.61	.37
(56) People who take their work home with them probably don't have a very interesting home life.	.56	.31
(33) People who work harder at their jobs than they have to are a little strange.	.56	.31
Eigenvalue	2.22	
Percent of variability retained by factor	37.1	
Cronbach's alpha	.65	
Test for skewness	z= -1.73	

Table 8

Factor Analysis of Intrinsic Value of Work (Subscale of
Initial Cynicism Scale)

Items	Factor loading	Communality
(49) Work gives a person a feeling of self-respect.	.71	.50
(38) A job provides a worker with a lot more good things than just a paycheck.	.69	.48
(25) Work provides people with the chance to really make something special out of their lives.	.67	.45
(47) Work is lots more than a necessity of life that people have to learn to put up with.	.47	.22
Eigenvalue	1.64	
Percent of variability retained by factor	41.0	
Cronbach's alpha	.50	
Test for skewness	z= -2.94	

and 41.0 percent of the variability in all the items was retained by the factor. The test for skewness was within acceptable limits as was the test for reliability.

Means and standard deviations were computed for all the scales in their final form (see Table 9). All of the scales had maximum values of 4.00, but only one scale, extrinsic value of work, had a minimum value of 1.00. The other five had minimum values beginning at 1.50. The means and standard deviations in Table 9 are for the dependent variables without being controlled for any independent variables. The tables for the major analyses contain the least square means which controlled for all the independent variables in the model. The ns for each scale are slightly different because of missing data.

Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of Responses to Work
Related Attitude Scales

	\bar{n}	\bar{x}	sd	min.	max.
Dependent variables					
Attitude scales					
(Scoring 1=low,4=high)					
1. Social commitment	245	2.984	.525	1.50	4.00
2. Work orientation	246	3.143	.497	1.63	4.00
3. Reliance on self	246	3.155	.543	1.50	4.00
4. Intrinsic value	247	3.486	.417	2.00	4.00
(Scoring 1=high,4=low)					
5. Extrinsic value	246	2.569	.587	1.00	4.00
6. Cynicism	247	3.298	.449	2.00	4.00

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The basic research question guiding this study was this: What is the effect of high school employment experiences on work related attitudes of college students? In order to address this question, four hypotheses were proposed: (a) Working while attending school in high school will have a significant effect on the work related attitudes of college students; (b) The amount of time students worked while attending high school will have a significant effect on the work related attitudes of college students; (c) The level of job students held while attending high school will have a significant effect on the work related attitudes of college students; and (d) College students who worked longer hours at low level jobs will have lower scores on work related attitudes than those who worked fewer hours and worked at higher level jobs.

Hypothesis Testing

The first three hypotheses were tested with three separate one-way multivariate analyses of covariance with Pillai's trace as the test statistic. The fourth hypothesis was tested with a two-way MANCOVA with Pillai's trace as test statistic.

The dependent variables that comprised work related attitudes were social commitment, work orientation, reliance on self, intrinsic value of work, extrinsic value of work, and cynicism about work. The independent variables were high school employment, time worked weekly, and level of job. The covariates used in the analyses were sex, race, class in college, college grade point average, and college residence. None of the hypotheses involving main effects of high school work variables was supported; however, there were significant effects for certain covariates and for a different interaction from the one hypothesized.

High School Employment

The results of the MANCOVA of the six work related attitudes for high school employment can be found in Table 10. There was no significant overall effect for high school employment when all work related attitudes of college students were taken into consideration together; therefore, there was no support for Hypothesis One. Table 11 presents the least square means of each dependent variable for high school employment.

The least square means differ from overall means in that they are adjusted for the covariates. These least square mean scores are calculated for each of the two categories of high school employment. Since the highest

Table 10

MANCOVA of Work Related Attitudes for High School
Employment (N=237)

Dependent variables:

Social commitment	Intrinsic value of work
Work orientation	Extrinsic value of work
Reliance on self	Cynicism about work

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Pillai's trace</u>	<u>F-value</u>	<u>p-value</u>
High school employment	1	0.017127	0.64	0.6966
<u>Covariates</u>				
Sex	1	0.051725	2.01	0.0656
Race	1	0.158171	6.92	0.0001
Class	3	0.141879	1.85	0.0177
College GPA	3	0.174027	2.29	0.0018
College residence	1	0.069430	2.75	0.0135

MANCOVA (df=10,226)

Table 11

Least Square Mean Comparisons of Work Related Attitudes by
High School Employment (N=237)

	High school employment	
	Employed	Not employed
MANCOVA (df=10,226)		
Dependent variables		
(Scoring 1=low, 4=high)		
1. Social commitment	2.86 (.07) ^a	2.79 (.09)
2. Work orientation	3.12 (.07)	3.04 (.09)
3. Reliance on self	3.20 (.07)	3.21 (.09)
4. Intrinsic	3.36 (.06)	3.40 (.07)
(Scoring 1=high, 4=low)		
5. Extrinsic	2.46 (.08)	2.50 (.10)
6. Cynicism	3.04 (.06)	3.07 (.08)

Covariates: Sex, race, class, college GPA, and college residence.

^a

Standard error of means are in the parentheses.

score was 4, these means for social commitment, work orientation, reliance on self, and intrinsic value of work are all positive. For extrinsic value of work, scores closer to 4 indicate that the persons place less importance on the extrinsic aspect of work than persons whose scores are closer to 1. Whether this is a positive or negative attitude depends on one's perspective. For cynicism, scores that are closer to 4 indicate that the person is lower in cynicism about work and, therefore, has a more positive attitude.

Although there was no overall effect for high school employment, there was a significant overall effect on work related attitudes for four of the five covariates (see Table 10). They were race ($p=0.0001$), class ($p=0.02$), college GPA ($p=0.002$), and college residence ($p=0.01$). Although sex did not reach the predetermined level of significance ($p=.05$), it came close ($p=.06$).

There were 12 significant effects when the covariates were subjected to a univariate analysis of covariance within the MANCOVA for each of the six work related attitudes. Race had a significant effect on reliance on self ($p=.0005$) and cynicism ($p=.01$). Class had a significant effect on work orientation ($p=.02$), reliance on self ($p=.001$), and extrinsic value of work ($p=.03$). College GPA had a significant effect on work orientation

($p=.01$), reliance on self ($p=.01$), and extrinsic value of work ($p=.04$). College residence had a significant effect on intrinsic value of work ($p=.002$). Although sex did not have a significant overall effect, it did have a significant effect on the individual scales of social commitment ($p=.04$), work orientation ($p=.04$), and cynicism about work for high school employment ($p=.01$).

Time Worked Weekly

Table 12 presents the results of the MANCOVA of work related attitudes for time worked weekly. There was no significant overall effect for time worked weekly on work related attitudes in this analysis either. Hypothesis Two, therefore, was not supported. The least square means for each cell of the independent variable on each dependent variable are presented in Table 13.

When time worked weekly was used in the MANCOVA, four covariates in this analysis had a significant overall effect on work related attitudes (see Table 12). They were race ($p=0.0001$), class ($p=0.02$), college GPA ($p=0.003$), and college residence ($p=0.02$).

When the five covariates were subjected to a univariate analysis of covariance within the MANCOVA for each of the six work related attitudes, there were 12 significant effects. Race had a significant effect on reliance on self ($p=.0004$) and cynicism ($p=.001$). Class

Table 12

MANCOVA of Work Related Attitudes for Time Worked Weekly
(N=235)

Dependent variables:

Social commitment	Intrinsic value of work
Work orientation	Extrinsic value of work
Reliance on self	Cynicism about work

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Pillai's trace</u>	<u>F-value</u>	<u>p-value</u>
Time worked weekly	2	0.035160	0.65	0.7962
<u>Covariates</u>				
Sex	1	0.052204	2.00	0.0667
Race	1	0.157169	6.78	0.0001
Class	3	0.139917	1.79	0.0226
College GPA	3	0.172180	2.23	0.0025
College residence	1	0.064770	2.52	0.0225

MANCOVA (df=11,223)

Table 13

Least Square Mean Comparisons of Work Related Attitudes by
Time Worked Weekly (N=235)

	Time worked weekly		
	High	Low	No job
MANCOVA (df=11,223)			
Dependent variables			
(Scoring 1=low, 4=high)			
1. Social commitment	2.80 (.08) ^a	2.94 (.09)	2.80 (.09)
2. Work orientation	3.09 (.07)	3.16 (.08)	3.04 (.09)
3. Reliance on self	3.18 (.08)	3.23 (.08)	3.22 (.09)
4. Intrinsic	3.37 (.06)	3.37 (.07)	3.39 (.07)
(Scoring 1=high, 4=low)			
5. Extrinsic	2.46 (.09)	2.46 (.10)	2.51 (.10)
6. Cynicism	3.02 (.07)	3.07 (.07)	3.08 (.08)

Covariates: Sex, race, class, college GPA, and college residence.

^a Standard error of means are in the parentheses.

had a significant effect on work orientation ($p=.03$), reliance on self ($p=.001$), and extrinsic value of work ($p=.04$). College GPA had a significant effect on work orientation ($p=.01$), reliance on self ($p=.01$), and extrinsic value of work ($p=.03$). College residence had a significant effect on intrinsic value of work ($p=.003$) and extrinsic value of work ($p=.05$). Although sex did not have a significant overall effect, it did have a significant effect on the individual scales of work orientation ($p=.03$), intrinsic value of work ($p=.05$), and cynicism ($p=.01$).

High School Job Level

The results of the MANCOVA of work related attitudes for high school job level can be found in Table 14. There was no significant overall effect for high school job level on work related attitudes of college students and, therefore, no support for Hypothesis Three.

Even though there was no significant overall effect for high school job level on work related attitudes, there was a significant effect ($p<.05$) of high school job level on cynicism about work. In order to determine which category of job level was responsible for the effect, contrasts were done on the categories of job levels. It was found that students who worked at medium level jobs were significantly higher ($p=.05$) on cynicism, and students

Table 14

MANCOVA of Work Related Attitudes for High School Job Level
(N=236)

Dependent variables:

Social commitment	Intrinsic value of work
Work orientation	Extrinsic value of work
Reliance on self	Cynicism about work

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Pillai's trace</u>	<u>F-value</u>	<u>p-value</u>
High school job level	2	0.051557	0.97	0.4766
<u>Covariates</u>				
Sex	1	0.065777	2.57	0.0200
Race	1	0.164157	7.17	0.0001
Class	3	0.142431	1.84	0.0185
College GPA	3	0.167341	2.18	0.0033
College residence	1	0.067657	2.65	0.0168
MANCOVA (df=11,224)				

who worked at low level jobs were significantly higher ($p=.05$) on social commitment (see Table 15).

Although there was not a significant overall effect for job level, the trend was the same for all scales when high school job level was used in the MANCOVA (see Table 15). Those who had held medium level jobs had more negative work related attitudes than those who had held low level jobs. For most scales, students who had held medium level jobs also had more negative attitudes than those who had not worked at all. The one exception was on the work orientation scale. On that one scale, those who had not worked had the lowest work orientation.

Even though different job level groups were lower than others, overall the scores for all groups indicated that they had more positive than negative work related attitudes. This has been true for all of the results.

When high school job level was used in the MANCOVA, there was a significant overall effect on work related attitudes for all of the covariates (see Table 14): sex ($p=.02$), race ($p=.0001$), class ($p=.02$), college GPA ($p=.003$), and college residence ($p=.02$).

When the covariates were subjected to a univariate analysis of covariance within the MANCOVA for each of the six work related attitudes, there were some significant effects. In particular, sex had a significant effect on

Table 15

Least Square Mean Comparisons of Work Related Attitudes by
High School Job Level (N=236)

	High School Job Level		
	Medium	Low	No job
MANCOVA (df=11,224)			
Dependent variables			
(Scoring 1=low, 4=high)			
1. Social commitment	2.74 (.09) ^a	2.90* (.08)	2.76 (.09)
2. Work orientation	3.06 (.09)	3.14 (.07)	3.02 (.09)
3. Reliance on self	3.16 (.09)	3.22 (.07)	3.20 (.09)
4. Intrinsic	3.34 (.07)	3.38 (.06)	3.39 (.07)
(Scoring 1=high, 4=low)			
5. Extrinsic	2.44 (.10)	2.47 (.08)	2.50 (.10)
6. Cynicism	2.92* (.08)	3.09 (.06)	3.05 (.08)

Covariates: Sex, race, class, college GPA, and college residence.

^a

Standard error of means are in the parentheses.

* $p < .05$

social commitment ($p=.02$), work orientation ($p=.02$), intrinsic value of work ($p=.04$), and cynicism ($p=.002$). Race had a significant effect on intrinsic value of work ($p=.05$), reliance on self ($p=.001$), and cynicism ($p=.0001$). Class had a significant effect on work orientation ($p=.02$), reliance on self ($p=.001$), and extrinsic value of work ($p=.04$). College GPA had a significant effect on work orientation ($p=.02$), reliance on self ($p=.01$), and extrinsic value of work ($p=.04$). College residence had a significant effect on intrinsic value of work ($p=.002$) and extrinsic value of work ($p=.05$).

High School Job Level by Time Worked Weekly

The fourth hypothesis was tested with a two-way MANCOVA, followed by contrasts. There were no significant main effects for job level and time worked weekly on work related attitudes. There, also, was no significant overall interaction effect of job level by time worked weekly on work related attitudes. Contrasts did not reveal a significant difference for the high time, low level job group on the six work related attitudes as predicted by the hypothesis (see Table 16). Hypothesis Four could not be supported.

The contrasts did reveal, however, that there was a significant overall effect for another of the job level by time worked categories on the six work related attitudes.

Table 16

MANCOVA of Work Related Attitudes for Job Level by Time
Worked Weekly (N=235)

Dependent variables:

Social commitment	Intrinsic value of work
Work orientation	Extrinsic value of work
Reliance on self	Cynicism about work

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Pillai's trace</u>	<u>F-value</u>	<u>p-value</u>
Job level by time worked	4	0.143765	1.36	0.1159
<u>Covariates</u>				
Sex	1	0.067219	2.59	0.0190
Race	1	0.162021	6.90	0.0001
Class	3	0.138841	1.76	0.0261
College GPA	3	0.180380	2.32	0.0015
College residence	1	0.064680	2.49	0.0238
<u>Contrasts</u>				
Med job/high time	1	0.044762	1.69	0.1254
Low job/high time	1	0.022523	0.83	0.5482
Med job/low time	1	0.230131	0.85	0.5342
Low job/low time	1	0.072591	2.82	0.0116
No job	1	0.021140	0.76	0.6013
MANCOVA (df=13,221)				

The low level, low time group had a significant overall effect ($p < .01$) on the six work related attitudes (see Table 16). The contrasts revealed that this low level, low time group was significantly higher on social commitment ($p < .001$) and on work orientation ($p < .05$) than the other groups (see Table 17).

Univariate analyses of covariance carried out within the MANCOVA indicated that there was a significant difference on cynicism for one of the job level, time worked categories. Follow-up contrasts indicated that the medium level, high time category scored significantly higher ($p < .05$) on cynicism about work (see Table 17).

When time worked weekly by high school job level was used in the MANCOVA, all the covariates had significant overall effects on the work related attitudes. Sex was significant at .02, race at .0001, class at .03, college GPA at .002, and college residence at .02 (see Table 16).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of high school work experiences on the work related attitudes of college students. The question of interest was: What impact does high school employment have in the occupational socialization process of adolescents? The four hypotheses developed to answer this question were not supported by the empirical results of the study; therefore,

Table 17
Least Square Mean Comparisons of Work Related Attitudes for
Job Level by Time Worked Weekly (N=235)

		Time worked weekly	
		High	Low
MANCOVA (df=13,221)			
Dependent variables			
(Scoring 1=low, 4=high)			
Job level	1. Social commitment		
	Medium job level	2.70 (.11) ^a	2.80 (.11)
	Low job level	2.84 (.09)	3.00 (.10)**
	No job: 2.77(.09)		
	2. Work orientation		
	Medium job level	3.09 (.10)	3.06 (.11)
	Low job level	3.08 (.08)	3.23 (.09)*
	No job: 3.03(.09)		
	3. Reliance on self		
	Medium job level	3.15 (.11)	3.18 (.11)
	Low job level	3.20 (.09)	3.26 (.10)
	No job: 3.21(.09)		
	4. Intrinsic value		
	Medium job level	3.25 (.08)	3.43 (.09)
	Low job level	3.43 (.07)	3.30 (.07)
	No job: 3.38(.07)		
(Scoring 1=high, 4=low)			
	5. Extrinsic value		
	Medium job level	2.32 (.12)	2.54 (.12)
	Low job level	2.54 (.10)	2.37 (.11)
	No job: 2.50(.10)		
	6. Cynicism		
	Medium job level	2.89 (.09)*	2.96 (.09)
	Low job level	3.07 (.07)	3.11 (.08)
	No job: 3.05 (.08)		

Covariates: Sex, race, class, college GPA, and college residence

^a Standard error of means are in the parentheses.

* $p \leq .05$.

** $p \leq .001$.

the answer to the question could appear to be that there is no effect.

The conclusion that there is no longlasting effect of high school employment can be supported by a perspective presented by Steinberg, Greenberger, Vaux, and Ruggiero (1981) as an alternative to the occupational competence and occupational deviance models that they tested in their research. From this perspective, "early work experience has virtually no effects on the young person's work attitudes, values, habits, and plans" (p. 407). This viewpoint is reinforced by the minimal impact that employment programs for youth have on their participants. Greenberger and Steinberg (1981) saw some support for the perspective in the fact that adolescents do not view their early jobs as comparable to the work they expect to do when their schooling is complete.

As part of the perspective that early work has no longlasting effects on young people, the implication is that demographic variables such as sex, race, and socio-economic status are more influential in affecting work attitudes and values than is early work experience. In the present research, that seems to be a plausible explanation, because those variables used as covariates had significant effects whereas the early work variables apparently did not. The covariates in this study were selected because

previous studies have shown that they do have a significant effect on work related variables (Bachman et al., 1986; D'Amico, 1984).

Another plausible explanation for the results is the sample used for this study. The students in this sample attended a state university that traditionally has been associated with preparation for the workplace. Overall, the scores on all the work related variables reflected positive attitudes about work. The only exception to this were the scores on the extrinsic value of work. Originally extrinsic value of work was part of a scale developed by Ruggiero (1984) to measure materialism, and it was considered a negative work related attitude; however, this is a debatable position. Materialism may have been a negative value of the 1970s because of the cultural pressure to be more concerned about personal growth than material goods. More recently there has been a balance between materialism and personal growth.

Behn et al. (1974) make the point that monetary rewards are an important part of the work world in order to provide workers who do not have fulfilling jobs a source of gratification. In this perspective, work is a way of earning wages for consumption. Whether one accepts the perspective of Behn et al. about wages and work, it is difficult not to acknowledge that in the United States

today, there is an ubiquitous emphasis on money and possessions. That young people embrace this widespread societal value should come as no surprise to observers of the adolescent culture. It probably is more a reflection of the effective socialization of adolescents into the value system of the workplace than it is a negative work related attitude.

Another plausible explanation for the results from this study can be derived from the perspective of Behn et al. (1974). It presents some interesting possibilities for speculation about the interrelationship of the school and work in the socialization process.

According to the point of view of Behn et al., the school and the workplace are both hierarchial systems that reinforce comparable behaviors and attitudes. Schools prepare youth to become workers by "differentiating both the amounts and types of schooling experiences they receive" (p. 55). Low-level workers are expected to defer to authority, follow orders, and become part of the "faceless multitudes at the bottom of the work hierarchy" (p. 57) with minimal cognitive skills. Middle-level workers are expected to show some independence, to give as well as follow orders, and to have higher levels of cognitive skills. High-level workers are expected to have

high cognitive skills, have an air of authority, and behave with independence.

In the socialization process, schools reinforce these same job level behaviors at various points in the educational process. Those who make it to the top (i.e., become college graduates) expect to have better jobs that are more fulfilling and have greater monetary rewards.

Using the perspective of Behn et al., it is easy to explain the significant findings of this research. First of all, the individuals in the sample are all college undergraduates. They have made it through the educational system and expect to have the rewards of a fulfilling job when they complete their years in college. This would account for their overall positive work related attitudes.

An interesting sidelight of the research came from an examination of the mean scores for the level of college GPA. The lowest college GPA group was consistently the lowest group on the positive work related attitudes and the highest group on the cynicism and extrinsic reward scales. College GPA represents the tangible mark of success in the academic world, and low GPA indicates failure in the academic area and a lowering of the level of probable future jobs.

It is also interesting to note again the significant findings on the individual scales. Students who had held

low level jobs in high school were significantly higher in social commitment, a scale that measured concern for and involvement with fellow workers. Those who had worked low time as well as low level jobs were significantly higher both on social commitment and work orientation. It is plausible to argue that the exposure these students had to the role of the low level worker caused them to absorb the attitudes expected in the role but that the time was not so great that they felt restricted by the role to the point of rejecting the attitudes associated with it.

Those students who had held medium level jobs were highest in cynicism. One explanation for this could be that at the medium level jobs, they would be expected to display independent thinking and higher levels of cognitive attainments. One expression of independent thinking could be a slightly cynical attitude towards accepting work as an absolutely positive value.

If the school and the workplace affect each other in the socialization of youth, then the encroachment of the workplace into the educational domain would be perceived by the educational institution as a threat to the established roles of each institution. It would also explain the concern that educators feel about the impact of working on the academic achievement of full-time students in college or in high school.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of the present research was to assess the effects of high school employment experiences of college students (N=248) on six work related attitudes. Multi-variate analyses of covariance (MANCOVAs) were carried out to determine if high school employment, time worked weekly, and level of high school job significantly affected social commitment, work orientation, reliance on self, intrinsic value of work, extrinsic value of work, and cynicism about work. Sex, race, class in college, college grade point average, and college residence were used as covariates. Each of the covariates had significant overall effects in at least one of the analyses.

None of the major independent variables had a significant effect on the six work related attitudes when taken together in the MANCOVAs. When univariate analyses were computed within the MANCOVAs, however, there were significant effects ($p=.05$) for level of high school job on cynicism about work and social commitment. College students who had worked at medium level jobs (secretaries, telemarketers, sales associates) were higher on cynicism,

and students who had worked at low level jobs (fast food workers, school bus drivers, stock clerks) were higher on social commitment. When time worked weekly was taken into account, students who had worked a high number of hours (20 or more) at medium level jobs were significantly higher on cynicism ($p < .05$). Students who worked low hours (under 20 hours) at low level jobs were significantly higher on social commitment ($p < .001$) and on work orientation ($p < .05$).

Conclusions

The results of this study indicated that early experiences with employment while attending high school apparently do not carry over to overall work related attitudes of college students. This is one interpretation of the results. If this interpretation is an accurate one, then whatever socializing effects being an adolescent worker while attending high school has on overall attitudes about work, the effects do not seem to be permanent. The fact that sex, race, and college grade point average do significantly affect overall work related attitudes suggests that individual characteristics exert a stronger socializing influence on college students' opinions about work than experiences in the workplace while a student is in high school.

An alternate explanation is that early work experience does have a socializing effect on high school students by

teaching them to conform to the roles that are expected of workers in the jobs at different levels in the workplace. Schools also socialize students into the same type of behaviors that are expected of them in the jobs at different levels in the workplace. The significant differences on individual scales by students who had worked at different levels of high school jobs seemed to support this explanation.

A general conclusion from the overall scores on the six work related attitudes is that college students who are comparable to the students in the sample believe in work. Scores were primarily positive on all the work related attitudes, and there was very little difference between the categories of employment, job level, or time worked.

The results also confirm the consistency of certain variables in explaining differences in attitudes about work. Sex, race, class in school, college grade point average, and college residence were found to affect work related attitudes. It is important, therefore, for researchers working in the area of high school employment to control for demographic and individual differences between students to ensure that it is high school employment experiences and not extraneous variables that are causing significant effects on work related attitudes.

Recommendations

There is a need for more research about college students and work. This study looked at a very small portion of college students' experiences with the workplace during high school. Future research should include employment in college as a variable in conjunction with high school work experiences. Whether or not there is any difference between those who have worked and those who have not as far as handling their own money and budgeting time would be fruitful areas for research.

More should be done to expand and develop scales to measure work related attitudes. The ones that were refined in this study can be used in future research, but they could be more reliable by the addition of items that accurately measure what the scale is supposed to measure. It is important to go beyond face validity to ensure that a scale is measuring a single dimension. There is a need to take split items and construct new items that tap each dimension of the original items.

Researchers need to recognize that college students have work histories that may be influencing their working and academic behaviors. Most college students today have been members of the work force while they were still in high school. They have been socialized in some way from

that experience, and researchers need to acknowledge that and discover how that affects them as college students.

Since this study was conducted with college students about their high school work experiences, another recommendation is that a study of high school students be conducted. First, the instrument should be validated on high school students. Then, using the same independent variables of employment, job level, and time worked, an analysis of the immediate effects on work related attitudes should be conducted controlling for sex, race, class, and high school GPA. Of the many variables that could be important to study, one of these is the effect of high school employment on rural youth, especially those from farm families. Although much has been done to study high school students' work experiences, there are still many aspects that could be researched to yield valuable information about the increasing numbers of youth that are working while attending school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Apostal, R. A., & Doherty, C. P. (1972). Effects of positive and routine job assignments on academic performance. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13, 270-272.
- Applied Systems Institute, Inc. (1983). Work patterns of full-time college students in 1974 and 1981 (Research/Technical Report). Washington, DC: Applied Systems Institute, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 228 969)
- Astin, A. W. (1977). Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Augustin, J. W. (1985). Adult students and career planning (Research/Technical Report). Green Bay, WI: Wisconsin University Assessment Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262 225)
- Bachman, J. G., Bare, D. E., & Frankie, E. I. (1986). Correlates of employment among high school seniors (Monitoring the Future Occasional Paper 20). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 145)
- Eachman, J. G., Johnston, L. D., & O'Malley, P. M. (1987). Monitoring the future: Questionnaire responses from the nation's high school seniors, 1986. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 143)
- Barnes, J. D., & Keene, R. (1974). A comparison of the initial academic achievement of freshman award winners who work and those who do not work. Journal of Student Financial Aid, 4(3), 25-29.
- Behn, W. H., Carnoy, M., Carter, M. A., Crain, J. C., & Levin, H. M. (1974). School is bad; work is worse. School Review, 83, 49-68.

- Christoffel, P. (1985). Working your way through college: A new look at an old idea (Research/Technical Report). Washington, DC: College Entrance Examination Board. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 263 866)
- D'Amico, R. (1984). Does employment during high school impair academic progress? Sociology of Education, 57, 152-164.
- Ehrenberg, R. G., & Sherman, D. R. (1987). Employment while in college, academic achievement, and post college outcomes: A summary of results. Journal of Human Resources, 22, 1-23.
- Gordon, R. (1985). Part-time work experience of high school seniors: Education & employment. Research for the practitioner (Research Brief No. 4). Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262 254)
- Greenberger, E. (1983). A researcher in the policy arena: The case of child labor. American Psychologist, 38, 104-111.
- Greenberger, E., Josselson, R., Knerr, C., & Knerr, B. (1975). The measurement and structure of psychosocial maturity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4, 127-143.
- Greenberger, E., & Steinberg, L. (1981). The workplace as a context for the socialization of youth. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10, 185-210.
- Greenberger, E., & Steinberg, L. (1986). When teenagers work: The psychological and social costs of adolescent employment. New York: Basic Books.
- Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L., & Ruggiero, M. (1982). A job is a job is a job... or is it? Behavioral observations in the adolescent workplace. Work and Occupations, 9, 79-96.
- Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L. D., Vaux, A., & McAuliffe, S. (1980). Adolescents who work: Effects of part-time employment on family and peer relations. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9, 189-202.

- Hamilton, S. F., & Crouter, A. C. (1980). Work and growth: A review of research on the impact of work experience on adolescent development. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9, 323-338.
- Hay, J. F., & Lindsay, C. A. (1969). The working student--How does he achieve? Journal of College Student Personnel, 10(2), 109-114.
- Healy, C. C., & Mourton, D. L. (1987). The relationship of exploration, college jobs, and grade point average. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 28-34.
- Heller, B. R., & Heinemann, H. N. (1987). The impact of structured and nonstructured work experiences on college students' attitudes, values, and academic performance. Journal of Cooperative Education, 23(3), 19-32.
- Henry, J. P. (1967). Part-time employment and academic performance. Journal of College Student Personnel, 8, 257-260.
- Hollingshead, A. B. (1975). Four factor index of social status. Dept. of Sociology, Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Kaiser, H. E., & Bergen, G. (1968). Shall college freshmen work? Journal of College Student Personnel, 9, 384-385.
- Lewis, M. V., Gardner, J. A., & Seitz, P. (1983). High school work experience and its effects (Contract No. 300-78-0032). Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 227 310)
- President's Science Advisory Committee, Panel on Youth. (1974). Youth: Transition to adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ruggiero, M. (1984). Work as an impetus to delinquency: An examination of theoretical and empirical connections (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 4502B.
- Ruggiero, M., Greenberger, E., & Steinberg, L. D. (1982). Occupational deviance among adolescent workers. Youth & Society, 13, 423-448.

- Steinberg, L. D., & Greenberger, E. (1980). The part-time employment of high school students: A research agenda. Children and Youth Services Review, 2, 159-183.
- Steinberg, L. D., Greenberger, E., Garduque, L. & McAuliffe, S. (1982). High school students in the labor force: Some costs and benefits to schooling and learning. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 4, 363-372.
- Steinberg, L. D., Greenberger, E., Garduque, L., Ruggiero, M., & Vaux, A. (1982). Effects of working on adolescent development. Developmental Psychology, 18, 385-395.
- Steinberg, L. D., Greenberger, E., Jacobi, M., & Garduque, L. (1981). Early work experience: A partial antidote for adolescent egocentrism. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10, 141-157.
- Steinberg, L. D., Greenberger, E., Vaux, A., & Ruggiero, M. (1981). Early work experience: Effects on adolescent occupational socialization. Youth and Society, 12, 403-422.
- Van de Water, G., & Augenblick, J. (1987). Working while studying: Does it matter? An examination of the Washington State Work Study Program (Research/Technical Report). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 290 356)

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION, AND ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

This is a study about college students, their employment, their education, and their attitudes. You can contribute to our knowledge about this area through your thoughtful participation in this research.

Please write your name on this sheet but not on any other page of the questionnaire. This page will be removed and the questionnaire assigned a code number so that anonymity will be assured. Your responses will be completely confidential. Please answer as accurately and as honestly as you can.

You are under no obligation to participate in this study and may withdraw at any time. Choosing not to participate will not affect your standing in this course. If you do participate, you are free to omit any question that you do not want to answer. However, we would appreciate it if you would answer every question so that your questionnaire can be included in the study. (You may be instructed to skip certain parts of the questionnaire that do not apply to you.)

As you are answering the questions, you may run into some that you are not quite sure how to answer. Please answer as best you can and write any clarifying comments in the margin of the questionnaire.

We hope that you will choose to participate in this important research project. Thank you for your help with this research.

I have read the above information regarding the research procedure and agree to participate voluntarily in this study.

Signature of participant

Date

Regardless of your willingness to participate, if you would like a summary report of the overall findings of the project sent to you, please print your permanent mailing address below.

I.D. Number _____
(Leave blank)

SECTION I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. How old are you? _____
2. What is the department in which you're majoring (ex. CDF, SOC, PSY, CED)? _____
3. How many semester hours are you currently taking? _____

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT APPLIES IN THE FOLLOWING ITEMS

4. What is your sex?
 - 1 Female
 - 2 Male
5. What is your race?
 - 1 White
 - 2 Black
 - 3 Other (specify _____)
6. What class are you in?
 - 1 Freshman
 - 2 Sophomore
 - 3 Junior
 - 4 Senior
 - 5 Other (specify _____)
7. What is your marital status?
 - 1 Never married
 - 2 Married
 - 3 Separated
 - 4 Divorced
 - 5 Widowed
8. While attending college this year, where do you live?
 - 1 In family home with parents
 - 2 In dorm
 - 3 Off campus alone or with roommate(s)
 - 4 With my spouse and/or children
 - 5 More than one of above
9. Since you graduated from high school, have you had one full academic year in which you were not enrolled in college?
 - 1 Yes
 - 2 No

10. Please indicate the highest grade or educational level completed by each of your parents.

	a. FATHER	b. MOTHER
1 less than 7th grade	_____	_____
2 junior high school	_____	_____
3 partial high school	_____	_____
4 high school graduate or equivalent	_____	_____
5 some college or specialized training	_____	_____
6 college graduate	_____	_____
7 graduate degree	_____	_____

11. Please describe your father's usual occupation. If retired, currently unemployed, or deceased, what was his occupation prior to that?

Title: _____

Kind of work : _____

Kind of company or business: _____

12. Please describe your mother's usual occupation. If retired, currently unemployed, or deceased, what was her occupation prior to that?

Title: _____

Kind of work: _____

Kind of company or business: _____

13. What is your parents' marital status?

1 Married

2 Widowed (father deceased)

3 Widowed (mother deceased)

4 Separated

5 Divorced (If divorced, which parent has provided
major support? _____)

6 Other (Please explain. _____)

_____)

14. What is the range that applies to your parents' average yearly income (before taxes). If your parents' marital status is "married", give average total income. Otherwise, give income of parent primarily responsible for your support. Please estimate if you're not sure. Remember, your answer is confidential.

- 1 Less than \$10,000
- 2 \$10,000 - \$19,999
- 3 \$20,000 - \$29,999
- 4 \$30,000 - \$39,999
- 5 \$40,000 - \$49,999
- 6 \$50,000 - \$59,999
- 7 \$60,000 - \$69,999
- 8 \$70,000 - \$79,999
- 9 \$80,000 or over

15. While attending high school, in what type of area did you live?

- 1 Rural nonfarm
- 2 Rural farm
- 3 Town
- 4 City (less than 100,000)
- 5 City (more than 100,000)

SECTION II. HIGH SCHOOL

QUESTIONS 16-28 APPLY TO YOUR EMPLOYMENT DURING ANY SCHOOL YEAR IN HIGH SCHOOL. DO NOT INCLUDE SUMMER EMPLOYMENT.

16. Were you employed for pay during any school year when you were in high school? (CIRCLE THE NUMBER OR NUMBERS THAT APPLY)

- 1 Never
- 2 12th Grade
- 3 11th Grade
- 4 10th Grade
- 5 9th Grade

- 16a. IF NEVER: What is the main reason you didn't work during the school year? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- 1 I didn't need the money.
- 2 The type job I wanted wasn't available.
- 3 I couldn't find a job.
- 4 My parents wouldn't let me work.
- 5 The idea of working didn't really interest me.
- 6 It would have taken too much time away from schoolwork and studying.
- 7 It would have taken up too much of my free time.
- 8 Other. Please describe. _____

- 16b. If there was more than one important reason for not working, please list other reasons and number in order of importance (1=most important, 2=next most important). _____

17. How did your parents feel about your working or not working during the school year? Please describe.

Mother _____

Father _____

(IF YOUR ANSWER TO QUESTION 16 WAS NEVER, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 29.)

IF YOU WORKED FOR PAY DURING ANY SCHOOL YEAR IN HIGH SCHOOL, (DO NOT INCLUDE SUMMER EMPLOYMENT), CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 18.

18. What was your main reason for getting a job? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- 1 I wanted job experience for the future.
- 2 I got a job in order to meet new friends.
- 3 I didn't really have to work, but I wanted to have money for "extras".
- 4 I got a job in order to earn money for things I really needed.
- 5 I got a job to meet financial obligations (ex., car payments).
- 6 I thought working would be interesting.
- 7 My parents put pressure on me to get a job.
- 8 I had a lot of extra time on my hands and wanted something to do.
- 9 Other _____

18a. If there was more than one important reason for working, please list other reasons and number in order of importance (1=most important, 2=next most important). _____

19. What grade were you in when you got your first job (other than babysitting, yardwork) during the school year?

20. Give the name or title of that job. Be as specific as possible (waiter/waitress, salesperson at a record store).

21. Describe what you actually did on that job (served food to customers at lunch counter). _____

22. How many hours a week did you usually work at that job?

23. What was the average amount of your earnings at that job?
- a. per hour _____
- b. per week _____
24. What grade (10th, 11th, 12th) were you in the last year that you worked during any school year when you were in high school? (No summer employment)
- _____
25. Give the name or title of the job where you last worked during high school. Be as specific as possible (cook at fast food restaurant). If you worked at two jobs during the same period of time, please indicate that and give information for both jobs.
- Job 1 _____
- Job 2 _____
26. Describe what you actually did on that job (those jobs).
- Job 1 _____
- Job 2 _____
27. On the average, how many hours a week did you usually work at that job (those jobs)?
- Job 1 _____
- Job 2 _____
28. What was the average hourly amount of your earnings at that job (those jobs)?
- Job 1 _____
- Job 2 _____
29. Did you live on a farm when you were in high school?
- 1 Yes]
- 2 No]
- ↓
- 29a. If yes, did you work on family farm when you were in high school?
- 1 Yes]
- 2 No]
- ↓
- 29b. If yes, how many hours a week did you work?
- (1) For pay _____
- (2) Not for pay _____

SECTION III. COLLEGE EMPLOYMENT

THIS SECTION APPLIES TO YOUR EMPLOYMENT DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR IN COLLEGE. DO NOT INCLUDE SUMMER EMPLOYMENT.

30. During this academic year, are you working on a regular, weekly basis either on campus or off campus? (CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT APPLIES.)

1 Yes

2 No

- 30a. IF NO: What is the main reason you don't work at the present time? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

1 I don't need the money.

2 The type of job I want isn't available.

3 I can't find a job.

4 My parents won't let me work.

5 The idea of working doesn't really interest me.

6 It would take too much time away from school work and studying.

7 It would take up too much of my free time.

8 Other Please describe _____

- 30b. If there was more than one important reason for not working, please list other reasons and number in order of importance (1=most important, 2=next most important). _____

31. Did your employment or lack of employment during high school have any effect on your decision about whether or not to work during college?

1 Yes

2 No

Please explain. _____

32. Have you worked during any academic year before this one?

1 Yes

2 No

IF YOUR ANSWER IS NO AND YOU ARE NOT WORKING DURING THIS ACADEMIC YEAR, SKIP TO QUESTION 54.*

33. If you have worked during any academic year in college before this one, please describe the job you held. If you've held more than one job, describe the ones where you worked the most hours during an academic year. Please list no more than 2 jobs. (No summer employment)

Job 1	Job 2
Year you worked (fresh, soph, jr, sr)	
Job title	
Description of work	
On campus or Off campus	
Average hours worked per week	
Pay per hour	
Did you supervise anyone?	
If yes, how many people did you supervise?	

34. What was your main reason for getting a job? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- 1 I wanted job experience for the future.
- 2 I got a job in order to meet new friends.
- 3 I didn't really have to work, but I wanted to have money for "extras".
- 4 I got a job to meet financial obligations (ex. car payments).
- 5 I thought work would be interesting.
- 6 I got a job in order to pay for things I really need.
- 7 My parents put pressure on me to get a job.
- 8 I had a lot of extra time on my hands and wanted something to do.
- 9 I got a job to help pay my educational expenses.
- 10 Other _____

34a. If there was more than one important reason for working, please list reasons other than the one circled above and number them in order of importance (1=most important, 2=next most important).

IF YOU ARE NOT WORKING DURING THIS ACADEMIC YEAR, SKIP TO QUESTION 43.**

IF YOU ARE WORKING DURING THIS ACADEMIC YEAR, CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 35.

35. Give the name or title of the job where you've been working during this academic year. Be as specific as possible (driver for UPS). If you are working at more than one job, give information on both jobs.

Job 1 _____

Job 2 _____

36. Describe what you actually do on your job (jobs).

Job 1 _____

Job 2 _____

37. Where do you work?

	Job 1	Job 2
On campus	_____	_____
Off campus	_____	_____

38. On the average, how many hours a week do you usually work on your job (jobs)?

Job 1 _____ Job 2 _____

39. What is the average amount of your earnings?

	Job 1	Job 2
a. Per hour	_____	_____
b. Per week	_____	_____

40. Do you supervise anyone?

1 Yes
2 No

If Yes, how many people do you supervise? _____

41. CIRCLE THE NUMBER FOR EACH RESPONSE THAT MOST CLOSELY INDICATES HOW MUCH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH STATEMENT BELOW AS IT APPLIES TO THE JOB WHERE YOU WORK THE MOST HOURS.

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. My job requires that I keep learning new things.	1	2	3	4
b. A lot of people can be affected by how well I do my work.	1	2	3	4
c. I have a lot of say about what happens while I'm at work.	1	2	3	4
d. My job lets me use my skills & abilities.	1	2	3	4
e. The product or service I help provide is up to the standards that the public should get.	1	2	3	4
f. I feel that most of the things I do on my job are meaningless.	1	2	3	4

42. PLEASE CIRCLE THE RESPONSE THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE DONE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING SINCE YOU BEGAN YOUR JOB (JOBS) WHERE YOU'VE WORKED THIS ACADEMIC YEAR.

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
a. Called in "sick" or with a phony excuse when you didn't want to go to work.	1	2	3	4
b. Put more hours on your time card than you actually worked.	1	2	3	4
c. Come to work "high" on drugs or alcohol <u>or</u> used drugs or alcohol at work.	1	2	3	4
d. Purposely short-changed a customer.	1	2	3	4
e. Lied to your employer about your age or something else in order to get or keep your job.	1	2	3	4
f. Taken money from the place you work.	1	2	3	4
g. Given goods or services for free or for less money than you should have to people who visit the place you work.	1	2	3	4
h. Taken things from the place where you work or from other people who work at the same place you do.	1	2	3	4
i. Purposely damaged or destroyed property belonging to your employer (including letting something break down so you wouldn't have to work until it was fixed.	1	2	3	4

IF YOU HAVE WORKED AT ALL DURING AN ACADEMIC YEAR SINCE YOU'VE BEEN IN COLLEGE, PLEASE CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 43.**

43. About how many days during a semester are/were you usually absent from your job/jobs (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)
- 1 Almost never absent
 - 2 A few days
 - 3 Once or twice a month
 - 4 About once a week
 - 5 More than once a week
44. When you have/had a conflict between being at your job and attending class in college, which would you do?
- 1 Attend class
 - 2 Go to work
- 44a. Why did you choose this option? _____
- _____
45. If you were given the choice, which would you rather do? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)
- 1 Spend all time working and not go to school
 - 2 Spend more time working and less time at school
 - 3 Continue to spend about the same amount of time at school and work as you do at present
 - 4 Spend more time at school and less time working
 - 5 Spend all time at school and no time working
46. What has been the greatest benefit to you of working while you are in school? _____
- _____
47. What has been the biggest problem you have had with working while you are going to school? _____
- _____
48. How have you handled this problem? _____
- _____
49. Do you think that the university should make any policy changes (ex., attendance policies) to make it easier for students to work? _____
- _____
- _____

50. Have you ever requested deadline extensions (ex. tests, written assignments) from instructors because of your job?

- 1 Yes
2 No

Please explain _____

51. How do you feel about the way instructors responded to your requests? _____

52. What changes, if any, do you think instructors should make to accommodate students who have jobs?

53. If you were given the same amount of money that you earn/earned from your job, would you still have wanted to work?

- 1 Yes
2 No

SECTION IV. MONEY AS A COLLEGE STUDENT

* 54. Do you have any of the following things at the present time? (CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE)

- | Yes | No | |
|-----|----|--|
| 1 | 2 | a. A <u>checking</u> account of your own |
| 1 | 2 | b. Use of a parent's <u>checking</u> account or a joint checking account with a parent |
| 1 | 2 | c. A <u>savings</u> account of your own |
| 1 | 2 | d. Use of a parent's <u>savings</u> account or a joint savings account with a parent |
| 1 | 2 | e. Use of your own credit card |
| 1 | 2 | f. Use of a parent's credit card or joint credit card with a parent |

55. Do your parents help you financially while you're in college? Please explain. _____

56. How much of your money do you save? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- 1 None of my money
- 2 Some of my money
- 3 About half of my money
- 4 Most of my money
- 5 All of my money

57. Which of the following statements is most true about the way in which you usually SPEND money? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- 1 I buy what I want or need whenever I see it.
- 2 I put aside a certain amount of money for a few things and spend the rest on whatever I want.
- 3 I make a very detailed plan of how I want to spend my money and stick to it.
- 4 I don't have to plan how to spend my money because my parents buy me whatever I need.

SECTION V. FUTURE PLANS

58. What occupation would you most like to have when you finish your education? Be as specific as possible.

59. For a number of reasons, people do not always end up with the kind of occupation they had wished for. What kind of job do you actually think you will hold when you have finished your education. Be as specific as you can.

60. Do you expect eventually to have a better job than your parents?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Please explain. _____

61. When you've finished your education and start to look for a full-time job, how important will these things be to you?

BELOW IS A LIST OF THINGS WHICH PEOPLE CONSIDER IMPORTANT IN THEIR WORK. SOME OF THESE THINGS MAY BE VERY IMPORTANT TO ONE PERSON, BUT NOT TO ANOTHER.

WE WOULD LIKE FOR YOU TO INDICATE HOW IMPORTANT EACH ONE IS TO YOU BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER AFTER EACH.

- 1=VERY IMPORTANT
 2=SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
 3=NOT TOO IMPORTANT
 4=NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT

Work in which I help others	1	2	3	4
Work in which I have authority over others	1	2	3	4
Work in which I try out new ideas and suggestions	1	2	3	4
Work in which I make my own decisions	1	2	3	4
Work in which I form friendships with my fellow employees	1	2	3	4
Work which I know that others consider important	1	2	3	4
Work in which I do many different things	1	2	3	4
Work in which I have a good place to work (good lighting, quiet, clean, enough space)	1	2	3	4
Work in which I am sure of another job in the company if my present job ends	1	2	3	4
Work in which I can earn a lot of money	1	2	3	4
Work that I enjoy	1	2	3	4

SECTION VI. EDUCATION INFORMATION

62. What is your current college grade point average (GPA)?
(CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- 1 About an A average (that is, 3.6 to 4.0)
- 2 About a B+ average (that is, 3.4 to 3.5)
- 3 About a B average (that is, 3.0 to 3.3)
- 4 About a C+ average (that is, 2.6 to 2.9)
- 5 About a C average (that is, 2.0 to 2.5)
- 6 About a D average (that is, 1.0 to 1.9)
- 7 About an F average (that is, less than 1.0)

63. What was your grade point average (GPA) when you graduated from high school? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

- 1 About an A average (that is, 3.6 to 4.0)
- 2 About a B+ average (that is, 3.4 to 3.5)
- 3 About a B average (that is, 3.0 to 3.3)
- 4 About a C+ average (that is, 2.6 to 2.9)
- 5 About a C average (that is, 2.0 to 2.5)
- 6 About a D average (that is, 1.0 to 1.9)
- 7 About an F average (that is, less than 1.0)

64. What was your total SAT score?

- 1 Under 800
- 2 Between 800 and 1000
- 3 Over 1000

65. What is your main reason for attending college?

SECTION VII. STUDENT ATTITUDES & OPINIONS

66. TRY TO GO THROUGH THIS SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE QUICKLY, WITHOUT SPENDING TOO MUCH TIME ON ANY ONE QUESTION. WE ARE INTERESTED IN THE OPINIONS EACH OF YOU MAY HAVE. REMEMBER, THIS IS NOT A TEST. THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS. FEEL FREE TO ANSWER EACH QUESTION EXACTLY THE WAY YOU FEEL.

CIRCLE THE NUMBER FOR EACH RESPONSE THAT MOST CLOSELY INDICATES HOW MUCH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH STATEMENT BELOW.

	Strongly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(1) Workers are entitled to call in sick when they don't feel like working.	1	2	3	4
(2) The best things in life are free	1	2	3	4
(3) I would rather not work in an environment where there are people of different races or skin color.	1	2	3	4
(4) Very often I forget work I am supposed to do.	1	2	3	4
(5) It's not very practical to try to decide what kind of job you want because your future job depends so much on other people.	1	2	3	4
(6) A person is responsible only for the happiness of his family, relatives and close friends.	1	2	3	4
(7) In my opinion, it's alright for workers who are paid a low salary to take little things from their jobs to make up for it.	1	2	3	4

Attitudes & Opinions, continued

	Strongly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(8) When a job turns out to be much harder than I was told it would be, I don't feel I have to do it perfectly.	1	2	3	4
(9) Someone often has to tell me what to do.	1	2	3	4
(10) People who say they don't need to own things to make them happy are only kidding themselves.	1	2	3	4
(11) It is much more satisfying to work for your own good than to work for the good of a group you belong to.	1	2	3	4
(12) I don't know whether I like a new outfit until I find out what my friends think.	1	2	3	4
(13) If I had the chance, I'd go through life without ever working.	1	2	3	4
(14) Even if it's illegal to hire teenagers to do certain jobs, it's okay for an employer to do it to help a kid out.	1	2	3	4
(15) It's more important for a job to pay well than for a job to be very interesting.	1	2	3	4
(16) When things go well for me, it is usually not because of anything I myself have done.	1	2	3	4
(17) It's acceptable to me if a teenage worker cheats a little to make a profit.	1	2	3	4
(18) I would not make want to work closely with a person who had very different social skills from me.	1	2	3	4

Attitudes & Opinions, continued

	Strongly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(19) If I owned a Ford, I'd probably want a Porsche.	1	2	3	4
(20) I wouldn't like to go on a weekend trip with people who have a different ethnic background from me.	1	2	3	4
(21) I seldom get behind in my work.	1	2	3	4
(22) I feel very uneasy if I disagree with what my friends think.	1	2	3	4
(23) It's not really my problem if my coworkers are in trouble and need help.	1	2	3	4
(24) People who break a few laws to make a profit aren't doing anything I wouldn't do in their position.	1	2	3	4
(25) Work provides people with the chance to really make something special out of their lives.	1	2	3	4
(26) There's no such thing as a company that cares about its employees.	1	2	3	4
(27) I often leave my homework unfinished if there are a lot of good TV shows on that evening.	1	2	3	4
(28) My goal in life is to make a lot of money and buy a lot of things.	1	2	3	4
(29) Time you spend helping others get what they want would be better spent trying to get what you want.	1	2	3	4

Attitudes & Opinions, continued

	Strongly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(30) It is best to agree with others, rather than say what you really think, if it will keep the peace.	1	2	3	4
(31) I often don't finish work I start.	1	2	3	4
(32) I feel kind of bad when a friend buys me a present that obviously didn't cost much.	1	2	3	4
(33) People who work harder at their jobs than they have to are a little strange.	1	2	3	4
(34) I would not mind working closely on a job with a person whose skin color is different from mine.	1	2	3	4
(35) The main reason I'm not more successful is that I have bad luck.	1	2	3	4
(36) Most people today are stuck in deadend, go-nowhere jobs.	1	2	3	4
(37) Workers who let equipment on the job break down so they can "take a rest" should be fired by employers.	1	2	3	4
(38) A job provides a worker with a lot more good things than just a paycheck.	1	2	3	4
(39) Adults who have honestly acquired a lot of wealth really have my respect and admiration	1	2	3	4

Attitudes & Opinions, continued

	Strongly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(40) Employers should "look the other way" if the people who work for them take little things now and then.	1	2	3	4
(41) I find it hard to stick to anything that takes a long time to do.	1	2	3	4
(42) Hard work really doesn't get you much of anything in this world.	1	2	3	4
(43) Money burns a hole in my pocket; if I have it, I spend it.	1	2	3	4
(44) If I saw a worker on the job take something that didn't belong to him, I'd hope he'd get in trouble for it.	1	2	3	4
(45) You can't be expected to make a success of yourself if you had a bad childhood.	1	2	3	4
(46) I hate to admit it but I give up on my work when things go wrong.	1	2	3	4
(47) Work is lots more than a necessity of life that people have to learn to put up with.	1	2	3	4
(48) If a worker <u>agrees</u> to work on a job that is harmful to his health and against the law, his employer shouldn't be held responsible for what happens.	1	2	3	4
(49) Work gives a person a feeling of self-respect.	1	2	3	4

Attitudes & Opinions, continued

	Strongly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(50) It seems that the more money I have, the more things I want to buy.	1	2	3	4
(51) Why work for something that others will enjoy if you won't be alive to enjoy it too?	1	2	3	4
(52) I tend to go from one thing to another before finishing any one of them.	1	2	3	4
(53) Luck decides most things that happen to me.	1	2	3	4
(54) I believe in working only as hard as I have to	1	2	3	4
(55) Running a business is enough of a hassle for an employer without worrying about obeying child labor laws.	1	2	3	4
(56) People who take their work home with them probably don't have a very interesting home life.	1	2	3	4
(57) It's better to have a rich friend than a poor friend.	1	2	3	4
(58) In a group I prefer to let other people make the decisions.	1	2	3	4
(59) I would rather use my time at work for my own advancement than for the advancement of the work group.	1	2	3	4
(60) It doesn't matter if a businessman bends the law to make a profit.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX B
INITIAL WORK RELATED ATTITUDE SCALES:
ITEMS AND FACTOR ANALYSES

Table B-1

Individual Items That Comprised Initial Work Related
Attitude Scales

Social commitment

- (Att59) I would rather use my free time to enjoy myself than to help raise money for a neighborhood project.
- (Att11) It is much more satisfying to work for your own good than to work for the good of a group you belong to.
- (Att23) It's not really my problem if my neighbors are in trouble and need help.
- (Att51) Why work for something that others will enjoy if you won't be alive to enjoy it too?
- (Att29) Time you spend helping others get what they want would be better spent trying to get what you want.
- (Att6) A person is responsible only for the happiness of his family, relatives and close friends.

Cynicism about work

- (Att36) Most people today are stuck in deadend, go-nowhere jobs.
- (Att26) There's no such thing as a company that cares about its employees.
- (Att56) People who take their work home with them probably don't have a very interesting home life.
- (Att42) Hard work really doesn't get you much of anything in this world.
- (Att49) Work gives a person a feeling of self-respect.
- (Att38) A job provides a worker with a lot more good things than just a paycheck.

Table B-1, continued

- (Att47) Work is lots more than a necessity of life that people have to learn to put up with.
- (Att13) If I had the chance, I'd go through life without ever working.
- (Att25) Work provides people with the chance to really make something special out of their lives.
- (Att33) People who work harder at their jobs than they have to are a little strange.

Self-reliance

- (Att12) I don't know whether I like a new outfit until I find out what my friends think.
- (Att22) I feel very uneasy if I disagree with what my friends think.
- (Att30) It is best to agree with others, rather than say what you really think, if it will keep the peace.
- (Att58) In a group I prefer to let other people make the decisions.
- (Att9) Someone often has to tell me what to do.
- (Att5) It's not very practical to try to decide what kind of job you want because your future job depends so much on other people.
- (Att45) You can't be expected to make a success of yourself if you had a bad childhood.
- (Att16) When things go well for me, it is usually not because of anything I myself have done.

Work orientation

- (Att46) I hate to admit it but I give up on work when things go wrong.
- (Att27) I often leave my homework unfinished if there are a lot of good TV shows on that evening.

Table B-1, continued

- (Att52) I tend to go from one thing to another before finishing any one of them.
- (Att41) I find it hard to stick to anything that takes a long time to do.
- (Att4) Very often I forget work I am supposed to do.
- (Att21) I seldom get behind in my work.
- (Att8) When a job turns out to be much harder than I was told it would be, I don't feel I have to do it perfectly.
- (Att9) Someone often has to tell me what to do.
- (Att31) I often don't finish work I start.
- (Att54) I believe in working only as hard as I have to.

Materialism

- (Att32) I feel kind of bad when a friend buys me a present that obviously didn't cost much.
- (Att10) People who say they don't need to own things to make them happy are only kidding themselves.
- (Att57) It's better to have a rich friend than a poor friend.
- (Att15) It's more important for a job to pay well than for job to be interesting.
- (Att43) Money burns a hole in my pocket; if I have it, I spend it.
- (Att50) It seems that the more money I have, the more things I want to buy.
- (Att39) Adults who have honestly acquired a lot of wealth really have my respect and admiration.
- (Att2) The best things in life are free.
- (Att19) If I owned a Ford, I'd probably want a Porsche.

Table B-1, continued

(Att28) My goal in life is to make a lot of money and buy a lot of things.

Acceptance of unethical business practices

(Att24) People who break a few laws to make a profit aren't doing anything I wouldn't do in their position.

(Att60) It doesn't matter if a businessman bends the law to make a profit.

(Att17) It's acceptable to me if a teenage worker cheats a little to make a profit.

(Att1) Workers are entitled to call in sick when they don't feel like working.

(Att7) In my opinion, it's alright for workers who are paid a low salary to take little things from their jobs to make up for it.

(Att14) Even if it's illegal to hire teenagers to do certain jobs, it's okay for an employer to do it to help a kid out.

(Att40) Employers should "look the other way" if the people who work for them take little things now and then.

(Att37) Workers who let equipment on the job break down so they can "take a rest" should be fired by employers.

(Att44) If I saw a worker on the job take something that didn't belong to him, I'd hope he'd get in trouble for it.

(Att48) If a worker agrees to work on a job that is harmful to his health and against the law, his employer shouldn't be held responsible for what happens.

(Att55) Running a business is enough of a hassle for an employer without worrying about obeying child labor laws.

Table B-2

Factor Analysis of Acceptance of Unethical Business
Practices Scale

Items	Fact. 1	Fact.2	Fact.3	Fact.4	Communal.
Att24	.81				.66
Att60	.76				.60
Att17	.56		.38		.48
Att1		.78			.65
Att7		.64		.39	.59
Att14		.45			.29
Att40	.38	.40		.38	.54
Att37			.75		.58
Att44			.72		.52
Att48				.80	.67
Att55	.38			.50	.40
Eigen.	2.54	1.25	1.10	1.08	
Pct. of var. ret.	23.0	11.4	10.0	9.8	

Table B-3

Factor Analysis of Initial Social Commitment Scale

Items	Factor loading	Communality
Att59	.70	.49
Att11	.64	.41
Att23	.63	.39
Att51	.56	.32
Att29	.48	.23
Att6	.43	.19
Eigenvalue	2.03	
Percent of variability retained by factor	33.8	

Table B-4

Factor Analysis of Initial Work Orientation Scale

Items	Factor 1 loadings	Factor 2 loadings	Communality
Att46	.69		.48
Att27	.67		.45
Att52	.57		.47
Att41	.56		.46
Att4	.56		.38
Att21	.55		.31
Att8		.80	.64
Att9		.68	.49
Att31	.50	.50	.51
Att54	.42	.44	.37
Eigenvalue	3.53	1.03	
Pct. of var. retained	35.3	10.3	

Table B-5

Factor Analysis of Initial Self-Reliance Scale

Items	Factor 1 loadings	Factor 2 loadings	Communality
Att12	.72	.16	.54
Att22	.63	.31	.49
Att30	.57	.27	.40
Att58	.33	.61	.48
Att9	.15	.69	.49
Att5	.05	.49	.25
Att45	.68	-.09	.47
Att16	.07	.67	.45
Eigenvalues	2.56	1.01	
Pct. of var. retained	32.1	12.6	

Table B-6

Factor Analysis of Initial Materialism Scale

Items	Factor 1 loadings	Factor 2 loadings	Factor 3 loadings	Communality
Att32	.68			.51
Att10	.64			.44
Att57	.64			.43
Att15	.59			.46
Att43		.86		.74
Att50		.83		.72
Att39			.66	.44
Att2			.61	.39
Att28	.38	.36	.53	.55
Att19		.36	.46	.40
Eigenvalues	2.61	1.37	1.12	
Pct. of var. ret.	26.1	13.7	11.2	

Table B-7

Factor Analysis of Initial Cynicism Scale

Items	Factor 1 loading	Factor 2 loading	Factor 3 loading	Communality
Att36	.73			.54
Att26	.67			.50
Att56	.63			.40
Att42	.51		.42	.45
Att49		.68		.50
Att38		.64		.50
Att47		.62		.40
Att13			.81	.67
Att25		.50	.52	.53
Att33	.35		.49	.44
Eigen.	2.41	1.45	1.06	
Pct. var ret.	24.2	14.5	10.6	