INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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 copyrighted 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 oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17″ × 23″ black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6″ × 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.

Accessing the World's Information since 1938

300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

Order Number 8816355

Cohort work values of employed men and women

Norman, Kathryn Heath, Ph.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1987

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

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __✓__
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____
16. Other _____

_____

_____

U·M·I

COHORT WORK VALUES OF EMPLOYED MEN AND WOMEN

by

Kathryn Heath Norman

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
1987

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 Sarah Hoffner

Hyun Kodim

William S. Tullar

November 3, 1987
Date of Acceptance by Committee

October 7, 1987
Date of Final Oral Examination

NORMAN, KATHRYN HEATH, Ph.D. Cohort Work Values of Employed Men and Women. (1987). Directed by Dr. Rebecca M. Smith. 83 pp.

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences in work values of employees. The major purpose was to determine (a) age group differences in work values and (b) the predictors of work values as measured by Super's Work Values Inventory (WVI) (1970). Predictor variables, other than age, were sex, education, race, marital status, job type, and number of children.

Of the 400 employees randomly selected from a southeastern regional bank, 265 employees returned the questionnaire. Overall, Achievement, Supervisory Relations, Way of Life, Economic Returns, and Security were the most important work values. A t-test ($p < .05$) showed significant between-group differences in total WVI scores with the young group (born 1960 to present) having higher scores than the older group (born on or before 1943). An analysis of variance also showed significant differences between the young and older groups on five of the 15 subscales of the WVI. Prestige, Economic Returns, Associates, Variety, and Way of Life were more important to the younger group than to the older group. The Baby Boomer (born 1944 - 1959) group also valued Variety more than the older group.

The hypothesis that there were no significant differences on work values between the sexes was not supported. Women valued 13 of the values higher than men did. Men

valued Independence and Management more than women did.

A multiple regression analysis showed sex to explain the most variance (5%) in total work value scores. Job type, sex, education, and age explained more of the variability than marital status, number of children or race in the subscales of the WVI. Taken together these variables explained up to 15% of the variance in the subscale scores.

Differences in work values by age group were related to the era in which an individual was born and socialized. Younger workers had higher work values and had high expectations of the work place. Therefore, cohort work value differences are evident from this study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The guidance and support of numerous people have allowed me to complete this study. I am especially grateful to my major adviser, Dr. Rebecca M. Smith, Professor of Child Development and Family Relations, for her commitment to me through many years by sharing her expertise, time, and support. The encouragement and direction of the committee members, Dr. Hyman Rodman, Excellence Foundation Professor of Child Development and Family Relations; Dr. Sarah Shoffner, Assistant Professor of Child Development and Family Relations; and Dr. William Tullar, Associate Professor of Management, were particularly helpful and are acknowledged with gratitude. Also, my appreciation is expressed to Dr. Fernando Bertolli and Ms. Ann Lance from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte for their help with the statistical analysis.

In addition, I am grateful to First Union National Bank for allowing me to survey their employees and to those who participated in the study.

The confidence of my family and their patience and willingness to assume extra responsibilities have been an invaluable resource throughout my doctoral program.

My final appreciation is to Chris Brown who not only used her excellent typing skills but also encouraged me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Managers in all types of organizations are continually challenged with the fact that there are differences in the values, interests, and motivation of different groups of employees. For example, some employees value autonomy and desire to work independently. On the other hand some employees desire close supervision and coaching. The reasons for the differences are varied and complex.

Today's popular press often attribute some of those differences to age. The press has consistently asserted the belief that today's young worker has a different set of work values from older generations. "Yuppie," or young upwardly mobile urban professional, has been used to describe these young workers. They have been labeled as not very loyal, job jumpers, and lacking the work ethic.

An American Council on Education study, conducted at UCLA, showed that college students want cash not just an education. Nearly three-fourths of the freshmen in 1985 answered that "being well off financially" was important. This is up from 43.8% in 1966 (Hellmich, 1986). A national survey by Yankelovich (1981) also showed that more people are seeking self-fulfillment goals instead

of the more traditional values such as the ethic of self-denial and sacrifice.

Writers and researchers have examined the differences in work values, and they have also compared the American worker's values to other countries. Ouchi (1981) and Pascale and Athos (1981) compared the values of the American worker to the Japanese worker. They asserted that Western management needs to inculcate some of the Japanese workers' values into Western workers' thinking in order that the productivity of the Western nations would increase instead of decline. Values such as participative management, team development, quality supervision, and worker creativity in quality circles were stressed as values that American companies needed to reinforce.

Examining the Japanese management systems have led researchers to focus on the culture of organizations. Schein (1985) and Deal and Kennedy (1982) define the corporate culture as the shared basic assumptions and beliefs of the members of an organization or the dominant values expressed by an organization. Management needs to be intentional about the culture and values it postulates and move the culture and values in the direction desired. Hickman and Silva (1984) said today's top management needs to be "culture builders" shaping the values of the organization.

Not only has there been a great deal written in the

last few years on corporate values and organizational effectiveness but also on the changing work organization. Much time and money has already been spent trying to design innovative organizational structures and personnel programs that match this changing workplace and the changing worker. Flexible benefit packages, permanent part-time work, job redesign, job rotation and job sharing are all new programs that have been instigated to deal with the new workers' values (Kanter, 1977, 1978, 1980).

Schein's (1978, 1982) examination of these different work values, in his longitudinal research on MBA school graduates of the 1960's, showed that not all graduates wanted to climb the corporate ladder. Schien (1982) stated that "social values regarding the role of work will make it more complicated to manage people...some want security, others are seeking non-organizational careers,...and a few are becoming entrepreneurs" (p.5). Multiple career ladders and multiple reward systems are needed to deal with people who vary from the norm (Schein, 1978).

It is necessary to understand the different values and motivators of the organization and the employee, and how those values are changing over time (Schein, 1978 & 1982). By doing so organizational systems can be designed which allow for American business to be more productive and competitive. Vincent S. Flowers and Charles L. Hughes

(1982), founders of the Center for Value Research, Inc., made a simple suggestion on how to understand workers. They reported that after a 20-year study the answer to the question of what motivates employees or what is important to workers will come from the recommendation to "go ask your people." The problem is that most organizations or managers do not ask their employees what is important. Management tends to make assumptions about differences in groups, assuming that other employees have the same desires, values, and goals as they do. In order to increase organizational effectiveness, work values of employees need to be examined.

Purpose

The purpose of this research project was to determine if there are differences in work values among different groups, in particular age group differences. Does the youngest cohort have different values from the oldest cohort? Or do all people employed today want self fulfillment as shown by the Hellmich (1986) and the Yankelovich (1981) studies?

This research project was an attempt to discover what motivates people by understanding the differences in work group values. Knowing what the values are that motivate workers of different age groups will help organizations as they strive to hire, train, and retain competent workers.

Turnover plagues businesses costing millions of extra dollars for hiring, training, and developing new workers. If the era in which a person is socialized influences work values, then an organization could consider structuring flexible systems which match these different types of workers.

Assumptions and Limitations

The sample represents the population in only one organization, a financial institution which employes many women. However, the organization is diverse since it is a regional bank. The four-state regional bank is the result of six different banks having been merged. When the sample was drawn in May of 1987, the mergers were very new. The length of time since the mergers had been completed varied from six months to 18 months.

An assumption which is debatable is the question of whether values predict behavior. If the individuals sampled stated that these are their work values, it may or may not determine how they behave in the workplace.

Definition of Terms

Individual decision making determines one's values. People process information and sort priorities according to what is important to them. Values also motivate people by determining how desirable different choices may be. A value is an enduring belief that a certain type of be-

havior in a certain condition of life is desirable (Rokeach, 1973). Values are standards or principles regarded as desirable or worthwhile.

Work values were defined as being work-goals. They are attributes or qualities considered to be intrinsically desirable and which people seek in the activities in which they engage (Super, 1970). Values are related to interests but are different, because they are qualities that are sought rather than activities or objects (Breme and Cockriel, 1975; Super, 1970). Therefore, this research addressed the question of what predicts work values of men and women. The major research question was whether cohort, gender and job type are related to work values.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature on work values was examined on a continuum from the global organizational level to a group level to the individual worker level. Related research on work values and motivation was examined. Past research was reviewed and gaps were found in the literature. This review is set in a theoretical framework for cohort differences. In the final section, the research questions and hypotheses are presented.

Work Values Research

According to Tannenbaum and Davis (1983) who have based their views on observations in large organizations, American organizations are changing because workers' values are changing. In fact, what workers believe to be desirable or worthwhile is changing. What organizations themselves value is also changing. Organizations are questioning the traditional bureaucratic model, because they believe that the values of a bureaucracy are out of step with the values of today's workers. It is Tannenbaum's and Davis' (1983) view that organizations are adopting more humanistic values such as viewing man as basically good, emphasizing collaboration, trusting employees, seeing an employee as

a whole person, and accepting and utilizing individual differences. The new values and models of organizations are organic and systems-oriented stressing "man's individuality and his centrality," in part because of a growing dissatisfaction with the personally constraining impact of bureaucracies.

Brody (1985) also believes values are in transition. He summarized his observations of young workers (ages 18-35) by characterizing them as (a) wanting new skills; (b) wanting to know what is occurring in the organization; (c) wanting training to move up and out; and (d) having a commitment to their career and not to the organization. Brody (1985) does not believe that the "Yuppie image" of "I'm entitled" is accurate. Instead young urban professionals' needs and values match those of corporations, which are flexible, mobile, highly skilled, and not willing to sign up with a union. He based his hypotheses on interviews with workers and not on statistical research.

Grant (1982) painted a much more pessimistic summary of today's worker. Problems with organizations and with workers are causing motivation and productivity to decrease. Grant (1982) stated that "individuals frequently redirect their interests and life pursuits....On-the-job goals are being changed at a rapid pace" (p.905). Grant also postulated that workers: (a) are less loyal, (b) have a shorter

time perspective, (c) have a disappearing work ethic, (d) have less individual responsibility because of group problem solving, and (e) have a greater diversity of values. His conclusions are based on unsystematic observations as a consultant.

Yankelovich's (1981) conclusions that work values are for self-fulfillment are based on more than observations. From repeated national random surveys, he concluded that self-fulfillment is the goal of 80% of the population today. These self-fulfillment seekers "are determined to prove that life can be more than a grim economic chore. They are eager to give more meaning to their lives" (p.39). He studied workers and students over time and found a declining value of work. Between the mid 1960's and the early 1970's the number of college students who felt that "hard work always pays off" dropped from 71% to 40%. The number of Americans who believed that "hard work always pays off" dropped from 58% to 43%. What has changed is not the willingness to work but what both young and old workers seek from work. They desire a new set of psychological satisfactions from their jobs (Yankelovich, 1981).

Yankelovich & Immerwahr's (1983) hypothesis is that "incentive and managerial systems are out of synchronization with changing values and attitudes" in the workplace (p.41). In order to stimulate the work ethic, organizations need

to have systems which match workers' values. The American workplace has weakened the link between employees' level of pay and their performance (Yankelovich & Immewahr, 1983). Organizations must link workers' values and organizational systems.

Loyalty as a work value has also been researched. Touretsky's (1979) observations of workers today led him to state that workers are loyal to their profession and not to the organization. He believes that individuals derive security from their ability, education, and training and not from the organization.

Resistance to transfers is increasing because professionals and managers are interested in more personally rewarding pursuits and will not easily move to another city. Again, the preference seems to be to change jobs and preserve one's way of life rather than to follow the organization (Touretzky, 1979). Leinberger (1986) has also written about how the organizational man's willingness to sacrifice has changed. Leinberger, like Touretzky, based his hypothesis on observations and interviews. Leinberger reinterviewed individuals who participated in Whyte's (1949) original research on The Organization Man. Whyte had said the organization man was an individual who left home physically as well as spiritually to take the vows of a company. Leinberger's (1986) interviews led

him to conclude that today's organizational men and women "value caution less than risk, security less than automony" (p.98). For today's workers the loyalty contract that previous generations made with the company does not hold. Leinberger (1986) speculated that workers in 1949 were children of the Depression and therefore were willing to give more to the organization for the guarantee of a job.

The American Council of Life Insurance conducted a national telephone survey of 1,000 people born between 1946 and 1964 (Price, 1982). Information from the survey and data from the Census Bureau's March 1982 Current Population Survey led to several conclusions that do not eliminate traditional values. "Baby boomers" are different from other generations in that they are more optimistic about their financial future. The baby boomer group was characterized by a longing for more traditional values such as hard work, strong family and religious ties, and respect for authority. The difference is that these traditional values were also coupled with an increasing acceptance of non-traditional ideas in other areas such as a tolerance of changing sexual morals and a desire for less materialism (Price, 1983). She said, "More than nine in ten believe that they have a 'very good' or 'fairly good' chance of achieving the good life" (p.31). Price further stated that "two-thirds think that they're better off financially

than their parents were at the same age" (p.32).

Rothenbach and Rash's (1984) research on differences in work force expectations points out as does Price (1982) that different ages desire different outcomes from their work. A stratified random sample of 926 employees from one national manufacturing company was conducted by asking employees to rank order what they wanted most from the work place. Job security was ranked high except for the highly educated group. The highly educated ranked "good salary" and "challenging and interesting work" as most important. No significant rank order differences were found between males and females. The youngest group, 20 years old or younger, had significantly different rankings from the older group. They ranked learning new skills, good work conditions, working with a supervisor you like and people you like as their top priorities. Rothenbach and Rash (1984) concluded that there are significant differences in what employee groups want from their jobs.

Rothenbach and Rash's (1984) research gives some help about how work values differ. However, the instrument they used lacks strong reliability and validity, therefore it is difficult to put a great deal of weight of their findings. A rank ordering of job elements was used. The characteristics measured had not been sampled before and were not tied to any prior research. The results also

have little external validity because the sample was limited to one organization.

Staats' (1981) research on work values used Super's (1970) Work Values Inventory to survey a small sample of undergraduates in both 1970 and 1980. Although the sample is small and not random as is that of Rothenbach and Rash (1984), the results show some significant shifts in values. Scores on 12 of the 15 scales showed an increase in importance from 1970 to 1980. This means that more items were important with regard to future job satisfaction in 1980 as compared to 1970. Security and economic return scales show notable increases.

Drummond, McIntire, and Skaggs (1977) explored young males' work values and job satisfaction also using Super's (1970) Work Values Inventory. The 136 males, with a mean age of 22, completed an instrument measuring job-hunting strategies, job satisfaction, aspirations, and the Work Values Inventory (Super, 1970). The results showed that the young male workers with high job satisfaction were more interested in values that represent intrinsic values such as supervisory relations, achievement, way of life and security. The medium job satisfaction group ranked the top four scales as way of life, security, economic returns, and supervisory relations. The low job satisfaction group ranked economic return as their top value.

Drummond et al. (1977) had a small sample of all males, but at least they were currently working and not students as was true in many samples. The study showed this group of young workers in semiskilled or technical jobs, no matter what their level of job satisfaction, ranked the highest job values as supervisory relations, achievement, way of life, security, and economic returns.

Security has also become a more important job value to managers in the 1980's. An Opinion Research Corporation employee attitude survey used 42,000 employees for 1980 to 1982 and 66,000 employees for 1983 to 1986 and found that job security had declined (Morgan and Schiemann, 1986). The questionnaire asked the question: How would you rate your company on providing job security? From the first sample in 1980-1982 compared to the second sample from 1983 to 1986, the percentage of managers who answered very good to good at providing job security dropped from 77% to 68%. Non-managerial employees ratings stayed at 64% over the two samples for job security. The results showed that management does not feel as protected as they once did. This loss of security was probably due to downsizing efforts at management levels in many organizations. This differs from Touretsky's (1979) finding that individuals gain security from education. The 1980's may have changed how security is valued in the workplace.

Kohn (1969) also sheds light on the scope of work values. Kohn's theory is that social class has a decided connection with values. Social class is defined with two major dimensions which are occupational position and education. Income and subjective class identification was also factored in. Men of middle class position attached more importance to how interesting the work is, the amount of freedom an individual has, the chance to help people, and the chance to use their abilities. Men in the lower class position attached more importance to pay, fringe benefits, the supervisor, co-workers, the hours of work, how tiring the work, job security, and the amount of job pressure. Middle-class men valued more intinsic values as opposed to the lower class men who valued extrinsic values.

Kohn's (1969) national study of 3,100 fathers and non-fathers, and two other large studies conducted in Washington, DC and in Turin, Italy found that men of a higher social class valued self-direction more than the conformity that men of the lower class valued. Kohn's (1969) research included large samples, but unfortunately they included only men and even though most of the research questions were concerned with family relationships, especially parent-child relationships, the data are also almost 20 years old.

Another very recent study conducted on female managers

in the work place examined the differences between male and female managers (Morrison, White and Velson, 1987). Test scores from thousands of male and female managers from corporations with more than 5,000 employees who had participated in management development programs from 1978 to 1986 at the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina were compared. The results supported the hypothesis that executive women are more alike than different from executive men in terms of goals, motives, and personalities. Unfortunately, Morrison et al. (1987) did not cite extensive statistical data nor the procedures with which specific instruments were compared. They just gave conclusions from the comparisons of test scores. Morrison et al. (1987) did support some conclusions that there were few differences between male and female managers by using qualitative research results of interviews with female managers.

Gaps in the Literature

Despite Rothenbach and Rash's (1984) and Staats' (1981) recent look at job expectations, there is a gap in the work values literature. No one has recently used a sound instrument to compare work values between age groups. There has been a great deal of speculation based on observations and interviews, but no research has used a broad age sample and a sound measurement tool. Rothenbach and

Rash's (1984) research was not even purported to be a work values study. They examined job elements which did not include altruism, creativity, intellectual stimulation, prestige, and desire to be a manager.

Stanton (1983), Yankelovich (1981), and Harrick and Sultan (1982) all believe that the work force is changing, and that in order to keep productivity and motivation from declining even further, research is needed on what is important to employees today. Stanton (1983) reviewed why he believes productivity appears to have declined even when wages have increased. Stanton (1983) concluded that it is necessary to investigate whether the changes in workers' values and motivations are due to problems with management or changes among workers.

Motivation Theory and Values

Needs, values, and interests are three different variables are often used interchangeably. The term "values" has already been defined as attributes or qualities considered to be desirable and which people seek in their activities. Breme and Cockriel (1975) distinguish between values and interests and postulated that values and interests emerge from an individual's needs. The examination of need theories that have been applied to the work place may help explain work values. Two major need theories were developed by Maslow (1959) and Herzberg (1959).

Maslow (1959) believed that people's needs are arranged in an order of importance from the most simple and basic to the most complex. A person's needs will move to the next level in the hierarchy when the lower order need is minimally satisfied. Maslow's (1954) theory has five levels. Szilagy and Wallace (1980, p.80) added to Maslow's list and showed general factors, need levels, and organizational specific factors. Exhibit 1 shows organizational factors that are assumed to be on each of the five basic need levels. It is only in the highest two levels that personal achievement on the job can become a need. Therefore, organizations may be having problems because they do not look beyond the two lowest levels of basic needs.

Exhibit 1.

Maslow's Need Hierarchy

General Factors	Need Levels	Organizational Specific Factors
1. Growth		1. Challenging job
2. Achievement	5. Self-actualization	2. Creativity
3. Advancement		3. Advancement in organization
		4. Achievement in work
1. Recognition		1. Job title
2. Status		2. Merit pay increase
3. Self-esteem	4. Ego, Status and Esteem	3. Peer/supervisory recognition
4. Self-respect		5. Responsibility
1. Companionship		1. Quality of supervision
2. Affection	3. Social	2. Compatible work group
3. Friendship		3. Professional friendships
1. Safety		1. Safe working condition
2. Security		2. Frienge benefits
3. Competence	2. Safety and Security	3. General salary increases
4. Stability		4. Job security
1. Air		1. Heat and air conditioning
2. Food		2. Base salary
3. Shelter	1. Physiological	3. Cafeteria
4. Sex		4. Working Conditions

The organizational specific factors list are very similar to many aspects in the work values survey (Szilagy and Wallace, 1980). The most complex or top factors shows creativity, and achievement which are both part of Super's (1970) work value subscales.

Herzberg's (1959) two-factor need theory also relates to work values. Herzberg (1959) wrote that there are extrinsic job conditions that, when not present in the work place, cause dissatisfaction. These are called "hygiene factors" and include job security, salary, working conditions, status, supervision, and quality relations with peers. Intrinisic job conditions help build motivation. The "motivator factor" includes achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement, and personal growth. They are called satisfiers.

The methodology of Herzberg (1959) and Maslow (1954) has been critized and the simplicity of their models have been critiqued by Szilagyi and Wallace (1980) who stated that an individual's needs are dynamic, not static, and that more than one level of need may be operating at the same time. Even so, Herzberg's and Maslow's theories are important, because they help explain why employees feel more strongly about certain aspects of their jobs more than others. The present work values research was a further attempt to explain what is most important to employees

and why.

Theoretical Framework for Cohort Differences

Stage theorists of adult development such as Erickson (1968) and Levinson (1978) have proposed that adults progress through stages and transitional periods as they age. Their values, needs and interests change according to which stage they are in. Neugarten and Datan (1973), Easterlin (1968), and Elder (1974) found that changing times and social expectations influence groups of people born in the same time period or "cohort." Values and expectations are shaped by the period in which people are born and socialized. These values then follow an individual throughout life.

The work values literature does not specifically address cohort differences as does Easterlin (1968), Elder (1974) and Neugarten and Datan (1973) in their examination of trends in families. Easterlin's (1968) cohort explanations refer to the consequences in later years of shared early experiences. Easterlin (1968) believes that because the post-war babies were born into relative affluence, they expect a high standard of living, and they value work that allows them to prosper. Elder (1974) concluded that the deprived children of the Great Depression considered strong families as a valuable resource, since they lacked a strong family structure during the Depression. Therefore,

they had higher birth rates and lower divorce rates in the 1950's and valued work in order to give them security.

Hypotheses

If cohort differences explain changes in age of marriage, divorce, and childbearing, then it can be hypothetized that cohort differences may also explain differences in work values as Rothenback and Rash (1984) found. The present research attempted to show that there are age differences in work values and that the differences can be explained by using cohort analysis.

1. It was hypothesized that the work values in Super's (1970) Work Values Inventory would vary by age group. According to Yankelovich (1981), Grant (1982), and Drummond et al. (1977) younger workers will value their way of life. Young workers will choose work which permits them to choose the kind of life they want. Touretzky (1979) also found that younger workers valued their leisure activities and were less receptive to transfers, because they liked the lifestyle they had in their community.

Furthermore, it was hypothesized that the younger worker would value economic returns more than the older worker would. Staats (1981) and Hellmich (1986) both found that economic return was more important for the younger worker. In addition it was expected that the younger worker would also value independence more (Leinberger, 1986).

Altruism, however, was expected to be valued more by the older worker. The worker socialized in the 1960s and 1970s or the Vietnam era were expected to put more emphasis on contributing to the welfare of others.

2. Rothenbach and Rash (1984) found no sex or race differences in their survey of desired job elements. Morrison et al. (1987) found few significant sex differences. McCarrey, Gasse, and Moore (1984) also found no differences in work values between the sexes or races in their Canadian sample using Super's (1970) Work Value Inventory. Staats (1981), however, did find that women had higher value scores on the altruism scale. Therefore, it was hypothesized that the results of this study would indicate no sex or race differences.

3. It was also hypothesized that there would be differences in work values by job level. Security would not be as important in the supervisory, professional and management job levels. According to Touretzky (1979) individuals gain security for their innate ability, education, and training, not from the organization. Accordingly, the subscale of supervisory relations would be more important for lower job levels in which there is less discretionary decision making, such as technical, sales, service, or clerical workers (Kohn, 1969). Rothenbach and Rash (1984) found that the job element of working for a super-

visor one respects is more important for sales and service workers than for other workers.

4. The creativity variable of the Work Values Inventory was hypothesized to change according to education. Rothenbach and Rash (1984) and Kohn (1969) found that the less education workers had, the less they valued challenging and interesting work. The creativity sub-scale is the closest to challenging and interesting work.

5. It was difficult to hypothesize about how other variables such as pay grade, marital status, or number of children would influence work values, because there had been no research in those areas. Speculation was that the individuals with more children to support and those who were married would value security more.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Cross sectional survey research was used to address the major research questions about factors influencing work values as measured by Super's (1970) Work Values Inventory (WVI). In addition to the factors hypothesized to influence work values, the independent variable list included age, sex, education, race, marital status, number of children, job type, salary and length of time in the present job.

Research Instrument

The first part of the research instrument was Super's Work Values Inventory (WVI) (1970) (See Appendix A). The scores on the WVI were used for the dependent variable. This inventory tests for relative emphasis the subject puts on each of the 15 values. There are 45 value statements (three for each value) which respondents rated on a 5-point scale: very important (5) to unimportant (1). The scores on the sub-scales range from 3 to 15. These are the values as defined by Super (1970):

Altruism (AL): work which enables one to contribute to the welfare of others.

Esthetic (ES): work which permits one to make beautiful things.

Creativity (CR): work which permits one to invent new things, design new products, or develop

new ideas.

Intellectual Stimulation (IS):	work which provides opportunity for independent thinking and for learning how things work.
Achievement (AC):	work which gives one a feeling of accomplishment in doing a job well.
Independence (IN):	work which permits one to work his own way, as slowly as he/she wishes.
Management (MA):	work which permits one to plan and lay out work for others to do.
Prestige (PR):	work which gives one standing in eyes of others and respect.
Economic Returns (ER):	work which pays well and enables one to have the things he wants.
Surroundings (SU):	work which is carried out under pleasant conditions.
Security (SE):	work which provides one with the certainty of having a job even in hard times.
Supervisory Relations (SR):	work which is carried out under a supervisor who is fair and with whom one can get along.
Associates (AS):	work which brings one into contact with fellow workers whom he likes.
Way of Life (WL):	work which permits one to have the kind of life he chooses and to be the type of person he wishes to be.
Variety (VA):	work that provides an opportunity to do different types of jobs.

Super's (1970) normative information came from a sample of 10,083 students in grades 7 to 12. Normative data from smaller samples of adults including different occupations was also presented (Super, 1970). Conventional estimates

of internal reliability were not cited, but there was some evidence of high inter-item correlation within the subscales. Test-retest reliability over two weeks ranged from .75 to .88 with a median of .83 (Super, 1970 and Warr, Cook, Hepworth, & Wall, 1981). The sub-scales were documented as generally postively intercorrelated. Factor analytic evidence for the 15 values was not cited for the 45-item questionnaire, only on an earlier 30-item questionnaire.

Warr et al. (1981), in a review of Super's (1970) inventory, stated that "relatively simple items and good face validity suggested that this instrument would be useful for studies concerned with work experience" (p.152). Super (1970) tested construct validity by comparing the WVI to the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, and the Kuder Preference Record which showed positive correlations on 10 of the WVI subscales to constructs in the three vocational tests. Achievement, Independence, Associates, Way of Life and Variety showed no useful correlations with other value or interest scales (Super, 1970). Content validity was researched by testing to detect if individuals sampled on this self-report instrument were influenced by social desirability (Super, 1970). Altruism and Independence were influenced by social desirability. Responses were inflated for Altruism but deflated for Independence. To establish concurrent validity, WVI

was compared to personality measures and by occupational groups. Super (1970) found no relationship of work values with personality traits. Occupational differences were found which supported Super's (1970) view that people choose professions based on their values and that the instrument which was designed to discriminate these values does what it was intended to do. For example, Altruism was found to be high among Peace Corp volunteers, Independence and Management by business groups and Intellectual Stimulation among psychologists, lawyers, accountants and engineers.

According to Warr et al. (1981) the WVI instrument does have three weaknesses. First, the literature does not include norms from full time employees. There was also little information on internal reliabilities and, last, there was not strong statistical support for the 15 separate work values.

The second part of the research instrument was for collecting demographic data (See Appendix B). There were 10 questions, one question for each of the independent variables. Age was reported by date of birth, sex as male or female, and education as the total number of years of formal schooling that had been completed. Race was reported as Black, White or Other (Specify). Job type was whether the respondents reported themselves to be in a supervisory, managerial, professional, technical, sales or services,

or a clerical group. Pay grade was noted by a two-digit number corresponding to the employee's job level. Marital status was described as never married, married, divorced, remarried or widowed. Number of children was noted with a numerical number. Length of time in present job was reported in years and months. State was noted by their checking whether they worked either in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, or Florida.

Subjects

The sample for the study consisted of 265 employees from the 400 randomly selected people employed by a regional financial institution with locations in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. This institution has over 16,000 employees. Employees who work for subsidiaries other than in these four states were not sampled. The sample was selected by taking a list for each state, selecting a random number from a 5,000 Random Digits Table (Glass and Stanley, 1970). The number spacing between subjects varied between states because some states had more employees than others. The procedure was to start randomly and then select employees regularly until 100 people were selected from each state. The description of the 265 respondents in this present research is shown in Table 1.

The age composition was this: 29% born from 1960 to the present, 50% born between 1944 - 1959, and 21% born

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of Demographic Characteristics of Total Survey Sample

N = 265	Number of Subjects	% of Sample
Age		
Young (Born 1960 to present)	77	29
Baby Boomers (Born from 1944-1959)	132	50
Older (Born on or before 1943)	56	21
Sex		
Male	68	26
Female	196	74
Did not report	1	
Education		
12 years of education or less	99	38
13-15 years of education	87	34
16 or more years education	75	29
Did not report	4	
Race		
Black	32	12
White	232	88
Other	1	
Marital Status		
Never Married	45	17
Married	168	63
Divorced	25	9
Remarried	22	8
Widowed	5	2
Number of Children		
0	96	36
1-2	125	47
3 or more	44	17

Table 1 (continued)

	Number of Subjects	% of Sample
Job Type		
Manager, Supervisor, Professional	126	49
Sales, Service, Technical	72	28
Clerical	58	23
Did not report	9	
Pay Grade		
Lower Third Pay	57	32
Middle Third Pay	91	51
Upper Third Pay	30	18
Did not report	87	
Length of Time In Job		
1 year or less	93	35
2-3 years	57	22
4-8 years	69	27
9-15 years	32	12
15-38 years	13	4
Did not report	1	
State		
North Carolina	66	25
South Carolina	65	25
Georgia	65	25
Florida	69	26

on or before 1943. There were fewer individuals in the oldest group. This financial institution employed mostly female workers, therefore 74% of the sample was female. The sample is best characterized as well educated, white, married, with children, and having been in their present job from one to three years. Eighty-seven people did not report their pay grade probably because they were from a merged group and their salaries had not been converted to the new compensation system.

Procedure for Data Collection

All persons whose names came up randomly received, in the office mail, a letter from the Director of Human Resources (See Appendix C) asking them to answer the two questionnaires and to return them in a stamped self-addressed envelope directly to the researcher's office. The survey was confidential and returned to the researcher and not to management. The individuals sampled were promised that the scores would be shown to management only as group data and not as individual scores (See Appendix D). They were also promised that the researcher was to be the only person to see their individual scores. If they were willing to sign their names they were promised a summary of the research project. Three-fourths of them signed their names.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data were first analyzed by a multiple regression procedure using SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Jenkins, Steinbrenner and Bent, 1975 and 1981). The statistical analysis examined the amount of variance in the total Work Value Inventory Scores explained by age, sex, education, race, marital status, number of children, job type, pay grade, and length of time on the job.

Frequencies for the WVI scales and independent variables were computed. Crosstabulations comparing the subscales of the WVI to the independent variables were also computed. Chi-Square tests were conducted to test for statistical significance at the .05 level on all subscales with each independent variable.

A regression analysis was conducted on each one of the 15 subscales entering all seven predictor variables (age, sex, education, race, marital status, number of children and job type). Male was coded as a 1 and female as a 2. Black was coded as a 1 and white as a 2. Then a stepwise multiple regression on each of the subscales was conducted using only those variables that had significant betas.

An analysis of variance was computed using the three age groups as the independent variable and the 15 subscales of the Work Values Inventory (Super, 1970) as the dependent

variable. Three posteriori contrast tests were computed to test for significance. The LSD which is essentially a Student's t-test between group means was the least strict test. Tukey uses a single range value for all comparisons. Scheffé is the strictest test. All tests for significance were at the .05 level (Nie et al., 1975). A two-tailed t-test was also used to compare the group differences on total work values.

The pay grade variable had missing data on 87 employees. Therefore the regression analysis was conducted using both a pairwise deletion and a mean subsitution regression for missing variables. The regression was also computed leaving pay grade out of the regression as an independent variable.

Since there were some missing data in many of the cells, the data were recoded to collapse some of the cells. Age was divided into 3 groups (Young = Born 1960 to present; Baby Boomers = Born from 1944-1959; and Older = Born on or before 1943). Job categories were also collapsed. Supervisors, managers, and professionals were put into one group, because they are all considered to have more authority than others. Sales, services, and technical employees were grouped because of similar pay and type of job. Sales, service, and technical employees include all those employees in a bank who work in branches or who technically support

the branching network. Clerical employees made up the third group and were grouped because of similar pay and type of job. Clerical workers were defined as all those employees who work in a support type job. Education was recoded by making three groups: employees with 12 or fewer years of education (High School or less), 13 through 15 years of education (some college), 16 or more years of education (college graduate). There were only 4 people with less than a high school education.

The work values subscales were also recoded. The range on subscales could be from 3 to 15, therefore a low value category was 3 to 12 and a high value category was from 13 to 15. The mode and frequency distribution of the total Work Value Inventory Scores showed a division at score 12, therefore it was chosen as the cut off between a high and low score.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Two major findings in this research concerned the relationship of cohort and sex with work values as measured by the Work Values Inventory (Super, 1970). The results of the tests showed a significant difference on certain values between the young group born after 1960 and the older group born before 1944. The young group had significantly higher scores than the older group for the values: Prestige, Economic Returns, Variety, Way of Life, and Associates.

There were also significant sex differences on work values. Not only were there significant differences in the total score but also on the subscales. Women valued Altruism, Esthetics, Achievement, Economic Returns, Way of Life, Intellectual Stimulation, Prestige, Creativity, Associates, Security, Surroundings, Supervisory Relations and Variety more than men did. Men, on the other hand, valued Independence and Management more as work values than women did. A multiple regression analysis showed sex to explain most of the variance in total work value scores. Job type, sex, education, and age explained more of the variability in the certain subscales of the WVI than did race, marital status, and number of children.

The analyses of the data will be shown in two ways. First the mean scores will be used to show the importance of work values; and second, results from regression analyses will be used to show predictors of work values. The results of these analyses and others will then be used to show tests of the hypotheses.

Importance of Work Values

The 15 subscales on the WVI had mean scores that ranged from 9.14 on Esthetics to 13.85 for Achievement (See Table 2). Each item on the 45-item questionnaire has a possible value from 1-5. There were three questions for each subscale, therefore each subscale could have a raw score as high as 15 or as low as 3. The subjects ranked the questions mainly from important to very important. The means on the subscales are skewed to the high end. The modes on each of the subscales ran from 10.00 to 15.00.

When the mean scores were ranked, a priority ranking of the 15 subscales showed Achievement, Supervisory Relations, Way of Life, Economic Return, and Security as the most important work values to employees (See Table 2). Esthetics, Management, Associates, Variety, and Creativity were at the bottom of the ranking. All of the mean scores are higher than Staats (1981), research on students, found except for Way of Life. Staats had found an increase in work values scores in four samples in 1970, 1976, 1978,

Table 2

Rank Order of Work Values for Total Sample

Subscale	Mean	S.D.
1. Achievement	13.85	1.44
2. Supervisory Relations	13.72	1.66
3. Way of Life	13.65	1.60
4. Economic Returns	13.43	1.89
5. Security	13.11	2.28
6. Altruism	12.77	1.95
7. Intellectual Stimulation	12.53	1.72
8. Prestige	12.07	2.00
9. Surroundings	11.94	2.18
10. Independence	11.83	2.00
11. Creativity	11.77	2.02
12. Variety	11.67	2.21
13. Associates	11.03	2.13
14. Management	10.20	2.01
15. Esthetics	9.14	2.66

and 1980. The 1987 sample in the present research follows the trend that individuals want more from the work place.

The rankings of Rothenbach and Rash (1984) also matched the rankings in the present research. Their sample ranked job security, good salary, challenging and interesting work, and opportunity for advancement as the top four job elements desired. Rothenbach and Rash's (1984) top four job elements are also similar to the top five values in the WVI, Achievement, Supervisory Relations, Way of Life, Economic Returns, and Security, found in the present study. The only work value in this study that was different from the Rothenbach and Rash (1980) sample was Supervisory Relations. For the Rothenbach and Rash (1984) sample, "working for a supervisor you respect," was number 10 as opposed to number two for this sample. Security may be ranked high in this sample because of the downsizing of workers that has occured in large organizations which makes workers fearful of loosing their jobs. In the Staats (1981) and Drummond et al. (1977) studies, Supervisory Relations was one of the top five values.

Leinberger (1977) had proposed that way of life is important to employees. Hellmich (1986) agreed and had asserted that economic returns were also becoming more important. In this sample, Way of Life and Economic Return were ranked number three and four, respectively, just as Hell-

mich (1986) and Leinberger (1977) found. Number five is Security which is what Morgan and Scheiman (1986) found employees want more from the work place.

With a large percentage (49%) of the sample coming from the manager, supervisor, and professional levels it was surprising that Management as a value was ranked next to the bottom of the list with a mean of 10.20 (See Table 2). The Management value is defined by Super (1970, p.9) as "work which permits one to plan and lay out work." Management was ranked low by 64% of the sales and service personnel and 68.9% of the clerical. Of the manager, supervisory, and professional staff 40% ranked it a low value but 60% ranked it as a high value. The low ranking by the sales and service and clerical staff pulled the overall ranking down. Also, the financial institution sampled here is known to support participative management as one of their values. It may be that as employees have more input into decisions they do not feel the need to control the activities of others or to be a manager.

If Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy were applied to the results of the present survey, it would be expected that employees would value good working conditions as a precondition to progress, job security needs, and on up to achievement in work. The results of this study do not consistently support Maslow's theory. Achievement, Supervisory Relations,

Way of Life, Economic Returns, and Security are most important to the subjects in this group. Their needs match Maslow's theory by ranking Economic Returns and Security as an important base need but mismatch Maslow by ranking Achievement, Supervisory Relations and Way of Life as an important value. Maslow would say that these are higher level needs. Some would argue that values are different from needs and cannot be compared. It does appear that this group did not follow Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy pattern. It is difficult to compare Herzberg's (1959) need hierarchy of "hygiene" and "motivators." The basic and lower hygiene factors of Herzberg (1956) match this sample's top values: Economic Returns, Security, and Supervisory Relations. Herzberg's motivator factor that matches this sample is Achievement which was the top value.

Predictors of Work Values

Total Work Value Scores

A multiple regression analysis was conducted using total WVI scores as the dependent variable and age, sex, education, race, marital status, number of children, and job type as the independent variables (recoded as described in Chapter III). The correlation matrix using all independent and the dependent variable showed many significant ($p < .05$) correlation coefficients among the independent variables (see Table 3). Sex and education were the only

Table 3

Correlations between Age, Sex, Years of Education, Race, Marital Status, Number of Children, Job Type, and WVI

	Age	Sex	Educ.	Race	Marital Status	No. Children	Job Type	WVI
Age	1.0							
Sex	-.20*	1.0						
Education	-.13*	-.24*	1.0					
Race	.07	-.11	-.01	1.0				
Marital Status	.34*	-.05	-.12*	.14*	1.0			
No. of Children	.57*	-.17*	-.09	.01	.38*	1.0		
Job Type	-.15*	.35*	-.20*	-.16*	-.004	-.03	1.0	
WVI	-.09	.21*	-.11*	-.05	-.09	-.02	.07	1.0

*$p < .05$

variables significantly correlated to the total WVI score, but the coefficients were low.

The regression results (see Table 4) showed that these seven predictor variables account for only 6% (R^2 = .064) of the variability in total Work Values Scores. While sex explained a significantly larger proportion (R^2 = .045; B = .19; F = 7.82; significance = .005) of the variability than any other variable in the regression equation, the overall dependence of work values on sex alone was quite limited. Proportioned contributions of the other variables were minimal.

Pay grade was not put into the first regression equation because there were 87 cases in which the subjects had not reported their pay grades. The correlation matrix (see Table 5), using both a pairwise deletion (r = .26) and a mean substitution analysis (r = .19), shows a significant relationship between pay grade and total WVI scores. However, the regression results are difficult to interpret because of 87 missing cases which is a third of the sample.

A casewise plot of standardized residuals was also examined using total Work Values Inventory (Super, 1970) scores as the dependent variable. All the residuals fell within a normal curve.

Work Value Subscale Scores

A subsequent multiple regression analysis was conducted

Table 4

Stepwise Multiple Regression on Total Work Values Scores

Prediction Variables	Standardized Betas	Cumulative R^2	R^2 Change	F	Sig.
Sex	.19	.045	.045	7.82	.005*
Marital Status	-.09	.052	.007	1.89	.170
Yrs. of School	-.09	.058	.007	2.08	.150
No. of Children	.08	.059	.002	1.10	.295
Yr. of Birth	-.08	.063	.004	1.11	.293
Job Type	-.03	.064	.001	.19	.665
Race	-.03	.064	.001	.17	.684

*$p < .05$

Table 5

Correlation of Deleted and Mean Substitution Pay Grade to Predictor Variables

Predictor Variables	Pairwise Deletion	Mean Substitution
Age	.13	.10
Sex	-.60*	-.46*
Education	.49*	.39*
Race	.23*	.21*
Marital Status	.02	.01
No. Children	.11	.09
Pay Grade	1.0	1.0
Job Type	-.61*	-.51*
WVI	-.26*	-.19*

*$p < .05$

entering all seven predictor variables using each separate work value subscale as a dependent variable (See Table 6). There are 15 subscales in the WVI, therefore 15 separate multiple regression analyses were conducted.

Table 6 shows that a better understanding of the variability of work values can be discovered by examining each of the 15 WVI subscales. The regression analysis indicated which of the seven predictor variables were significant and the total R^2 that was accounted for by the seven predictor variables for each of the 15 work values.

Of those work values in which more than 6% of the variability was explained, job type, sex and education were likely to be predictors. Sex was a significant predictor for Surrounding, Supervisory Relations, Security, Esthetics, Variety, and Altrusism (See Table 6). Education influenced values on Surroundings, Security and Altruism. Race significantly influenced only Independence. Job type emerged as a major predictor for Creativity, Management, Supervisory Relations, Security, Independence and Economic Returns. For example sex and education accounted for 15% (R^2 = .152) of the variabilility of Surrounding.

Relationship Among Predictor Variables and Work Values

A stepwise multiple regression, using only the predictor variables that were significant in the regression shown

Table 6

Regression of Each of the 15 Work Values on all Seven Recoded Predictor Variables

Dependent Variable	Predictor Variables							
Values	Age	Sex	Educ.	Race	Marital Status	No. Children	Job. Type	Cumulative R^2
1. Creativity							*	.038
2. Management							*	.091
3. Achievement								.028
4. Surrounding		*	*					.153
5. Supr. Relations		*					*	.103
6. Way of Life	*							.041
7. Security		*	*				*	.146
8. Associates								.027
9. Esthetics		*						.070
10. Prestige								.029
11. Independence				*	*		*	.084
12. Variety	*	*				*		.069
13. Economic Retns.							*	.113
14. Altruism		*	*					.082
15. Intell. Stim.								.031

*T $p < .05$

Note. All Recode:
Job Type = Manager, Sales and Service, Clerical
Age = Young, Baby Boomers, Older
Educ. = 0-12, 13-15, 16-Hi
Child = 0, 1-2, more than 2
Work Value = High and Low

on Table 6 (p .05), is shown on Table 7. Sex and job type continue to account for more of the variability in the subscales of the work values.

The review of literature raised unanswered questions that left it difficult to hypothesize about the relationship between pay grade, marital status, and number of children because there had been no research in the area. There was only speculation that individuals with more children to support would value Security more. The results show no significant relation between number of children and security with a Chi Square = 1.37 (2 d.f. and significance = .50). Also, 62.5% of employees with no children rated security as a high value as did 71.4% of people with 1 to 2 children and 65.1% of people with more than two children. Number of children appears to have no relationship to security as a work value.

Data for length of time in the present job were collected and compared to total work values. Another question was whether as people stay longer in the work force, their values might change. A Chi Square test of length of time ($<$ 1 year; 1-5 years; $>$ 5 years) by work values (low-high) showed no relationship between time on job and work values (.88151 with 2 degrees of freedom, p = .6436). People who had been in jobs more than 5 years had no significant differences on work values compared to employees who had jobs

Table 7

Regression of Each Work Value on Predictor Variables

Dependent Variable	Predictor Variables							
Work Value	Age	Sex	Educ.	Race	Marital Status	No. Children	Job Type	Total
	R^2	R^2	R^2	R^2	R^2	R^2	R^2	R^2
1. Creativity							.0159	.02
2. Management							.0533	.05
3. Achievement								-
4. Suroundings		.1017	.0257					.12
5. Super. Rel.		.0566					.0182	.07
6. Way of Life	.0193							.02
7. Security		.0302	.0983					.13
8. Associates								-
9. Esthetics		.03661		.01474				.05
10. Prestige								-
11. Independence							.0494	.05
12. Variety	.0349	.0154						.05
13. Economic Rtns						.0801	.08	
14. Altruism		.0478	.0139					.06
15. Intell. Stim.								-

Note. All recode:
Job type = Manager, Sales and Service, Clerical
Age = Young, Baby Boomers, Older
Education = 0-12, 13-15, 16 on
Child = 0, 1-2, more than 2
Work Value = High and Low

less than a year or from one to five years.

Hypothesis Testing

H_1: Age Group Differences in Work Values

A major hypothesis of this study was that there would be age group differences in work values. The results showed a significant difference between the young group born after 1960 and the older group born before 1944 when computed on total work values. The young group had higher total work values scores which means they ranked more items as important (See Table 8). There were no significant differences between the young group and the baby boomer group or between the baby boomer group and older group although there was a trend toward higher mean scores as age increased.

The fifteen subscales also showed significant differences between the young and older group for total work values (See Table 9) and differences on the means of the subscales. The young group rated Prestige, Economic Returns, Variety, Associates and Way of Life significantly higher than the older group (See Table 10). Table 10 shows the results of the analysis of variance for each significant subscale using three posteriori contrast tests. The odds of having 14 out of 15 of the means higher for the younger group according to signs test (Siegel, 1956) is .004 which indicates the likelihood that there are cohort differences.

Table 10 also shows Variety to be significately more

Table 8

Age Group Differences in Mean Scores of Work Values

	Young n = 77	Baby Boomer n = 132	Older n = 56	Significance
Total WVI	186.04		179.25	.028*
Total WVI		182.20	179.25	NS
Total WVI	186.04	182.20		NS

*Two-tailed t-test of differences significant at .05 level.

Table 9

Age Group Differences in Mean Scores of Work Values Between Young Group and Older Group (Ranked by Young Group)

WVI Subscale	Young Group N = 77	Older Group N = 56	Young Group Higher	Significance
Achievement	14.01	13.71	+	
Way of Life	13.88	13.23	+	
Supr. Relations	13.87	13.70	+	
Economic Returns	13.83	13.04	+	
Security	13.42	13.30	+	
Altruism	13.03	12.49	+	
Intell. Stim.	12.64	12.13	+	
Prestige	12.52	11.71	+	
Surroundings	12.25	11.73	+	
Variety	12.05	10.82	+	
Creativity	11.84	11.48	+	
Independence	11.77	11.68	+	
Associates	11.49	11.04	+	
Management	10.18	9.91	+	
Esthetics	9.26	9.29		
WVI Total	186.04	179.25	+	.028*

*Two-tailed t-test of differences significant at .05 level.

Table 10

Posteriori Tests between Age Groups on Significant Work Value Subscales

Work Values Scales	Groups[a]	Posteriori Tests LSD	Turkey-HSD	Scheffé
Economic Returns	(3) 13.04		13.04	-
	(2) 13.36*		13.36*	-
	(1) 13.83*		13.83*	-
Associates	(2) 10.75		10.75	-
	(3) 11.04		11.04	-
	(1) 11.49*		11.49*	-
Way of Life	(3) 13.23		-	-
	(2) 13.68		-	-
	(1) 13.88*		-	-
Prestige	(3) 11.71		-	-
	(2) 11.96		-	-
	(1) 12.52*		-	-
Variety	(3) 10.82		10.82	10.82
	(2) 11.80*		11.80*	11.80*
	(1) 12.05*		12.05*	12.05*
Independence	(3) 11.68		-	-
	(2) 11.92		-	-
	(1) 11.77		-	-
Altruism	(3) 12.48		-	-
	(2) 12.73		-	-
	(1) 13.03		-	-

*$p < .05$

[a](3) Older Group
(2) Baby Boom Group
(1) Young Group

important to the baby boomer group on all three of the posteriori contrast tests. Variety is the only value that shows up groups differences for the baby boomers. This means that the individuals born between 1944 and 1959 value Variety more than the older group. This supports Yankelovich's (1981) hypothesis that today's workers are seeking variety and self-fulfillment in the work place.

The expectations were that the young group would value Economic Return, Independence, and Way of Life more than the older group. Table 10 shows Economic Return and Way of Life to be significantly different for the young group. Independence was not significantly different for the young group. Although, Altruism was expected to be higher for the older group, it was not.

These results matched Hellmich's (1985) survey findings that freshman in college valued being "well off financially" more than they had 20 years ago in 1966. Also Yankelovich (1981) concluded that individuals value self-fulfillment. Those individuals who want self-fulfillment want life to be more than just work. The higher score for the Way of Life subscale for the younger group supports Yankelovich's (1981) theory that today's younger workers are seeking self-fulfillment.

Easterlin (1968), Elder (1974) and Neugarten and Datan (1973) proposed that the cohort into which a person is born

determines their values. The results of this survey showed definite differences between groups. The older group which was born during or before World War II or when the United States was still recovering from the Depression had a different set of work values from the group born into the 1960's and 1970's. Not only did the younger group desire more Prestige, Economic Returns, Associates, Variety, and Way of Life, but they had higher expectations of the work place. The younger group's total work value scale was higher than the older group.

H_2: Sex Differences in Work Values

The second hypothesis was that there would be no between-group differences when the sample was divided into male and female groups. The results (see Table 11) show a significant difference on the total WVI scores. The females rated Altruism, Esthetics, Creativity, Intellectual Stimulation, Achievement, Prestige, Economic Returns, Security, Surroundings, Supervisory Relations, Associates, Variety and Way of Life higher than the males did. Therefore, this hypothesis was rejected.

The basis for the hypothesis that there would be no sex differences came from the fact that Rothenbach and Rash (1984), McCarrey et al. (1984), and Morrison et al. (1987) found no significant differences between the sexes. Staats (1981) did not cite statistical differences between male

Table 11

Sex Differences in Work Values

WVI Subscale	Mean Females N = 196	Mean Males N = 68	Females Score Higher	Significance
Achievement	13.97	13.50	+	
Supr. Relations	13.95	13.04	+	
Way of Life	13.68	13.56	+	
Economic Returns	13.67	12.72	+	
Security	13.45	12.13	+	
Altruism	13.02	12.04	+	
Intell. Stimu.	12.56	12.47	+	
Surroundings	12.36	10.76	+	
Prestige	12.12	11.93	+	
Variety	11.86	11.07	+	
Creativity	11.82	11.62	+	
Independence	11.67	12.31		
Associates	11.16	10.66	+	
Management	10.15	10.34		
Esthetics	9.44	8.28	+	
WVI Total Score	184.88	176.44	+	.001*

*Two-tailed t-test of differences significant at $p < .05$ level.

and female groups on the WVI, however she did see an increase in the valuation of work by women from samples taken in 1970, 1976, 1978, and 1980. It may be that as more and more women enter the work place for a career, not just for a job, they will place more value, as do men, on values such as Economic Returns, Security, Surroundings, and Supervisory Relations. Also, there may be a deprivation theory working here. Most of the men in the sample are in higher job types which pay more. Women may value Economic Returns because most are employed in jobs that pay less.

H_3: Job Type Differences in Work Values

Another hypothesis was that job type would show differences in work values. It was believed that Security would not be as important to supervisors, managers, or professionals. Job type was a significant variable in predicting the variability in the Security work values. Job type together with sex and education accounted for 15% (R^2 = .146) of the variability of work values (Refer to Table 6).

Crosstabulations (see Table 12) showed a significant relationship between job type and Security with a Chi Square of 13.998 with two degrees of freedom (significance = .0009). Security was a high value for 73.6% of sales and service personnel and for 77.6% of the clerical employees. Only 53.2% of the supervisors, managers, and professionals rated

Table 12

Crosstabulation of Security by Job Type

	Job Type			
	Supervisor Manager, Professional	Sales & Service	Clerical	Total
Security Low	59	19	13	91
	46.8%	26.4%	22.4%	35.5%
Security High	67	53	45	165
	53.2%	73.6%	77.6%	64.5%
Security Total	126	72	58	256[a]
	49.2%	28.1%	22.7%	100%

Note. Chi Square 13.99764 with two degrees of freedom, $p < .0009$
Cramer's V = .23383

[a]N = 256. There were nine missing job types

it as a high value. Job type was a significant predictor of Security (Refer to Table 6). Kohn (1969) and Touretzky (1979) wrote that ability, education, and training of higher level individuals gives them security as opposed to the security coming from the organization. This added support to the hypothesis that security would not be as important to supervisors and managers.

Job type was a significant predictor of Creativity, (Refer to Table 6). The crosstabulation of Creativity and job type (see Table 13) showed 42.9% of managers, supervisors, and professionals rating Creativity as an important work value when only 29.2% of sales/service and 29.3% of clerical people rated it as a high value. Education does not appear to have a relationship to the value of Creativity, but job type does (Refer to Table 6). Employees at higher job types wanted and valued creativity as part of their job.

Crosstabulations of job type with the work value subscales yielded six of the fifteen subscales as significantly correlated to job type (Refer to Table 6). Security has already been examined (see Table 12). The other five subscales that had a significant relationship with job type are presented in Table 14. Managers, supervisors, professionals, sales, and service employees value independence more than clerical workers. The higher the level and the

Table 13

Crosstabulation of Creativity by Job Type

	Job Type			
	Supervisor, Manager, Professional	Sales & Service	Clerical	Total
Creativity Low	72	51	41	164
	57.1%	70.8%	70.7%	64.1%
Creativity High	54	21	17	92
	42.9%	29.2%	29.3%	35.9%
Creativity Total	126	72	58	256[a]
	49.2%	28.1%	22.7%	100%

Note. Chi-Square 5.16068 with two degrees of freedom, $p < .0757$
Cramer's V = .14198

[a]N = 256. There were nine missing job types.

Table 14

Crosstabulation of Job Type with Independence, Economic Return, Altruism, Surroundings, and Supervisory Relations

Rank of Value	Job Type (n = 256) Manager Supr., Professional	Sales & Service	Clerical
	Independence		
Low	50.8%	59.7%	74.1%
High	49.2%	40.3%	25.9%
	Chi Square 8.97380 (2 degrees of freedom Sign = .0113)*		
	Cramer's V = 18723		
	Economic Return		
Low	37.3%	18.1%	8.6%
High	62.7%	81.9%	91.4%
	Chi Square 20.09152 (2 degrees of freedom Sign = .000)*		
	Cramer's V = .28015		
	Altruism		
Low	53.2%	31.9%	46.6%
High	46.8%	68.1%	53.4%
	Chi Square 8.34368 (2 degrees of freedom sign = .0154)*		
	Cramer's V = .18053		
	Surroundings		
Low	68.3%	47.2%	46.6%
High	31.7%	52.8%	53.4%
	Chi Square 11.91361 (2 degrees of freedom sign = .0026)*		
	Cramer's V = .21573		
	Supervisory Relations		
Low	30.2%	16.7%	8.6%
High	69.8%	83.3%	91.4%
	Chi Square = 12.3065 (2 degrees of freedom sign = .0021)*		
	Cramer's V = .21920		

*$p < .05$

more independence an employee had, the more they valued independence.

Another difference was evident on the Economic Return scale. Of the sales and service group 81.9%, and of the clerical group 91.4%, rated Economic Return as a high value (see Table 14). Only 62.7% of managers, supervisors, and professionals rated Economic Return as a high value. The employees in the higher paying jobs valued economic rewards less than the employees who are in lower paying jobs.

Altruism also shows different job type results. The sales and service employees 68.1% rated Altruism as a high value (see Table 14). Only 46.8% of managers, supervisors, and professionals and 53.4% of clerical employees rated it high. Sales and service employees who have the most customer contact in the financial institution value helping people. Also, sales and service jobs are helping the customer manage their money.

People in sales and service (52.8%) and in clerical (53.4%) rated Surroundings as a high value (see Table 14). Only 31.7% of managers, supervisors, and professionals rated it as a high value. Again the managers already have bigger offices and nicer work space and therefore value it less.

Of the sales and service personnel 83.3% rated Supervisory Relations high as opposed to 91.4% of clerical employees and 69.8% of the manager, supervisor, and profes-

sional group (see Table 14). The conclusion from the results was that most employees value Supervisory Relations; however, the sales, service and clerical employees who are more controlled by supervisors valued it even more.

Supervisory Relations, Economic Return, and Surroundings are all valued by the employees that have the fewest benefits from all three work values. Sales, service and clerical employees all wanted these more than their managers, supervisors, or professionals. Values may be related to what people do not have and therefore desire.

H_4: Education Differences in Work Values

Another hypothesis was that as the education of the worker varied so would the work value of Creativity. This hypothesis was not supported. Education was not a significant predictor of Creativity (see Table 6) as Rothenbach and Rash (1984) and Kohn (1969) had found.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the differences in work values of employees. The major expectation was that there would be (a) significant age group differences in work values and (b) significant predictors of work values. The analysis of the data demonstrated that there were significant age and sex differences in work values. The analysis also showed job type, education, and sex were the best predictors of work values. In addition to a summary of the results, problems with instrumentation, assumptions, and design are discussed in terms of their possible impact on the results. Finally, recommendations for further research and for organizational systems are made.

Summary

The press and many employers assume that younger employees have different work values. However, very little research has been done on today's workers' values. The study of organizational cultures has focused on the total organization's values but not on individual work values. Individual values, however, are similar to organizational values. Values were defined as an enduring

belief that a certain type of behavior in a certain condition of life is desirable (Rokeach, 1973). Work values are work goals which employees seek in the work activities in which they engage.

These work values were expected to vary according to the cohort in which an individual was born and socialized. That is, younger workers were expected to value Way of Life, Economic Return, and Independence more because of rising expectations. On the other hand, the older worker was expected to value Alturism more. No difference in the sexes was expected based on prior research. Job level was expected to vary on the work value subscales because of differences in education and scope of the job. Security was not expected to be as important to supervisors, professionals, and management levels as to lower job levels. Supervisory Relations were expected to be more important for sales and service workers and for clerical workers.

A cross sectional survey design was used comparing scores on the Work Values Inventory (WVI) (Super, 1970) for age, sex, education, race, marital status, number of children, job type, and pay grade. A questionnaire was sent to a sample of 400 randomly selected respondents. The completed WVI and demographic data sheets were returned by 265 of the 400 employees (66%). The sample was selected

randomly from a list of employees from a four state regional financial institution.

The dependent variable was the total score on the WVI and the independent variables were age, sex, education, race, marital status, number of children, job type, and pay grade. A series of analysis of variance, t-tests and chi-squares on cross tabulations were used to compare means of the age groups, sexes, and job types. The data were also analyzed by a multiple regression procedure.

Achievement, Supervisory Relations, Way of Life, Economic Returns, and Security were the most important work values for the total group. The young group (born from 1960 to present) had higher total scores than the older group (born on or before 1943). That is, the young group ranked more of the values higher than the older group. The young valued 14 of the 15 subscales higher than the older group did. The older group had higher scores on Esthetics. Variety was also more important to the baby boomer group than the older group.

The hypothesis that there would be no significant differences on work values between the sexes was not supported. In fact, women valued 13 of the work values more than men. Men valued Independence and Management more than women did. Another indication of the importance of sex was in a multiple regression analysis which showed

that sex explained the most variance, although small (5%) on total work value scores. Furthermore, sex, education, along with job type, and age, explained most of the variability in the subscales of the WVI, but still only up to 15%.

Conclusion

Differences in work values by age group were related to the era in which an individual was born and socialized. Young workers wanted more from the work place. They desired more, especially prestige, money, variety in work, likeable people to work with, and a way of life that allows expression. Being socialized in the 1960's and 1970's must have had an impact on this group's values. The 1960's and 1970's witnessed the Black movement, the Women's movement, the Vietnam Era, and a mostly upward movement of the economy. The 1960's and 1970's were also characterized with increased leisure time allowing individuals an opportunity for a lifestyle other than work, therefore Way of Life as a value has become more important.

The worker born during World War II or before did not look to the workplace to fulfill as many of their desired wants. This older group did not desire or have as high expectations as the young worker.

Socialization by parents must have also had an impact

on these three groups. Parental values have been inculcated in these cohort groups influencing work values. Elder (1974) found, in his research on children of the Depression, that as they aged they came to view a strong family life as a valuable resource because of the scarcity of a stable family during the Depression. The children of the Depression would be in the older group in this study and since their parents did not have stable work or pay their children may have not had great expectations of the workplace. The older group may have felt lucky to have a job and not developed strong work values explaining their lower scores.

Kohn's (1969) work also helps explain how socialization influences work values. Kohn's (1969) research examined how parental values vary by social class. Kohn (1969, p.71) found that class, which is defined as education and occupational position, "was more powerfully related to values than was any other relevant social factor." Class, even when controlled for all other major social variables, was more powerfully associated to parented values than the total of the other social constructs such as race, religion, and material background (Kohn, 1969). As education and job type vary so do work values and parental values. Kohn's (1969) work shows that socialization influences parental values and work values.

The sexes also desired different values in the work place. Women wanted 13 of the values more than the men did. What is not clear is whether women desired these qualities because they are heavily concentrated in jobs that are more structured, pay less, have fewer benefits, and closer supervision or that they just value them more than men did. Men did value Independence and Management more than women did.

Recommendations

In view of pressures to increase productivity in the work place, understanding what employees feel is significant on the job is important. The top five work values were Achievement, Supervisory Relations, Way of Life, Economic Returns, and Security. Employees want a feeling of accomplishment as well as supervisors who are fair and easy to get along with; work which permits them to have the kind of life they want; good pay; and security. These top five values need to be addressed by organizations. However, these values vary by sex, age, and job type. Programs, therefore, need to be designed with full awareness that flexibility must be built around the sex of the worker, the age, and the type of job.

Some organizations have neglected to let employees in a large organization know their contributions to the total results which means organizations need to strive

to appreciate each specialized group. An independent way of life may have also suffered as dual-career couples have focused on balancing work and family. Pay has always been an issue, and according to the results of this survey, it still is. Security values must also be acknowledged. Downsizing of management and automation in the 1980's has worried employees and may be the reason security was rated so high.

Design of organizations, jobs, and compensation programs is dependent on what employees value. The results of this research showed significant differences on work values from the young to older groups. The desire of the young group for all values except Esthetics informs employers that flexible vacation programs, leave of absence policies, and sabbatical programs are needed to retain the young worker and to fulfill their needs for an independent way of life. Variety can also be designed in the work place by using teams as opposed to the assembly line. The Economic Return value can also be addressed by employers who develop incentive programs which allow workers to be rewarded on performance criteria as opposed to just cost-of-living or merit increases. Innovative incentive programs have even begun to be designed for staff jobs.

These types of redesign programs fulfill the needs

of young workers, but may not address the needs of the baby boomers or older workers. Programs are therefore needed which allow flexibility in benefits, compensation, and work systems. To retain and satisfy such different work values, human resource development staff, and organizational development specialist must push for flexibility in design.

More research is needed on work values. In order to generalize about cohort work values, the same employees need to be followed over time. A resampling in five to 10 years would determine if values change as the young worker ages, marries, has children, and climbs the corporate ladder. The research has shown a strong association between age and work values but the association needs to be empirically supported that, over time, the cohort differences hold.

Also a stronger research instrument is needed. Staats (1981) has shown that over time students assign more importance to all work values in Super's WVI (1970). Super's Work Values Inventory (1970) may be suffering from the lack of ability to discriminate differences in values because of the ceiling effect. Most of the people in this sample ranked values as either important or very important which makes it difficult to discern differences among groups. A newer research instrument

is needed to reflect current increasing importance in work values. In order to do better design for organizations, jobs, and work, it is important to understand employee's different work values.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blum, A. A., Estey, M., Kuhn, J. W., Wildman, W. A., & Troy, L. (1971). White-collar workers. New York: Random House.

Breme, F. J., & Cockriel, I. W. (1975). Work values & work interests: Are they the same? Journal of Vocational Behavior, 6, 331-336.

Brody, M. (1985). Meet today's young American worker. Fortune, November 11, 90-98.

Deal, T.E., & Kennedy, A.A. (1982). Corporate cultures. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Drumond, R.J., McIntire, W.G. & Skaggs, C.T. (1977). Work Values & Job Satisfaction of Young Adult Males. Journal of Employment Counseling, 14 (1), 23-26.

Easterlin, R.D. (1968). Population, labor force & long swings in economic growth. New York: Columbia University Press.

Elder, G.H., Jr. (1974). Children of the great depression. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Erickson, E.H. (1968). Identity: Youth & Crisis. New York: W.W. Norton.

Flowers, V. S. & Hughes, C. L. (1981) The Key to Motivation. Personnel Administration. 26 (2), 70.

Glass, G. V. and Stanley, J. C. (1970). Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Grant, P.C. (1982, December). Why employee motivation has declined in America. Personnel Journal. pp. 905-909.

Harrick, E.J. & Sultan, P.E. (1982). Workforce of the future: The problems and opportunities of maturity. Personnel. 59 (4), 27-34.

Hellmich, N. (1986, October 30). Freshmen want cash,

not ideals. USA Today. p. 1.

Herzberg, F., Marsner, B., & Synderman, B. (1959). The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley.

Kanter, R. M. (1980, December 5). How to satisfy the need of the organization to raise productivity as well as satisfy workers needs for better quality of work life. Paper presented at the College of St. Catherine: Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Kanter, R. M. (1978). Work in a New America. Daedalus. 107 (1), 47-78.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Work and family in the United States. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kohn, M.L. (1969). Class & Conformity: A Study In Values. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Leinberger, P. (1986, December 7). Organization man revisited. New York Times. pp. 46-98.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). The Seasons of A Man's Life. New York: Ballantine Books.

Maslow, A.H. (1954). Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper Row.

McCarrey, M.W., Gasse, Y & Moore, L. (1984). Work value goals and instrumentalities. International Review of Applied Psychology. 33 (3), 291-303.

Morgan, B. S. & Schiemann, W. A. (1986, October). Employee Attitudes: Then & Now. Personnel Journal. pp. 100-106.

Morrison, A.M., White, R.P., Velsor, E.V. & The Center for Creative Leadership (1987). Breaking the Glass Ceiling. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Neugarten, B. L. & Datan, N. (1973). Sociological Perspective on the Life Cycle. In P. B. Baltes & K. W. Schaie. Life-Span Developmental Psychology (pp. 53-69). New York: Academic Press.

Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. (1981). Statistical Package for Social Sciences

Update 7-9. New York: McGraw Hill.

Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. (1975). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw Hill.

Ouchi, W. G. (1981). Theory Z. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Pascale, R. T. & Athos, A. G. (1981). The Art of Japanese Management. New York: Simon Schuster.

Price, B. A. (1984). What the baby boom believes. American Demographics. May, 30-33.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press.

Rothenbach, W. F. & Rash, A. G. (1984, May). Differences in work force expectations. Personnel Administrator. pp. 122-128.

Schein, E. H. (1978). Career Dynamics. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Schein, E. H. (1982). Increasing Organizational Effectiveness through Better Human Resource Planning & Development. Career Issues in Human Resource Management. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; Prentice-Hall.

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational Culture & Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Siegel, S. M. (1956). Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavorial Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill.

Staats, S. (1981). Work values inventory scores from 1970 to 1980. Perceptual and Motor Skills. 53, 113-114.

Stanton, E. S. (1983, March). A critical reevaluation of motivation, management, and productivity. Personnel Journal. pp. 208-214.

Super, D. E. (1970). Work Value Inventory. Chicago: Riverside Publishing.

Szilagyi, A. D., & Wallace, M. J. (1980). Organizational Behavior and Performance. Santa Monica, California:

Goodyear Publishing.

Tannenbaum, R. & Davis, A. D. (1983). Values, man and organizations. In French, W. L. Bell, C. H. and R.A. Zawacki. Organizational Development (pp. 47-59). Plano, Texas: Business Publications.

Touretzky, S. J. (1979). Changing attitudes and questioning loyalty. Personnel Administrator. 24 (4), 35-36.

Warr, P. Cook, J. S. Hepworth, S. J. & Wall, T. D. (1981). The Experience of Work: London, Academic Press.

Whyte, W. (1949). The Organization Man. New York: Riverside Publishing.

Yankelovich, D. (1981). New rules in American life: Searching for self-fulfillment in a world turned upside down. Psychology Today. 15 (4), 35-89.

Yankelovich, D. & Immerwahr, J. (1983, Fall). Management and the work ethic. Directors and Boards. pp. 41-45.

APPENDIX A

WORK VALUES INVENTORY

Donald E. Super

Teachers College, Columbia University

THE RIVERSIDE PUBLISHING COMPANY

Copyright © 1968 by The Riverside Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved. With the exception of those parts of this work that are designated for reproduction by a specified means, no part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing by the Publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to Permissions, The Riverside Publishing Company, 8420 Bryn Mawr Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60631.
Printed in the U.S.A.

NCS Mark Reflex® EH07004-002:321

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

Appendix A : 78-80

University Microfilms International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

Please answer the following questions. All information is confidential.

1. Indicate your date of birth: _____ _____ _____
   Month Day Year

2. Sex.

   Male ( )
   Female ( )

3. Indicate the total number of years of formal schooling you have completed. _____
   Example: 12 years for High School Degree

4. Race.

   Black ( )
   White ( )
   Other ( ) Specify _____

5. Marital Status.

   Never Married ( )
   Married ( )
   Divorced ( )
   Remarried ( )
   Widowed ( )

6. Indicate the number of children you have. _____

7. Indicate your pay grade number. _____

8. Check your job type.

   Supervisor ( )
   Manager ( )
   Professional ( )
   Technical ( )
   Sales or Service ( )
   Clerical ( )

9. Indicate how long you have been in your present job. _____ _____
   Months Years

10. Indicate the state in which you work.

    North Carolina ( )
    South Carolina ( )
    Georgia ( )
    Florida ( )

Interoffice Memorandum

APPENDIX C

FIRST UNION

Date: April 28, 1987

From: Ken Thompson

To: Selected Employees

Re: Survey of Work Values

In order to better understand what is important to our employees, we have agreed to participate in a research project on work values. You have been randomly selected to participate in this research. Your participation is confidential and optional.

If you choose to participate, please read the Informed Consent form on the next page. Please fill out and return in the self-addressed, confidential envelope the:

1. Demographic Data Sheet and

2. Work Values Inventory

You do not need to sign your name unless you would like a summary of the work values project. Please return the blank Work Values Inventory even if you do not fill it out - they are expensive.

Kathryn Norman, a doctoral candidate at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, is conducting this survey. If you have questions, you can call her at (704) 366-8999.

Thank you for your help with this project. The summary of the results will help the Human Resources Division do a better job. I hope you will choose to participate.

KT

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT

This research is concerned with what is important to you at work.

The questionnaire will take approximately fifteen minutes. Your participation in this research project is strictly voluntary. You do not have to answer all questions if you do not want to, and you may withdraw from the research project at any time.

Your individual responses will be held confidential. Each participant will be assigned an identification number, and this information will be kept in a locked file. The results will be shown to management in a summary form. Individual responses will not be disclosed.

All questionnaires will be destroyed within twelve months after the completion of the project.

If you would like a copy of the summary of the project, please give your name. Otherwise, you do not need to sign this form.

NAME: _____

MAIL CODE OR ADDRESS: _____

_____

Thank you,

Kathryn H. Norman

(704)366-8999