A series of scales measuring attitudes toward work was developed. The Survey of Work Values (SWV) was based on a number of dimensions of Protestant Ethic, specifically those aspects that deal with the meaning that an individual attaches to his role at work. The content validity of the items was established by the reallocation method of scaling. Items were analyzed to determine the best method of scoring and to select items for the subscales according to the internal consistencies and independence of the subscales. Unweighted, multipoint scoring was selected for 54 items. SWV scores discriminated among occupational groups and correlated with background characteristics of employed and disadvantaged persons.

The purpose of this research was to construct a set of scales measuring several areas of work values. The Survey of Work Values (SWV) is intended to be an index of a person's attitudes toward work in general, rather than his feelings about a specific job. The concept of work values, referring to general attitudes regarding the meaning that an individual attaches to his work role, therefore, differs from that of job satisfaction (an attitude toward one's own job).

A few scales have been constructed for the purpose of measuring work values (Steffire, 1959; Super, 1957, 1962) and occupational values (Kilpatrick, Cummings, & Jennings, 1964; Rosenberg, 1957). Although these measures have been carefully developed, they seem to be extremely global. The SWV differs from previous scales2 in that it is directed toward separate areas of values and is limited to the construct of secularized Protestant Ethic with which work values seem to be closely linked.

The principal aspects of Protestant Ethic as described by Weber (1958) are individualism, asceticism, and industriousness. The emphasis placed on a man's industriousness probably represents the most critical aspect of Protestant Ethic. The Ethic has been assessed typically by indirect methods that have been presumed to index this concept. Amount of industrialization, amount of education, economic level, and occupation have been among the more frequently used indexes.

Correlations between attitudes and supposedly logically related behaviors have usually been found to be low. Frequently, a variety of considerations intervene to inhibit the behavioral manifestations of an attitude. Economic and social factors may greatly limit the alternative behaviors available to an individual regardless of his attitudes. It would, therefore, be naive to expect indirect measures to index accurately an individual's work values. Attitude scales should provide more direct measures of these concepts.

The categories of the SWV were selected on the basis of two considerations. The first was the apparent relevance of each category to the secularized interpretation of Protestant Ethic, specifically those aspects dealing with work. Although this selection was judgmental, it did narrow considerably the number of dimensions by eliminating the primarily religious aspects of the Ethic. A second consideration was that the categories should be relevant to the literature concerning the Protestant Ethic.

Despite an effort to choose areas of work values that provide a broad interpretation of Protestant Ethic, the categories of the SWV are by no means exhaustive. Unavoidably, some question may exist regarding any particular aspect of Protestant Ethic that was not
included among the subscales. Practicality, however, dictates a relatively brief scale.

Probably the most widely accepted notion of Protestant Ethic deals with the intrinsic aspect of work; that is, work as its own reward. Work is to be valued because it represents the best use of a man’s time, not merely because it is instrumental to the attainment of external rewards. The employee high in Protestant Ethic is presumed to prefer working to being idle, to be involved in his work, and to derive considerable satisfaction from doing his job well. The authors selected three dimensions of Protestant Ethic that cover the intrinsic aspects of work:

*Pride in Work:* the satisfaction and enjoyment a man feels from doing his job well.

*Job Involvement:* the degree to which a worker takes an active interest in co-workers and company functions and desires to contribute to job-related decisions.

*Activity Preference:* a preference by the worker to keep himself active and busy on his job.

Although the traditional Ethic stressed the intrinsic rewards of work, considerable value was placed on extrinsic rewards as well. The following subscales reflect the extrinsic nature of the Ethic:

*Attitude toward Earnings:* the value an individual places in making money on the job.

*Social Status of Job:* the effect the job alone has on a person’s standing among his friends, relatives, and co-workers, in his own eyes and/or in the eyes of others.

Two dimensions of the Ethic have been included that do not conform well to the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy and were, therefore, regarded to be of a mixed character.

*Upward Striving:* the desire to seek continually a higher level job and a better standard of living.

*Responsibility to Work:* the recognition that a man is obligated to work and that he must depend on himself rather than others for support.

**Method**

General definitions, as well as more specific items representing each subscale, were written on the basis of a review of the literature and suggestions from faculty and graduate students, all having had industrial experience. The representativeness of these categories was then checked with an industrial sample. Generality was investigated in two undergraduate samples. Scale values were obtained on another industrial sample and an undergraduate sample. Endorsements of the items were then obtained on still another industrial sample.

**Scaling by Method of Reallocation**

First, the a priori attitude statements and the list of defined categories were presented to a group of 58 employees of a glass-manufacturing company in the Midwest. The workers ranged from the unskilled to the managerial level. In accordance with the method of reallocation described by Smith and Kendall (1963), the judges were instructed to assign each of the 91 statements into the defined category that they believed best corresponded with the meaning of the statement. In addition to the seven defined categories, a category designated as other was included. The judges were instructed to allocate to this category any statement that they believed to correspond poorly with each of the defined categories. The purpose of the reallocation procedure was to determine: (a) whether discriminably different categories exist, (b) whether the items intended to measure a particular concept are judged to be relevant to that concept, and (c) whether the investigator’s conception of the categories being measured corresponds closely with the judgment of persons for whom the scale is intended.

The criteria for the retention of an item were at least 70% allocation to a single category and no more than 20% allocation to any second category. An item was rejected if it failed to meet either of these criteria. A scale was eliminated if it was not conceptually clear, as was indicated by allocation of items to other than the intended scale. Retained items were submitted to two further reallocations by samples of 56 and 57 undergraduates. Any item that failed to meet the criteria on any one reallocation was deleted. The use of a non-industrial population was intended to establish the stability of these judgments over distinctly different groups.

Then scale values indicating level of each statement along the relevant continuum were obtained from a sample of 46 workers from the same company representing the same range of occupational levels. The judges were given six lists of statements, each headed by the category name and definition. (The Responsibility subscale had been eliminated; see Results section.) The rating scale consisted of five letters with a different pair of behavioral descriptions as end anchors for each of the six scales. The points of the scale were described as hypothetical workers. The judges were instructed to indicate which of the five hypothetical workers was most likely to have made each of the statements. Scale values were computed on the basis of a 5-point rating scale.

To substantiate the scale values, which had been obtained from a relatively small group of judges, the statements were rescaled by a group of 45 undergraduates, and the two sets of values were correlated. Since the two groups of judges differed markedly in their backgrounds, the correlation between the two sets of scale values reflects the stability of the relative
positions of these ratings across different populations rather than their reliability across two samples drawn from the same population.

The 67 attitude statements were presented in mixed order to a group of 495 employees from three plants of the glass-manufacturing company mentioned previously. Employees were instructed to respond to each item on a 6-point scale of agreement ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The sample included seven occupational groups: management (N = 35), supervision (N = 79), professional (N = 82), technicians (N = 37), clerical (N = 120), skilled trades (N = 47), and semiskilled and unskilled (N = 85). Also included in the sample were 10 workers for whom job titles were missing.

Scoring of the Survey of Work Values

Strength of agreement was computed from a 6-point Likert scale, which was also scored dichotomously (agree-disagree). Agreement values were reflected in order to maximize the number of positive intercorrelations within each subscale. For unweighted multipoint and unweighted dichotomous scoring, agreement responses were simply summed for each subscale. Weighted multipoint scoring and weighted dichotomous scoring summed the products of the agreement value of each statement with its corresponding scale value.

Product-moment correlations were computed for each item against total score for the subscale, and all of the items were intercorrelated. Also, subscale totals were correlated both within and across the four methods of scoring. Because each correlation between item and subscale total was based on a small number of items, a correction for the possible spurious effect of autocorrelation was made (see Nunnally, 1967, p. 262). For each subscale, items were arranged in order of their correlation with total subscale score. Coefficient alpha (a measure of internal consistency) was computed for the items with the highest item-total correlations. Other items were added successively to this core of items in order of the magnitude of their correlations with total score. Items were retained only if their addition resulted in an increment to alpha. Preference was given to items spaced widely along the subscale continuum, but with scale values of low variability.

An item was retained, therefore, if it: (a) met reallocation standards, (b) had a high correlation with its subscale total score, (c) resulted in an increment to coefficient alpha, (d) increased the distribution of scale values among items of its subscale, and (e) had a scale value of low variability.

Dimensionality of the Survey of Work Values

The dimensions obtained by reallocation need not correspond with those obtained by factor analysis, especially since reallocation is based on discriminability among the scales, rather than orthogonality. Scoring by factors might be better than scoring by allocation subscales. Therefore, the factor structure of the SWV was examined. The items administered to the last industrial sample (N = 495) were analyzed by a principal components analysis with quartimin rotation (Goodale, 1969b).

RESULTS

Of the 91 items in the original pool, 45 were retained after allocation. They had been assigned to a particular category on an average of 84.1% of the judgments. The Responsibility to Work subscale was eliminated because its items did not meet allocation standards. The Activity Preference items also failed to meet the stated criteria because the items were consistently allocated to the Responsibility to Work scale as well as to the intended scale. The definition for Activity Preference was, therefore, revised and additional items were written.

The 45 items retained from the first allocation, plus the 13 statements for Activity Preference that had failed to allocate, as well as 17 new statements, were subjected to two subsequent allocations. Two samples, consisting of 56 and 57 undergraduate students, were instructed to allocate the statements into the six defined categories and an "other" category. Of the 75 statements, a total of 67 were retained with an average value of 85% allocation to a single category. A total of 42 statements had survived two reallocations, while 25 statements had been reallocated once. Of the latter 25 statements, 12 were from the Activity Preference scale, and 13 were from the new items that were added to the item pool.

Scale Values

The rating of item scale values by the industrial sample produced a wide range of mean values within each of the six subscales, with relatively low standard deviations. The correlation between the two sets of scale values obtained from the industrial and undergraduate samples was .94 (N = 67). In addition, no systematic displacement of these ratings had occurred.

Total subscale scores based on the 6-point ratings of agreement were highly correlated (r = .98) with totals based on the summed products of the agreement weights and scale values. Dichotomous scoring of the unweighted values was also strongly related (r = .96) to the totals derived from the multiplicative approach. The unweighted multipoint scoring
method was retained because it increased item variance over that from dichotomous scoring.

### Scale Characteristics of the Survey of Work Values

The item analysis resulted in six subscales each containing nine items. Table 1 summarizes the means and standard deviations for endorsement of the items of the SWV.

Median intrascale item intercorrelations and reliabilities (alpha) are shown in Table 2. To substantiate these values, the SWV was also administered to a sample of government employees (N = 356) and intrascale item intercorrelations and alpha coefficients were recomputed. The results of the latter analysis (also shown in Table 2) agree closely with the values obtained from the development sample.

The subscale reliabilities are considered to be satisfactory in view of the relatively small number of items within each subscale. Also, alpha tends to be small when item means are as extreme as those shown in Table 1.

### Table 1
**Item Endorsement Means and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Range of $X$s</th>
<th>Range of SDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>2.32-3.88</td>
<td>.95-1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>3.77-5.60</td>
<td>.62-1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striving</td>
<td>3.47-5.54</td>
<td>.55-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings</td>
<td>2.01-4.41</td>
<td>.99-1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>4.86-5.72</td>
<td>.55-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>4.16-5.42</td>
<td>.63-1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—N = 495.

### Table 2
**Median Intrascale Item Intercorrelations, Coefficient Alpha Reliabilities, and Test–Retest Reliabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Industrial workers&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Government workers&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Insurance employees&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mdn. r Alpha</td>
<td>Mdn. r Alpha</td>
<td>Test-retest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striving</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> N = 495.<br>
<sup>b</sup> N = 356.<br>
<sup>c</sup> N = 66.

Test-retest reliabilities with about a 1-mo. interval were obtained from a group of employees (N = 66) of a large eastern insurance company. The coefficients for each subscale are shown in Table 2. The test–retest reliabilities are as high as could be expected, given the level of internal consistency of the subscales.

Table 3 summarizes the relationships among the subscales based on the intercorrelations of the subscale totals. Of the intercorrelations among subscale totals, 11 were significantly greater than zero (p < .01). The data seem consistent with the hypothesized two-factor dichotomy of work-related values (intrinsic) and reward-related values (extrinsic). The intrinsic values are Pride in Work, Activity Preference, and Job Involvement. The correlations among these variables were all substantial and positive in direction. The correlation between the extrinsic variables of Attitude toward Earnings and Social Status of Job was positive and significant. Furthermore, all of the correlations across the intrinsic–extrinsic groupings were either nonsignificant or negative. Attitude toward Earnings was negatively related to each of the intrinsic variables. The Upward Striving measure, which is both intrinsic and extrinsic in its character, showed positive correlations with both sets of scales.

Principal components analysis revealed the presence of six factors that accounted for 36% of the total variance in the matrix (see Table 4). The six factors were rotated by the quartimin method (Harman, 1967), which was selected because it places no restriction on the obliqueness of the solution. The correlations among factors were relatively low, however, ranging from −.20 to .33 with a median value of −.01. The first factor extracted represented...
TABLE 4
SAMPLE ITEMS AND THEIR FACTOR LOADINGS FOR THE SIX FACTORS
OF THE SURVEY OF WORK VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample item</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic values</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A worker should feel some responsibility to do a decent job whether or not his supervisor is around.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the person can get away with it, he should try to work just a little slower than the boss expects him to.</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best job that a worker can get is one which permits him to do almost nothing during the working day.</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization-Man Ethic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man should feel a sense of pride in his work.</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a worker keeps himself busy on his job, the working day passes more quickly than if he were loafing.</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A worker who does a sloppy job ought to feel a little ashamed of himself.</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upward Striving</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a man likes his job, he should be satisfied with it and should not push for a promotion to another job.</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A worker is better off if he is satisfied with his job and is not concerned about being promoted to another job.</td>
<td>-.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A promotion to a higher-level job usually means more worries and should be avoided for that reason.</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Status of Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The man who holds down a good job is the most respected man in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends would not think much of me if I did not have a good job.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a good job makes a person worthy of praise from his friends and family.</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventional Ethic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing a good job should mean as much to a worker as a good paycheck.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man should always be thinking about pulling himself up in the world and should work hard with the hope of being promoted to a higher level job.</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is nothing as satisfying as doing the best job possible.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude toward Earnings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man should choose the job which pays the most.</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man should take the job which offers the most overtime if the regular pay on the job is about the same.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man should choose one job over another mostly because of higher wages.</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an intrinsic dimension in that it was pre-
dominated by significant loadings for items
from the Pride in Work, Job Involvement, and
Activity Preference subscales. Separate factors
were extracted for Attitude toward Earnings,
Social Status of the Job, and Upward Striving.
The items that loaded on a factor named
Conventional Ethic characterized a high level
of the work value dimension that they repre-
sented and were strongly endorsed by most Ss.
(Mean endorsement of the items was 5.16
on a 6-point scale and the mean scale value was
4.36 on a 5-point scale.) One other factor
accounting for 21% of the common variance
was tentatively named an Organization-Man
Ethic.

**DISCUSSION**

Reallocation resulted in six discriminably
different sets of items for which a considerable
degree of rater agreement was obtained. De-
spite the apparent success of the reallocation
procedure, the internal consistencies of the
SWV subscales were not as high as one would
prefer. The coefficient alpha reliabilities, which
were mainly in the .60s, are about what one
would expect, considering the range of scale
values within each subscale and the small num-
ber of items within each subscale. Since ap-
proximately three times this number of items
is usually required to achieve a reliability
coefficient of .80, extreme dissatisfaction with
the results of the analysis is not warranted.
Yet, in light of the extensive prescreening of
items by allocation, one may wonder why the
homogeneity of the subscales was not greater.

Two possible explanations for the generally
low item intercorrelations are worth mention-
ing. One such possibility is that the marginals
for computation of interitem correlations are not
comparable, due to the deliberate spread
of items along the continuum, rather than
close to the 50% endorsement level. We de-
cided on the strategy for a wide range with the
expectation that the 50% point would shift
widely among samples with different back-
ground or situations, as in comparisons of
social classes, or ethnic groups. This strategy
resembles that of Guttman (1947) in seeking
reproducibility rather than high interitem
intercorrelations.

Another possible reason for the low internal
consistencies may be that the subscales of the
SWV are factorially complex. In view of the
magnitude of the item-total correlations, how-
ever, more than just a few strong factors would
have to be demonstrated if the internal con-
sistencies are to be ascribed to factorial com-
plexity (Nunnally, 1967). The factor analysis
did indicate, in part, a lack of correspondence
with the results of the reallocation procedure
in terms of discrimination of the intrinsic
subscales. It did not reveal the presence of
many strong factors to account for the rela-
tively low internal consistencies and item-
total correlations. The question raised by the
factor analysis was whether to use the sub-
scales determined by reallocation or those
determined by the factor analysis. The lack
of correspondence between the two procedures
was not surprising; for although both factor
analysis and reallocation are suitable methods
for obtaining subscales, they are not alternate
methods for achieving the same ends. Factor
analysis clusters items in terms of common
response patterns, whereas reallocation groups
items in terms of whether they have been
judged to be relevant to a particular defined
category. The relative quality of prediction
and meaningfulness of the relationships of sub-
scale scores with relevant variables should
indicate which method of defining subscales is
preferable. The authors, therefore, elected to
use the subscales determined by both methods
in subsequent studies, and to delay deciding
in favor of one over the other set of subscales.

A problem often associated with scales of
this type is that of social desirability. While a
social desirability effect is usually regarded as
objectionable and as a source of bias, there is
reason to doubt whether this criticism is
appropriate for the measurement of values.
If one is concerned about the extent to which
a group of individuals shares a common value
pattern, then in a very real sense it is social
desirability that is being measured. Of course,
measured differences in work values between
diverse cultural groups are necessary if the
SWV is to have value as a research instrument.

Some Applications of the Survey of Work Values

**Occupational Level**

The SWV was used to determine whether
the subscales could discriminate between occupa-
tional groups. Wollack (1968) performed a
discriminant analysis using five occupational groups \((N = 449)\) ranging from unskilled employees through professionals.

Two statistically significant discriminant functions \((p < .05)\) were extracted with latent roots of .14 and .06, respectively (chi-square test for the dimensionality of discriminant space). Latent vectors for Functions I and II are given in Table 5. Discriminant scores were computed for each person in the sample. The procedure for obtaining a person's scores on the two discriminant functions consisted of weighting each of his subscale totals by the corresponding scaled vectors and summing these products over subscales. Group means are presented in Table 6.

The first discriminant function, which accounted for approximately 61% of the between-group variance, contrasted Activity Preference (positively weighted) with Attitude toward Earnings (negatively weighted). Table 6 suggests a blue-collar—white-collar continuum.

One word of caution should be raised regarding these data. One might be tempted to conclude without reservation that white-collar workers have a more favorable view of work-related activity than do blue-collar workers. However, activity probably means different things to different groups of workers. There is nothing within the items of the SWV that specifies the precise nature of job activity to which this subscale refers. To blue-collar workers, activity may imply physical activity, while to white-collar workers it may imply sedentary activity. Although this observation does not diminish the meaningfulness of these findings, it does suggest the need for cautious interpretation.

The second discriminant function, which accounted for about 29% of the between-group variance, was characterized primarily by a high positive weight for Social Status of Job and a high negative weight for Job Involvement. This function seems to describe a dimension of clerical versus other workers. Group differences appear to be small among professionals, supervisors, skilled-technical workers, and semiskilled-unskilled workers. Clerical workers, however, stood lowest on this discriminant function and were relatively distant from the other occupational groups.

**Biographical Factors**

The relationship between biographical factors and the subscales of the SWV has also been examined. Wijting (1969) studied the relationship of background variates and work values among unemployed persons \((TV = 133)\). A canonical regression analysis revealed a relationship \((R_e = .51, p < .05)\) between a criterion composite of Activity Preference \((- .71)\), Job Involvement \((- .58)\), and Social Status of Job \((.43)\), and a predictor composite including sex \((- .51)\), race \((- .28)\), education \((- .45)\), urban versus rural background \((- .28)\), parents' education \((.31)\), and amount of police trouble \((.38)\). The criterion composite reflected an emphasis on the social rewards of being employed but a devaluation of activity and involvement on the job. The corresponding predictor composite described a white, rural, poor male whose family has had some police trouble and who has had less education than his parents.

Goodale (1969a) performed a similar analysis but with different predictors and civil service employees \((N = 342)\). This study analyzed subscales determined by both methods. For

\[\text{All loadings used to interpret the vectors are correlations of the variable with its composite rather than canonical regression weights.}\]
the allocated subscales, Attitude toward Earnings (.75), Activity Preference (−.56), and Social Status of Job (−.43), were related \( (R_a = .51, p < .001) \) to race (−.65), occupational level (−.60), area of the country from which the person came (−.55), and supervisory level (.42). The combination of predictors, describing a negro whose parents came from the South and who held a low-level, nonsupervisory job, was associated with high attitude toward earnings, low preference for activity at work, and low social status of being employed. In the analysis of factored subscales, Attitude toward Earnings (.73), Organization-Man Ethic (−.54), and Conventional Ethic (−.48) were related \( (R_a = .50, p < .001) \) to race (−.65), area of the country from which the person came (−.48), occupational level (−.37), marital status (−.29), and supervisory level (.35). This pair of composites was characteristic of a married Negro; raised in the South; occupying a low-level, nonsupervisory job; who placed great value on earnings but did not subscribe to the Organization-Man Ethic or the Conventional Ethic.

**Summary**

The SWV has met some of the common criteria (Nunnally, 1967) for construct validity. First, the success of the reallocation procedure demonstrated that the six work values are discriminably different from one another and that the items well represent the constructs that they were intended to measure. Second, the internal consistencies of the subscales are relatively high in view of the small number of items comprising each subscale. Third, SWV scores have discriminated meaningfully among occupational groups and have correlated substantially with background variables that have been associated with other measures of work values. The SWV is, in its present format, considered to be a useful research tool. Work is currently under way to improve the scale and to investigate new scoring techniques.
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