2005

Work values comparison : Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians in Silicon Valley

Kamini Kumar
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Kumar, Kamini, "Work values comparison : Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians in Silicon Valley" (2005). *Master's Theses*. 2856.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.d3nc-5pkv>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2856

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

WORK VALUES COMPARISON: CAUCASIAN AMERICANS AND ASIAN
INDIANS IN SILICON VALLEY

A Thesis

Presented to

The Department of Psychology

San Jose State University

In Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Kamini Kumar

December 2005

UMI Number: 1432474

Copyright 2005 by
Kumar, Kamini

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1432474

Copyright 2006 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2005

Kamini Kumar

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Megumi Hosoda, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology
San Jose State University

Howard Tokunaga, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Psychology
San Jose State University

Medha Chandra, Ph.D.
Pesticide Action Network North America
San Francisco

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

WORK VALUES COMPARISON: CAUCASIAN AMERICANS AND ASIAN INDIANS IN SILICON VALLEY

By Kamini Kumar

A multicultural work environment emphasizes the need to understand work values of employees. Thus, work values of Asian Indian and Caucasian American employees in the Silicon Valley were compared in the present study. Furthermore, it was also hypothesized that the length of stay in a host country (i.e., U.S.) would have an impact on the work values of Asian Indians. Results showed that Asian Indians rated work dimensions of stability, coworker, social responsibility, and ability utilization as more important and variety as less important than Caucasian Americans. The impact of length of residence in the U.S. on the work values of Asian Indian employees was found only in the dimension of variety such that Asian Indians who had lived in the U.S. for less than three years rated the dimension of variety less important than Caucasian Americans. The implications of these findings are discussed.

Table of Contents

SECTION	PAGE
Introduction	1
<i>Positive Outcomes of Work Value Fit Between Individual and Organization</i>	4
<i>Work Values Defined</i>	5
<i>Work Value Models</i>	6
<i>Factors Influencing Work Values</i>	9
<i>Culture</i>	9
<i>American work values</i>	11
<i>Indian work values</i>	12
<i>Length of Stay</i>	15
<i>The Present Study</i>	16
Method	20
<i>Participants</i>	20
<i>Procedures</i>	20
<i>Measures</i>	21
Results	24
Table 1 <i>Descriptive Statistics for Work Value Dimensions as a Function of Overall</i>	
<i>Sample and Ethnicity</i>	24
Table 2 <i>Correlations Among all Work Value Dimensions</i>	27

Table 3 <i>Descriptive Statistics for Work Value Dimensions as a Function of Length of Stay in the U.S.</i>	30
Discussion	31
<i>Overall Importance of Work Values</i>	32
<i>Asian Indians</i>	33
<i>Supported Dimensions</i>	33
<i>Unsupported Dimensions or in the Opposite Direction</i>	33
<i>Caucasian Americans</i>	34
<i>Unsupported Dimensions or in the Opposite Direction</i>	35
<i>Length of Stay</i>	35
<i>Implications of the Study</i>	36
<i>Strength and Limitations of the Study</i>	36
<i>Conclusion</i>	39
References	40
Appendix: Consent Form and Questionnaires	50
<i>Consent Form</i>	51
<i>Work Values Questionnaire</i>	53
<i>Demographic Information</i>	56

List of Tables

Table 1 *Descriptive Statistics for Work Value Dimensions as a Function of Overall Sample and Ethnicity*

Table 2 *Correlations Among all Work Value Dimensions*

Table 3 *Descriptive Statistics for Work Value Dimensions as a Function of Length of Stay in the U.S.*

Introduction

Due to globalization, society is becoming increasingly diverse, and inter-ethnic contact occurs everyday (Bochner, 1994). Such is the case with the United States, especially in states like California, New York, and Florida. Much of this inter-ethnic contact is a result of new immigrants who come into the U.S. The most recent trend of immigrants has been from India. There has been a large influx of Asian Indians in the Silicon Valley due to the recent boom in the hi-tech industry. According to Brenner, Blazini, and Greenhaus (1988), the diverse workforce reinforces the need to understand their employees' work values. However, in spite of more than a decade of influx from the Indian sub-continent, to the author's knowledge, no study has examined what work values this group brings to the American workplace. Additionally, there are no studies comparing the work values of this ethnic group with those of the White majority group to investigate if there are differences in work values between the two groups.

A considerable amount of research has been conducted in the area of work values. For example, some researchers (e.g., English & English, 1958; Knoop, 1991; Lofquist & Dawis, 1978; Pine & Innis, 1987; Super, 1973) have focused on the definition of work values and others have developed work value models (Elizur, Borg, Hunt, & Beck, 1991; Ginzberg, 1971; Nord, Brief, Atieh, & Doherty, 1988; Hofstede, 1984; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Schwartz, 1999). Some have identified factors that influence work values such as ethnicity (Dillard & Campbell, 1982; Pine & Innis, 1987), gender (Brenner, Blazini & Greenhaus, 1988; Cheung, Chau-Kiu, & Scherling, 1999; Lee, 1984; Pine & Innis, 1987; Singer & Steffle, 1954; Yankelovich, 1979), and age (Wagman,

1965). Still others have tried to explain the importance of value congruence between the organization and the person by showing the effect of value congruence on variables such as job satisfaction (e.g., Cheung & Scherling, 1999; Daniel, 1974; Drummond & Stoddard, 1991; Drummond, McIntire, & Skaggs, 1977; George & Jones, 1996; Knoop, 1991), turnover intention or actual turnover rates (e.g., Wasti, 2003), and organizational commitment (Knoop, 1994). Many researchers (e.g., Andolsek & Stebe, 2004; Hofstede, 1984; Ralston, Holt, Terpstra, & Cheng, 1997; Sagy, 1997; Shapira, Griffith, & Terri, 1990) have also focused on the cross-cultural comparisons of values.

Those with different ethnic backgrounds have often been shown to have different values, beliefs, and attitudes (Hofstede, 1984). Some of these differences include differences in values in general (Oishi, Hahn, Schimmack, Radhakrishnan, Dzokoto, & Ahadi, 2005), ethical values (Alas, 2005), influence strategies (Lacassagne, Castel, & Fu, 2004), personality traits associated with work values (Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, & Garrod, 2005), organizational commitment (Andolsek & Stebe, 2004), and value priorities (Ryckman & Houston, 2003).

However, these comparisons have mainly been at the macro or the country level (Hofstede, 1984). Work values as a construct studied at the macro level focuses on the country or a society as a whole, and thus, most existing cross-cultural research focuses on values instead of work values. Although national or societal values play an important role in determining the nature of work values prevalent in a particular society (Karabati & Say, 2005; Roe & Ester, 1999), it is important to study them at an individual level (Menon, 2004). This is because national values may not be a reliable way to predict

individual work values (Paik & Teagarden, 1995). Organizational policies that take into account individual needs are likely to result in a better fit for the individual, and they also help companies retain their employees and create a more productive environment for them (Gomez, 2004). Therefore, in order to implement the policies that reflect individual needs at work, it is important to understand how these societal or national values translate into individual work values or preferences. In addition, to implement policies that cater to a diverse workforce, it is important to understand a minority group's work values within the larger society where they live.

The Silicon Valley work community is especially ethnically diverse and hosts a number of employees from different parts of the world. Although such a diverse workforce creates many advantages, it also underlines the differences among various subgroups. These differences in the subgroups might create conflicts and interpersonal tension due to misunderstandings, prejudices, or stereotypes against the minority groups. In the work context, these conflicts or misunderstandings could arise from differences in communication styles, or group interaction styles, and at a deeper level from differences in individual work values or preferences. For example, Dolan, Diez-Pinol, Fernandez-Alles, Martin-Prius, and Martinez-Fierro (2004) have suggested that there are large differences along the set of four work values and four life values between two ethnic subgroups within Spain, and have stressed the importance of studying the diverse subcultures within a single country. Likewise, Fischer and Smith (2004) have found that the perceived justice of reward-allocation among employees differs according to what their values are. Earley and Erez (1997) have also noted that uniform managerial interventions

do not work equally in different countries. For example, Saha (1990, as cited in Chakraborty, 1990) points out that in the Indian context, an over-emphasis to recognize individual excellence tends to demotivate employees and reduce group participation and team activities. Group activities are considered important in a collectivistic society such as India, and lack of motivation in group participation tends to spread across group members. Similarly, uniform policies at work may not be successful, especially if the workforce is very diverse and individuals have different values. For example, in a workforce that is comprised of Caucasian Americans and Indians in equal numbers, an over-emphasis on individual performance and achievement might demotivate half of the employees. Simply put, better policies can lead to better outcomes at work.

Positive Outcomes of Work Value Fit Between Individual and Organization

The commonly known outcomes of work value fit between the organization and the employee are increased satisfaction (Daniel, 1974; Knoop, 1994; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1996), motivation, performance, and organizational commitment, and reduced turnover (George & Jones, 1996; Taris, Feij, & Van, 2005; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). Alternatively, Parsons and Jennifer-Gail (2000) have also suggested that the person-organization incongruence can lead to decreased productivity and increased stress. They also state that such incongruence in values should be studied in detail to develop policies that can reduce the perceived incongruence. Work values are more individualized, and because each nation can be made up of many subcultures, we propose that studying the work values of the subcultures might be more beneficial to organizations than taking national values as a

basis for formulating human resource policies. The present study was thus designed to compare the differences, at the micro level, in work values between Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians in Silicon Valley, California.

The questions this study aims to answer are: How do the work values of employees from the two cultures differ? What is the nature of these differences? What effect does the length of stay in a host country (i.e. U.S.) among Asian Indians have on these differences? The answer to these questions might help organizations formulate better policies, procedures, and management styles to suit the diverse population. Additionally, insights from this study could be used to develop effective human resource development strategies (Parsons & Jennifer-Gail, 2000; Yavas, Luqmani, & Quraeshi, 1990) and resolve conflicts at work place pertaining to different ethnic values. The sections that follow briefly explore the definitions, models, and factors of work values that exist in literature.

Work Values Defined

Work values have been defined in numerous ways. For example, English and English (1958) have defined work values as the degree of worth ascribed to a particular work, activity, or an aspect of work (Rao, 1975). Such a definition seems to be similar to the definition of occupational or job preference. Super (1973) defined values as reflecting intrinsically desirable ends or means to ends which motivate people to work. This definition focuses on the preferences or needs that an individual associates with work. Furthermore, Knoop (1991) defined works values as the degree of worth, importance, and desirability of what happens at work (Knoop, 1994). Pine and Innis

(1987) have also defined work values as an individual's needs and priorities, and consequent personal dispositions and orientations to work roles that have the perceived capacity to satisfy those needs and priorities. This study has adopted the definition of work values provided by Walsh et al. (1996) who have described them as qualities or preferences that satisfy needs and priorities in relation to work and other activities (Walsh et al., 1996).

Work Value Models

All of the above mentioned definitions and many other definitions are based on an assumption that work values comprise of many factors or components (George & Jones, 1997). These components are put together in various combinations to create models and frameworks to describe work values in depth and to enable researchers to measure work values as a construct. Various models and frameworks currently exist to understand work values. Let us look at some of the models briefly.

The most commonly used framework of work values is to classify work value as extrinsic and intrinsic dichotomy (George & Jones, 1997; Zytowski, 1994). One definition describes intrinsic work values as desired end-states depending on the content of the work, and extrinsic values as independent of the content of work (George & Jones, 1997). Examples of extrinsic work values include job security, prestige, economic returns, and recognition. Examples of intrinsic work values include independence, individual growth, creativity, altruism, and intellectual stimulation. Psychometric analyses have provided evidence that the majority of work values can be meaningfully classified as either intrinsic or extrinsic (Dagenais, 1998).

A facet definition of work values was suggested by Elizur et al. (1991) and hypotheses were formulated regarding the relationships among the various components or facets of the model. Their definition proposes two facets of work values, namely, modality of outcome and system performance contingency. The modality facet includes instrumental (those aspects of work that have concrete or practical implications such as hours of work, and work conditions), affective (those aspects that deal with interpersonal relations), and cognitive (aspects that are cognitive in nature such as interest, responsibility, and achievement) aspects of work, and the system performance contingency facet includes rewards and resources provided to the employee. After comparing the work values of employees from eight different countries, results showed that the basic structure of work values domain was similar for most of the respondents of these countries and supported their facet model (Elizur et al., 1991).

As mentioned earlier, work values can also be examined from either the macro or micro level. The macro level includes studying a nation or a large group of people who share a common thread or as Durkheim (1938) and later Hofstede (1984) termed "mental programs." Hofstede's (1984) influential work on cross-cultural differences also compared values and attitudes of respondents on several dimensions across different countries. Four value dimensions in his study included: (a) power distance (the degree to which the members of a society accept an unequal distribution of power in that society), (b) uncertainty avoidance (the degree to which the members of a society are uncomfortable with or are threatened by uncertain, ambiguous, or unstructured situations), (c) individualism (the degree to which members of a society focus on

satisfying personal interests over the interests of the group), and (d) masculinity (the degree to which a society values material success, progress, assertiveness, and gender role differences).

Schwartz (1999) structured seven types of values along three dimensions: conservatism versus intellectual and affective autonomy (the degree to which individuals of a society see themselves as being either autonomous or embedded in their group), hierarchy versus egalitarianism (the degree of cultural emphasis on the legitimacy of unequal distribution of power in a society), mastery versus harmony (the degree of cultural emphasis on fitting harmoniously into the environment). Similarly, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) have also distinguished five value orientations to describe cultures (i.e. good-bad, subjugation-mastery, past-future, being-doing, linearity-individualism).

A final framework of work values is based on studying their relation to vocational behavior. Three studies (Lofquist & Dawis, 1978; Pryor, 1981; Pryor, 1982; Super, 1973) have focused on such a framework. Super (1973) defines work values as goals that one seeks to attain in order to satisfy a need. His work value inventory (Super, 1969; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) is the best known instrument for assessing values in terms of vocational behavior, and has been widely used. It has 21 dimensions of work values, including altruism, aesthetics, achievement, intellectual stimulation, prestige, security, and supervisory relationship among others. Similarly, Lofquist and Dawis (1978) have also defined work values as needs which are grouped together according to their underlying commonalities. Their Minnesota Importance Questionnaire delineates six dimensions of work values such as safety, autonomy, altruism, comfort, achievement,

and aggrandizement/status (Dose, 1997; Weiss, Dawis, & Lofquist, 1966). Finally, Pryor conceptualized work values as preferences (1981, 1982) and delineates 12 factors in his Work Aspect Preference Scale. They include security, self-development, altruism, lifestyle, physical activity, detachment, independence, prestige management, coworkers, creativity, and money.

Factors Influencing Work Values

In addition to dimensions and models used to explain work values, many variables have been found to influence work values, including ethnicity (e.g., Dillard & Campbell, 1982; Pine & Innis, 1987), sex roles (e.g., Brenner, Blazini, & Greenhaus, 1988; Lee, 1984; Singer & Stefflre, 1954; Yankelovich, 1979), age (e.g., Wagman, 1965), historical cohorts (e.g., DeVito, Carlson, & Kraus, 1984; Super and Mowry, 1962; Yankelovich, 1979), significant others (e.g., Dillard & Campbell, 1981), society (Pine and Innis 1987; Yankelovich, 1979), religiosity (Sagie, 1998; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961), economic conditions (Pine and Innis 1987; Ralston, et al., 1997; Yankelovich, 1979), time or era (Hines, 2000; Nord, et al., 1988), and the length of stay in a host country (Gupta, 1975; Kuo & Roysircar, 2004; Sonderegger & Barrett, 2004). Among all of these variables, ethnicity or culture and the length of stay in a host country are relevant factors to the present study. Thus, we will review them in more detail.

Culture

Ancient Hebrew philosophers saw work as a product of original sin and valued it as a means of atonement (Nord, et al., 1988). Similarly, the protestant work ethic was not concerned with either the content of work or the work product, but focused on earning

and accumulating wealth as a sign of salvation. Meanwhile, the Indian philosophy considered work as a duty performed by the head of the household in order to serve his family and society (Seth and Seth, 1990, as cited in Chakraborty, 1990). This duty was also prescribed by the religious texts as being congruent with the larger philosophy of how to live life.

Although earlier philosophical work focused on non-secular matters, more current philosophical views focus more on secular outcomes of the process and the content of the work (Nord, et al., 1988). These outcomes include, among others, job security, stability, monetary benefits, means to explore one's abilities, social status, social and familial responsibilities (Nord, et al., 1988).

Work values in a particular culture or society are derived from the individuals in that society (George & Jones, 1997). It is a shared opinion of what they think is the desired work environment or desired benefits of work, or what they expect out of work (Roe & Ester, 1999). Moreover, these shared interpretations could vary depending on societies. For example, whereas some cultures may value individual contribution, other cultures may emphasize team efforts. As mentioned earlier, ethnicity plays an important role in determining the values of a nation as well as the work values of an individual. However, even the defining characters of a culture such as relationship between members of the society, philosophy of life, approach to earning money, and so on are constantly undergoing changes due to the increasingly global society we all live in. The dominant group in any society has a strong influence on the minority groups in that society and the minority group also has some impact on the dominant group. Thus, it is important to

study the interaction of work values of specific minority groups with respect to the majority groups' values.

American work values

The western work ethic is based on the competitive spirit (Ghei, 1997; Hofstede, 1984; Uichol, 1995). Each person thinks for himself or herself from an early age. Primary importance is given to individual ambition, and secondary importance is given to cooperation and team effort. Schwartz (1999) conducted a cross-cultural comparison study of 49 nations, and found that Americans were high on the dimension of Affective Autonomy, Intellectual Autonomy (vs. Conservatism), and Mastery (vs. Harmony), and fell somewhere in the middle in terms of preference for a hierarchical or egalitarian society. These findings are comparable to other theories that Americans value more freedom in expressing their affective and intellectual capabilities. Similarly, United States tends to be an individualistic society (Hofstede, 1984; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Parson & Shills, 1951; Rafferty and Tapsell, 2001; Ralston, et al., 1997).

A similar conclusion about the American work values can be drawn using Hines' (2000) theory that examines the economic status of countries to assess their values. Rich nations have postmodern values focused on developing the individual's potential. Hofstede has also shown that the U.S. population has a high tolerance for ambiguity. Similar results were obtained by Ralston, Holt, Terpstra, and Kai-Cheng (1997). Most of these studies have inferred work values from values of the individual or group, instead of studying work values as a separate construct. However, only the study by Despain, Leinicke, Ostrosky, and Rexroad (2003) has examined at the work values of employees at

a specific location. Employees at Caterpillar were found to emphasize values such as independence, autonomy, and pride in their work. These findings probably reflect work values of U.S. at a micro level.

Indian work values

The ideal society in ancient India is often spoken in terms of a benevolent social order of the great mythological King Ram. The key principle for this order was “Dharma” or duty that guided action (Chatterjee & Pearson, 2000). These duties are performed by “Karmayoga” or the path of sincere work sacrificing any fruits/results and attachment to the fruits/results and to personal desires (Ganguly, 1990, as cited in Chakraborty, 1990). Material prosperity and satisfaction are important, but only until a certain point. Wealth is used to provide for the reasonable needs of the family and any surplus is used for the common good of all (Seth & Seth, 1990, as cited in Chakraborty, 1990).

Another system that impacted this philosophy of work came later and is well known as the caste system. The caste system divided the social order into four groups that were placed in a hierarchy, and each group was charged with specific work and responsibilities towards the maintenance of total society. If one fulfilled the functions and roles of the prescribed position, one would achieve material rewards and fulfillment of personal desires, and would eventually attain liberation from all worldly pairs of opposites (e.g., pleasure-pain) to merge with the Ultimate Truth (Bal, 1991). Although in theory and for a few centuries this notion probably worked well, soon the reality of

suppression of one caste by another became more evident as people started to exploit the rules to their own good.

Thus, the ancient Indian work ethic can be characterized using some of the following terms: identification with others, seeking the common good, self-restraint, self-sacrifice, and importance of family and society as basis of work (Saha, 1990, as cited in Chakraborty, 1990). The ancient Indian mode of living also represents a spirit of collectivism and disdains individualism.

In the 18th and 19th centuries, the long colonization of India by the British brought its own set of value systems. The British tended to exploit the hierarchical nature of the caste system to their benefit, and in addition, brought in the work values of a colonial era (Zwart, 2000). More recently, five decades of independence from the British rule have resulted in vast changes in the work environment. Much of this change has been due to the gradual decline of the importance of caste system, and hence more inter-caste mobility, both in the personal sphere and in the work sphere. In other words, people are more likely to marry a person of another caste now than before, and almost no restrictions on the professional choice based on the caste system exist (Seth, 1990, as cited in Chakraborty, 1990).

As with the American work values, the Indian work values have also received little research attention. In comparing 49 countries, Schwartz (1999) found Indians to value hierarchy in the hierarchy-egalitarianism dimension. Many other cross-national studies have not focused on India to study the eastern work philosophy. Very few cross-cultural studies were found pertaining to India (Schwartz, 1991; Sinha & Sinha, 1990). It

is difficult to use the results of these studies because the social, economic, and political climate in India has changed since then and thus the national, individual, and work values might have also changed. Seth (as cited in Chakraborty, 1990) argues that the individual feels increasingly oppressed by the organization in relation to his or her personal and social interests in today's liberal democratic milieu. The growing demands of new technology and the economics of scarcity appear to reduce individual freedom in the organization. The consumerist culture of modern technology emphasizes status and power through acquisition of wealth and compels man to seek the satisfaction of incessantly growing material needs.

It appears that many layers of values exist in India's old and complex society, and it is thus difficult to describe the current state of work values in the Indian context. What can be said about the society is that the social and economic reforms of decades of independence have resulted in the homogenization of the social structure, technological advances, increased consumerism, use of mass media, foreign investment, changing infrastructure, and importantly urbanization and globalization of work values and values in general (Chatterjee & Pearson, 2000). With all the traditional values and the current modernization of India, the cultural and work values might be in transition.

It is important to remember that values, especially work values, can and do change over time as the social, economic, and political conditions of the cultures change. The increased cross-cultural contact at both the work and non-work settings also has an impact on work values. This means that continuous research on current work values of a particular culture or society is needed. However, this is not the case in literature. There

is a paucity of research on American and Asian Indian values, especially as compared to different cultures. Even those that have been conducted in the past have tended to be either on a student population or a cross national comparison as stated above (Vondracek, Shimizu, Schulenberg, Hostetler, & Sakayanagi, 1990; Uichol, 1995; Hofstede, 1980; Shimon, Miriam, MariLuz, Antonio, & Salustiano, 2004). Thus, this study compares the Caucasian American work values with the Asian Indian work values in a cross cultural setting.

Length of Stay

Work values are also affected by values that prevail in the society in a particular time and hence when these conditions change with the social, economic, or political climate, work values will also change (Nord et al., 1988; Yu & Miller, 2003). It is also true that work values of one era will influence the work values of the next era. Thus, they need to be measured not only for different cultures or societies, but also from one era to another. How different each generation is from the previous one(s) depends on the amount of changes the society has gone through. Economic prosperity of a society in general also affects the values of that society (Ingelhart & Abramson, 1994). Every society has seen the ups and downs of the economic tide. When jobs are plentiful and the economy is booming for sustained periods of time, higher order values centering on social concerns, beauty, service to others, and self-actualization dominate (Pine & Innis, 1987). Conversely, survival values will dominate in times of financial and job insecurity.

In the context of the different cultures being studied, it is important to note that not only do the values of a nation and consequently its work values change with time, but

the process of acculturation into a new society might result in a change in an individual's work values over time. Acculturation is the process whereby individuals from one culture adopt the characteristics and values of another culture with which they have come in contact. The rate and degree of acculturation is often a function of the passage of time, and with time, such differences tend to be resolved if not reduced (Heine & Lehman, 2004). Many studies (e.g., Roysircar, 2003; Selmer, 1996) have shown that one's values and attitudes have a significant impact on the host culture.

Successive generations have different values (Yu & Miller, 2003), hence ongoing research is needed to better understand values associated with each generation. Every generation passes on their interpretations of work values to the next generation. These, in turn, are influenced by the prevailing social, economic, and political conditions. Similar value shifts have been observed by Ingelhart and Abramson (1994) who assert the transition of American values from materialist to the post-materialist values. Roe and Ester (1999) have documented general value changes in various European and North American countries. In the area of work values (Ralston, Egri, Stewart, Terpstra, & Cheng, 1999), partial changes have been noted by researchers such as an increase in the values of personal development. Thus this study also explores the impact of number of years spent in the U.S. on the work values of Asian Indians as compared to the work values of Caucasian Americans.

The Present Study

Instead of comparing groups of employees at a macro-level, the present study was designed to compare the work values of two groups of employees who worked in one

industry. Additionally, the present study was designed to examine if work value differences reduce over time as a function of the length of stay of Asian Indians in the U.S. Several studies (e.g., Berman, 1985; Calman, 2004; Mortimer & Lorence, 1979) have stressed the dynamic qualities of work values, suggesting that they change over a period of time. Similarly, values of expatriate and local managers may converge through interaction and socialization (Lee & Larwood, 1983; Yavas, Luqmani, & Quraeshi, 1990). The rate and degree of assimilation of the Asian Indian group into the American society may not only depend on perceived and/or actual similarities and the dissimilarities between the values of the two groups, but also depend on the number of people in the subgroup population. It is assumed that the larger the population of the minority group, the less assimilation will occur among the members of that group. Due to the abundant interactions with other members of their own group, the need to assimilate into the larger group or society would be reduced. It can then be reasonably assumed that at least the process of acculturation slows down and the minority group members might take longer to fully assimilate into the dominant society.

The Asian Indian population in America grew 106 percent from 1990 to 2000 according to the 2000 census (Chhabra, 2001). This increase was way ahead of other Asian American communities and the census reports of 2000 lists the Asian Indian population at 1.7 million. As the population increases, it is possible to assume that they are retaining more and more of their subgroup culture. This means that their values may not change for a long time. This might be true, especially among predominantly first generation Indians.

Additionally, the second generation of the subgroup assimilates the dominant groups' culture more easily. The reason for this is that several researchers (Berman, 1985; Nord, et al., 1988) have pointed out that most values are formed in the impressionable ages of a childhood and adolescence. Based on their studies of English workers, Goldthrope and his associates (1969) claim that work values precede the work situation, and that these values are different for different cultures. Thus, it is our contention that Asian Indians who come to the U.S. and who are younger are likely to assimilate the values and culture of the dominant group easily, and, in turn, adjust to their surroundings much faster than older Asian Indian immigrants.

The questions addressed in the present study include how ethnicity and time (i.e., the length of stay) are related to the work values of Asian Indians. More specifically, how different are these values from the dominant group? Is the length of stay in the U.S. related to their work values? Additionally, do Indian work values tend to become similar to the Caucasian American work values with time? The present study addressed the questions of (a) how are the work values of Asian Indians different from those of Caucasian Americans, and (b) how do the work values of Indians change as a function of the length of stay in the U.S. The following hypotheses were tested in the present study.

Hypothesis1: There will be differences between the work values of Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians in the dimensions of (a) supervisor, (b) responsibility, (c) ability utilization, (d) social responsibility, (e) independent growth, (f) respect, (g) coworker, (h) variety, (i) stability, (j) working environment, and (k) being accountable for others. More specifically, compared

to Caucasian Americans, Asian Indians will place higher value on the dimensions of (a) supervisor, (b) social responsibility, (c) respect, (d) coworker, (e) stability, and (f) being accountable for others. In contrast, compared to Asian Indians, Caucasian Americans will place higher value on the dimensions of (a) responsibility, (b) ability utilization, (c) independent growth, (d) working environment, and (e) variety. Both Asian Indians and Caucasian Americans will score similarly on the dimensions of (a) accomplishment, (b) professional advancement, and (c) compensation as they seem to be equally important to both cultures.

Hypothesis 2: The differences between the two groups will reduce over time.

There will be a difference in work values of Asian Indians who have been in the U.S. less than three years as compared to Caucasian Americans and this difference will reduce over time. More specifically, there will be a significant difference in the dimensions of (a) supervisor, (b) responsibility, (c) ability utilization, (d) social responsibility, (e) independent growth, (f) respect, (g) coworker, (h) variety, (i) stability, (j) working environment, and (k) being accountable for others. These differences will reduce with time and, hence, work values of Asian Indians who have lived in the U.S. for more than three years would be similar to the work values of Caucasian Americans.

Method

Participants

A total of 120 employees from various hi-tech companies in the Silicon Valley were contacted to participate in the study, and 104 surveys were returned, with a response rate of 82.5%. However, only 99 responses were usable because some of the respondents were not in the technical field or they were not either Caucasian Americans or Asian Indians. Among them, 47 (47.5%) were Caucasian American and 52 (52.5%) were Asian Indians.

Of these participants, 76 (76.8%) were male and 23 (23.2%) were female. The average age of the participants was 29.73, ranging from 22 years old to 48 years old ($SD = 4.49$). Participants worked at various hi-tech companies in the Silicon Valley. The average number of years of work experience was 7.3 ($SD = 4.25$) and the average tenure in the present company was 1.96 years ($SD = 1.6$). Most of the participants had a college degree (66.1%, $n = 66$). A substantial number of the participants also had a graduate degree (34.4%) and a very few had a post graduate/doctoral degree (2.9%, $n = 3$). There was one participant (1.0%) who had only an associate's degree. Among the Asian Indian participants, the average number of years in the U.S. was 5.5 ($SD = 6.16$).

Procedures

All participants were contacted personally. Participants were friends and acquaintances of the investigator. The study was explained to each participant by stating that it was comparing the work values of Caucasian Americans and those of Asian

Indians, and was part of her master's thesis. They were then asked to fill out a questionnaire and told that it would take them about 25 minutes to complete it. When the participants agreed to participate in the study, they were asked to read and sign a consent form. The surveys were collected over a long time period (Sept 2001 – Sept 2002) to ensure a high participation rate. Questionnaires were voluntary and anonymous.

Measures

Work values. Work values were measured using a questionnaire with 51 items. These items are based on the Work Values Inventory (Super, 1973) and the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1966) as well as items developed for the present study. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of agreement for each item on a 6-point Likert type scale (1 = *Not at all important*, 6= *Extremely important*). Items are listed in Appendix. The 51 items were classified into 14 dimensions based on the nature of the value being tested. Item scores in each dimension were added and then averaged. Thus, the higher the score for a particular dimension, the more important it was.

Stability. Stability was measured by three items. Items include “Knowing that I have a stable job,” “Having a guaranteed income,” and “Having high job security.” Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .85.

Social responsibility. Social responsibility was measured by three items. Items include “Being able to help others,” “Being able to contribute to society,” and “Working for a company that contributes to the society.” Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .76.

Variety. Variety was measured by three items. Items include “Doing many different things on the job,” “Having a challenging and exciting job,” “Doing a variety of things on my job.” Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .75.

Ability utilization. Ability utilization was measured by four items. Examples of such items include “Being able to utilize my abilities on the job,” and “Being able to utilize my knowledge on the job”. Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .73.

Professional advancement. Professional advancement was measured by five items. Examples of such items include “Being able to get ahead on the job,” “Having a position of authority,” “Having a lot of opportunities for advancement,” and “Being able to learn and grow in my work”. Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .70.

Compensation. Compensation was measured by three items. Examples of such items include “Having a good compensation package,” and “Being rewarded for good performance.” Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .68.

Responsibility. Responsibility was measured by four items. Examples of such items include “Having a lot of responsibilities,” “Being able to take risks in my job,” and “Being able to influence others.” Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .62.

Independent growth. Independent growth was measured by four items. Examples of such items include “Being able to try my own way of doing things,” “Having the opportunity of expressing myself fully and creatively,” and “Having a lot of autonomy in doing my work.” Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .59.

Respect. Respect was measured by five items. Examples of such items include “Being valued as an important employee,” “Working for a company that I am proud of,”

“Working with people I like and respect,” and “Knowing that I am respected in my work group.” Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .56.

Working environment. Working environment was measured by seven items. Examples of such items include “Having good working conditions,” “Being able to avoid working overtime or on the weekends,” “Being in a comfortable working environment,” and “Having a job that allows me time with my family.” Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .55.

Accomplishment. Accomplishment was measured by two items. Items include “Being able to do high quality work” and “Having a sense of accomplishment for a job well done.” Correlation coefficient for this dimension was .52.

Coworker. Coworker was measured by four items. Examples of such items include “Getting support and feedback from my coworkers,” and “Getting along with my coworkers.” Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .47.

Supervisor. Supervisor was measured by three items. Items include “Having a fair and considerate supervisor,” “Receiving feedback from my supervisory on my work,” and “Having a supervisor I can respect.” Cronbach alpha for this dimension was .44.

Being accountable for others. Being accountable for others was measured by only one item. This item was “Not having to be accountable for others.”

Results

Table 1 below demonstrates descriptive statistics of each measured dimension, including overall means and means separated by the ethnic groups. As can be seen in the table, the average importance of the dimensions ranged from 3.21 (being accountable for others) to 5.32 (Accomplishment) for the overall sample. The participants viewed being accountable for others as the least important work value dimension and a sense of accomplishment as the most important work value dimension. Participants also rated respect, professional advancement, supervisor, ability utilization as important work value dimensions. The same trend was seen when Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians work value dimensions were examined separately.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Work Value Dimensions as a Function of Overall Sample and Ethnicity

Dimensions	Overall		Ethnic Groups				F
			Caucasian Americans		Asian Indians		
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Variety	4.58	.84	4.83	.65	4.36	.94	8.30*
Work Environment	4.70	.62	4.58	.60	4.81	.63	3.73
Respect	4.86	.61	4.93	.47	4.81	.72	.94
Social Responsibility	3.96	1.04	3.57	.96	4.31	.98	14.61**
Coworker	4.38	.69	4.10	.51	4.63	.73	17.46**
Accomplishment	5.32	.54	5.32	.57	5.33	.51	.01

Table 1 (Contd.)

Dimensions	Overall		Ethnic Groups				F
			Caucasian Americans		Asian Indians		
Professional Advancement	4.85	.61	4.8	.62	4.9	.61	.56
Supervisor	4.96	.66	5.04	.51	4.90	.77	1.08
Compensation	4.85	.77	4.87	.63	4.83	.88	.085
Responsibility	4.21	.82	4.03	.83	4.38	.79	4.57*
Stability	4.34	1.15	3.97	1.17	4.66	1.05	9.38*
Independent Growth	4.41	.80	4.54	.76	4.30	.83	2.41
Accountable for Others	3.21	1.35	2.83	1.32	3.56	1.3	7.58*
Ability Utilization	4.90	.74	4.73	.73	5.05	.72	4.78*

n = 99

* $p < .05$, ** $p = < .001$

Table 2 presents the intercorrelations among the measured work value dimensions. Listed below are some of correlations that were strongly or moderately related to each other according to Cohen's criteria ($r = .5$ strong, $r = .3$ moderate, and $r = .1$ small relationship). Variety was strongly related to respect, professional advancement, independent growth, and ability utilization, moderately related to compensation, work environment, supervisor, social responsibility, accomplishment, and responsibility. Work environment was strongly related to not accountable for others, and moderately related to respect, social responsibility, coworker, professional advancement, supervisor, compensation, stability, and ability utilization. Respect was strongly related to coworker, supervisor, and stability, and moderately related to ability utilization, independent

growth, responsibility, compensation, professional advancement, and social responsibility. Social responsibility was strongly related to coworker, responsibility, and ability utilization, and moderately related to not accountable for others, stability, and supervisor. Coworker was strongly related to stability and moderately related to responsibility and supervisor. Accomplishment was moderately related to professional advancement, supervisor, and responsibility. Professional advancement was strongly related to independent growth, and moderately related to compensation, responsibility, and ability utilization. Supervisor was moderately related to compensation and accountable for others. Responsibility was strongly related to ability utilization and moderately related to stability and independent growth. Stability was moderately related to accountable for others.

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be a significant difference in work values between Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians in the Silicon Valley high-tech industry. More specifically, Asian Indians were hypothesized to consider the dimensions of (a) supervisor, (b) social responsibility, (c) respect, (d) coworker, (e) stability, and (f) being accountable for others more important than Caucasian Americans. In contrast, Caucasian Americans were hypothesized to consider the dimensions of (a) responsibility, (b) ability utilization, (c) independent growth, (d) working environment, and (e) variety more important than Asian Indians. Both Asian Indians and Caucasian Americans were hypothesized to rate the dimensions of (a) accomplishment, (b) professional advancement, and (c) compensation similarly as these seem to be equally important to both cultures.

Table 2
Correlations Among all Work Value Dimensions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Variety	--													
2. Work Environment	.30**	--												
3. Respect	.53**	.34**	--											
4. Social Responsibility	.26*	.41**	.37**	--										
5. Coworker	.14	.42**	.49**	.49**	--									
6. Accomplishment	.26*	.19	.27*	.14	.19	--								
7. Professional Advancement	.56*	.33**	.43**	.20*	.14	.40**	--							
8. Supervisor	.37**	.43**	.48**	.30**	.36**	.25*	.20*	--						
9. Compensation	.40**	.39*	.35**	.07	.08	-.05	.34**	.33**	--					
10. Responsibility	.27**	.09	.43**	.55**	.42**	.27**	.30**	.21*	-.09	--				
11. Stability	.06	.39**	.46**	.38**	.48**	.09	.12	.14	.20	.29**	--			
12. Independent Growth	.48**	.06	.39**	.20*	.18	.22*	.47**	.17	.08	.35**	-.08	--		
13. Not Accountable for Others	-.01	.47**	.15	.32**	.23*	.07	.11	.28**	.16	.01	.33**	.02	--	
14. Ability Utilization	.49**	.30**	.29**	.65**	.16	.22*	.31**	.21*	.14	.40**	.21*	.12	.08	--

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

This hypothesis was tested using a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with ethnicity (American Caucasian vs. Asian Indian) as a quasi-independent variable, followed by an analysis of variance (ANOVA) using Type I error rate of .005. Results of the MANOVA showed a significant difference between the two groups, Wilks' $\lambda = .443$, $F(14, 84) = 7.54$, $p < .001$.

ANOVAs showed that these two groups differed on seven out of the 14 dimensions; variety, $F(1, 97) = 8.30$, $p = .005$, social responsibility, $F(1, 97) = 14.61$, $p < .001$, coworker, $F(1, 97) = 17.45$, $p < .001$, stability $F(1, 97) = 9.38$, $p < .005$. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, Asian Indians had a higher mean for the dimensions of social responsibility, coworker, and stability than Caucasian Americans. However, Asian Indians did not rate the dimensions of supervisor, respect, and being accountable for others as more important than Caucasian Americans. Likewise, consistent with Hypothesis 1, Caucasian Americans rated only the dimension of variety more important than Asian Indians. Caucasian Americans did not rate on the dimensions of responsibility, ability utilization, independent growth, and working environment as more important than Asian Indians. These findings suggest that Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians did not differ on the dimensions of work environment, respect, accomplishment, professional advancement, supervisor, compensation, and independent growth, being accountable for others, responsibility, and ability utilization.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the length of stay in the U.S. would impact Asian Indian's work values. More specifically, it stated that there would be a significant

difference in work values of Asian Indians who have been in the U.S. less than three years as compared to Caucasian Americans and this difference will reduce over time. In order to test this hypothesis, the Asian Indian group was divided into two groups; those who had lived in the U.S. for more than three years and those who had lived for less than three years. Based on informal conversations with many Asian Indians, it seemed that it took them about an average of one and a half years to overcome the culture shock and accommodate to the life in the U.S. Additionally, it seemed to take an average of another one and a half years of assimilation to the dominant groups' values.

ANOVAs followed by Bonferroni tests using Type I error rate of .005 were conducted to measure differences between Caucasian Americans and those Asian Indians with less than three years of residence and between Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians with more than three years of residence in the U.S.

Table 3 shows the results of ANOVAs and reveals that only the dimension of variety was significant at the .005 level. Subsequent Bonferroni tests showed that Caucasian Americans rated the dimension of variety more important than Asian Indians with less than three years of residence in the U.S. and this difference was significant ($M = -.72^{**}$). The difference between Caucasian Americans and those Asian Indians with more than three years of residence was not significant ($M = -.37$).

A closer look at the pattern of the means indicates that this difference seemed to lessen when the years of residence in the U.S. was increased to more than three years. Thus, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Work Value Dimensions as a Function of Length of Stay in the U.S.

Dimensions	Caucasian Americans		Asian Indians (< 3 yrs of residence)		Asian Indians (>= 3 yrs of residence)		F
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Variety	4.88	.65	4.16	.98	4.53	.79	7.37**
Work Environment	4.62	.65	4.62	.64	4.94	.71	2.63
Respect	4.95	.49	4.73	.60	4.87	.81	1.10
Social Responsibility	3.7	1.1	4.36	.88	9.96	.97	3.69*
Coworker	4.17	.65	4.64	.67	4.44	.69	4.50*
Accomplishment	5.4	.55	5.21	.54	5.32	.50	1.15
Professional Advancement	4.83	.61	4.88	.62	4.84	.65	.07
Supervisor	5.06	.53	4.71	.88	5.08	.49	3.09*
Compensation	4.86	.63	4.66	.99	5.05	.66	1.83
Responsibility	4.09	.87	4.47	.74	4.13	.79	2.10
Stability	3.98	1.18	4.71	.99	4.55	1.13	4.43*
Independent Growth	4.56	.81	4.22	.75	4.38	.83	1.63
Accountable for Others	2.82	1.35	3.55	1.35	3.52	1.23	3.59*
Ability Utilization	4.79	.76	5.08	.83	4.9	.54	1.36

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Discussion

Previous studies (Hofstede, 2002; Harris & Ghauri, 2000; Offermann, & Hellmann, 1997) have studied national values in general or have studied work values of employees in different countries (Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, & Garrod, 2005; Kirkman, & Shapiro, 2001; Ardichvili, & Gasparishvili, 2001). They have also compared work values of different races, cultures, and gender in terms of the values they hold. Culture and values have a reciprocal and cyclical influence on each other. Most cultures undergo changes and thus their values change as well. These changes over time could be due to political, economic, sociological factors. Although national or societal values can help in predicting individual work values, they are not reliable if used exclusively as some individual work values can differ from general values. However, there is a paucity of research in the area of individual work values. The changing nature of work values as a function of time (Berman, 1985; Mortimer & Lorence, 1979), acculturation (Lee & Larwood, 1983; Yavas, Luqmani, & Quraeshi, 1990) or interaction and socialization with the host culture necessitates such ongoing research.

The main questions of our study were whether the work values of Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians are significantly different as they belong to different cultures and if these differences reduce or resolve over time. Answers to differences in work values as a function of ethnicity and time may help organizations formulate better policies, procedures, and management styles to accommodate the diverse population (Parsons, 2000; Yavas, Luqmani, & Quraeshi, 1990).

Therefore, the major purposes of the study were to (a) compare the work values of Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians on various work value dimensions, and (b) examine how the length of stay among Asian Indians in the U.S. influence their work values.

Overall Importance of Work Values

By far the most valued work value for both groups was the dimension of accomplishment. Both Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians also rated supervisor, ability utilization, respect, and compensation as relatively important. Perhaps, these are the dimensions that are highly valued, regardless of the ethnicity of employees. Alternatively, these findings might be a reflection of the nature of the sample in the present study. The participants were relatively young and most of them were male. Additionally, the participants were from the hi-tech industry. Such a sample might be more career-oriented, ambitious, and eager to advance in their careers (Brenner, 1988).

The least valued dimensions were those of being accountable for others and social responsibility. The dimension of being accountable for others measured the dislike of being accountable for other. This could mean that participants did not mind being accountable for others. In addition, the social responsibility was rated low by both Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians. Perhaps social responsibility is not a work value central to employees who work in for-profit organizations as compared to employees of non-profit organizations (“Exploring employee recruitment and retention by non-profit organizations”, n.d.).

Asian Indians

Asian Indians were hypothesized to rate the dimensions of (a) supervisor, (b) social responsibility, (c) respect, (d) coworker, (e) stability, and (f) accountable for others as more important than Caucasian Americans. Consistent with the hypothesis, they scored higher on the dimensions of coworker, social responsibility, and stability than Caucasian Americans.

Supported Dimensions

India is known to be a collectivistic society (Bordia & Blau, 2003; Kapoor, Hughes, Baldwin, & Blue, 2003) and Indian employees are said to work well in team projects and in work environments where group efforts are rewarded (Sinha, 1982). Because Asian Indians place great importance to groups and group involvement, colleagues and coworkers at work become an integral part of their work experience. This importance of group is also true in a larger context where their concern for their bigger group, their society, is also high. Results of this study support this assertion and Asian Indian participants rated the dimensions of coworker and social responsibility higher than Caucasian Americans. Additionally, work is seen as a means to support something important for Indians (Sinha, 1982), which is their family. Therefore, stability and security of job is of high importance to them as well.

Unsupported Dimensions or in the Opposite Direction

Although no specific research exists to show where India lies on Hofstede's power distance spectrum (Hofstede, 1984), many studies have pointed to the hierarchical nature of the Indian society (Sinha, 1982) and have also linked the Indian supervisor-

subordinate relationship to the Japanese supervisor-subordinate relationship (Punekar, 1989; Sinha, 1982). Thus, it was hypothesized that Asian Indians would rate the dimensions of supervisor and respect as more important than Caucasian Americans. However, this was not the case. Although there were no significant differences between the two groups, Caucasian Americans tended to score higher on both dimensions. This finding provides important clues as to the underlying factors in determining importance of work values. The relatively high importance given to the dimension of supervisor by Caucasian Americans may be attributed to the high importance that is given to performance appraisals and hence the increased value of the supervisor-subordinate relationship. It is also the researcher's observation that people in the U.S. earn respect by their actions as opposed to India where respect is a function of the position held in a company. Therefore, Caucasian Americans may attribute more importance to the dimension of respect as measured by the items (e.g., "Being valued as an important employee" and "knowing that I am respected in my work group"). A respected person in an American organization speaks more towards the character of the employee as opposed to the position he or she is in as compared to the Indian organization.

Caucasian Americans

Although Caucasian Americans were hypothesized to value the dimensions of (a) responsibility, (b) ability utilization, (c) independent growth, (d) working environment, and (e) variety as more important than Asian Indians, this hypothesis was not supported. Caucasian Americans only scored higher on the dimension of variety than Asian Indians. This might be because employees in Western nations have shown to have a high

tolerance for ambiguity (Hofstede, 1984), especially Americans. This means that they need to be able to change the focus of their tasks a little bit everyday, to keep their interest levels high. This is also consistent with previous research (Alas, 2005) that shows traditional capitalist countries to have a high need for work that is interesting for their jobs to be perceived as satisfying.

Unsupported Dimensions or in the Opposite Direction

Although, we had hypothesized that Caucasian Americans would score higher on (a) responsibility, (b) working environment, and (c) independent growth, surprisingly, the results showed that it was the Asian Indians who tended to score higher on these dimensions. However, these differences were not significant. Caucasian Americans in the Silicon Valley also seem to strive more for work life balance as the pace of work life is also seen as more frenetic than elsewhere in the U.S. This may be the reason why they hold less value for increasing responsibilities at the work place (White, 2003).

Length of Stay

Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be a significant difference in work values of Asian Indians who have been in the U.S. less than three years as compared to Caucasian Americans and this difference will reduce over time. Hence, it was hypothesized that Asian Indians who have been in the U.S. for more than three years would have values similar or closer to the Caucasian Americans and therefore the differences between these two groups would not be significant. This hypothesis was not supported.

The effect of time was only significant for the dimension of variety. There was a significant difference between Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians who had lived

less than three years, and this difference reduced as the length of stay in the U.S. increased. Thus we can say that Asian Indians who stay in the U.S. for more than three years place greater importance on the value of variety in their work.

Implications of the Study

By studying individuals in a specific profession in the Silicon Valley, this study provides insight into the work values of Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians. These differences can be used to develop better policies, and create a more comfortable working environment for all employees, regardless of their ethnic origin. Asian Indians are one of the larger immigrant groups in the Silicon Valley, and this line of research can be helpful in understanding their values at the work place. As mentioned earlier, a better organization-person fit can lead to reduced turnover, and increased job satisfaction at the work place. Policies that encourage team events and activities, and participation in corporate non-profit activities, may help Asian Indians build a community at the work place. At the same time, involving employees in job rotation experiences might help Caucasian Americans to bring in some variety in their day-to-day tasks in their jobs.

Strength and Limitations of the Study

Unlike previous studies, this study used employees from not only one nation, but also from a single profession working in a single location. Not only can values vary by culture, studies in the past (Becker & Connor, 2005; Sverko, Jerneic, Kulenovic, & Vizek, 1987) have indicated that values may vary by profession and hence, this study was controlled for employees in the technical fields only. This kind of information would be

difficult to extrapolate from national values research or cross-cultural values research, and thus provides specific knowledge of work values of Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians in the Silicon Valley.

Although the location and profession of the sample was controlled for, not all omitted variables such as age, gender, or educational background, could be controlled for. As with any cross-cultural research, the list of work value dimensions that were compared in this study was not exhaustive. Future research should include more variables such as importance of recognition, feedback, and companies standing in the industry among others.

It is widely accepted that the attitudes and behavior a person brings to the work place are shaped by the person's values. There seem to be many similarities between work values and life values, and researchers have conceptualized work values to be a part of and derived from general life values (Elizur & Sagie, 1999). Super (1969) has suggested that due to the non-vocational nature of general value scales, they cannot be used for making occupational inferences.

Although we have used national values to interpret and discuss differences in work values, this kind of overgeneralization of national values to the work situation may lead to faulty conclusions. Thus, more research in this area is needed to make sure that the results of this study are supported. Finally, because the intended aim of this study was to measure differences in work values in a specific industry and between specific groups of people, results should not be generalized to different industries and all immigrant employees.

Results for some of the hypothesized dimensions were not significant (e.g., supervisor, independent growth, respect, responsibility, ability utilization, accountable for others, and working environment). In addition, while studying the effect of time, the sample was broken down further into three small groups. Lack of differences among these groups might be due to the small sample size for each group, particularly for the Asian Indian group. A larger sample size might have helped validate our hypotheses better.

Future research should use a larger sample size to ensure the robustness of the results. In addition, the questionnaire may require additional items for dimensions that were measured by only one or two items. However, it should be cautioned that increasing the length of the questionnaire might have a negative impact on the response rate for the questionnaire. Some of the items may also benefit from slight rewording of certain words, as the intended meaning and the perceived meaning may have been different (e.g., “lifestyle”). A factor analysis is also recommended to delineate dimensions in future studies.

It is a common assumption that the process of acculturation requires the ‘fitting in’ of the minority group into the majority groups. This might have a direct effect on the individuals’ values. However, as can be seen from this study, although some values do change over time in a new society, many remain stable. Only the dimension of variety seemed to show a significant difference between Asians Indians who had lived for less than three years and Caucasian Americans. This means more research is needed in the area of specific values to examine the effects of a new society and length of time on these

values. This study may also be replicated in different locations and different industries to better understand the nature of ethical differences between the Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians.

Many of the Asian Indians to whom the researcher has spoken to, during the data collection period, have expressed their dissatisfaction with their work situation.

However, it was not clear if this was a direct result of the differences in values at the work place. Studies should, therefore, also examine the effect of organization-person fit on the individuals' satisfaction with their work.

Conclusion

In summary, this study examined the differences that exist in the work values between Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians. There were significant differences between the two groups in 4 (i.e., variety, social responsibility, coworker, stability) out of the 14 measured dimensions. In terms of the length of stay, only the dimension of variety differed between Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians with less than three years of residence. The study showed more similarities than differences between Caucasian Americans and Asian Indians.

References

- Alas, R. (2005). Job related attitudes and ethics in countries with different histories. *Cross-Cultural Management*, 12(2), 69-84.
- Adkins, C. L., Ravlin, E. C., & Meglino, B. M. (1996). Value congruence between co-workers and its relationship to work outcomes. *Group-and-Organization-Management*, 21(4), 439-460.
- Andolsek, D. M., & Stebe, J. (2004). Multinational perspective on work values and commitment. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 4(2), 181-209.
- Ardichvili, A. & Gasparishvili, A. (2001). Socio-cultural values, internal work culture and leadership styles in four post-communist countries: Russia, Georgia, Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 1(2), 227-242.
- Bal, G. (1991). Work and values: Persistence of traditional values in a new technological setting. *Man in India*, 71(2&3), 373-382.
- Bahl, V. (1993). Class consciousness and primordial values in the shaping of the Indian working class. *South Asian Bulletin*, 13(1-2), 152-172.
- Becker, B. W., & Connor, P. E. (2005). Self-selection or socialization of public- and private-sector managers? A cross-cultural values analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(1), 111-113.
- Berman, G. S. (1985). Change in job satisfaction and occupational values among immigrants in Israel. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 26(1-2), 45-59.
- Bhagat, R. S., Kedia, B. L., Harveston, P. D., & Triandis, H. C. (2002). Cultural variations in the cross-border transfer of organization knowledge: An integrative framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 204-221.
- Bochner, S., & Hesketh, B. (1994). Power distance, individualism/collectivism, and job-related attitudes in a culturally diverse work group. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25(2), 233-257.
- Bordia, P. & Blau, G. (2003). Moderating effect of allocentrism on the pay referent comparison-pay level satisfaction relationship. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 52(4), 499-514.

- Brenner, O.C. (1988). Relations of age and education to managers' work values. *Psychological Reports*, 63(2), 639-642.
- Brenner, O. C., Blazini, A. P., & Greenhaus, J. H. (1988). An examination of race and sex differences in managerial work values. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 336-344.
- Calman, K. C. (2004). Evolutionary ethics: Can values change? *Journal-of-Medical-Ethics*, 30(4), 366-370.
- Chatterjee, S. R., & Pearson, C. A. L. (2000). Indian managers in transition: orientations, work goals, values and ethics. *Management Information Review*, 40, 81-95.
- Chakraborty, S. K. ed. (1990). Human response development: Exploring transformational values. New Delhi, Wiley Eastern Ltd.
- Chhabra, A. (2001). Asian Indian population doubles in a decade. (May 15, 2001). Retrieved Date, Aug 2005, Rediff US Special.
- Cheung, Chau-Kiu, & Scherling, S. A. (1999): Job satisfaction, work values, and sex differences in Taiwan's organizations. *Journal of Psychology*, 133(5), 563-575.
- Dagenais, F. (1998). Super's work values inventory scales as intrinsic or extrinsic constructs. *Psychological-Reports*, 83(1), 197-198.
- Daniel, R. (1974). Task design, work values, and worker response: An experimental test. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 12(2), 264-273.
- Despain, J. E., Leinicke, L. M., Ostrosky, J. A., & Rexroad, W. M. (2003): Work values at Caterpillar: A process. *Organizational Dynamics*, 32(4), 405-414.
- DeVito, A. J., Carlson, J. F., & Kraus, J. (1984). Values in relation to career orientation, gender, and each other. *Counseling and Values*, 28(4), 202-206.
- Dillard, J. M. & Campbell, N. Jo. (1982). Career values and aspirations of adult female and male Puerto Ricans, Blacks, and Anglos. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 19(4), 163-170.
- Dolan, S. L., Diez-Pinol, M., Fernandez-Alles, M., Martin-Prius, A., & Martinez-Fierro, S. (2004). Exploratory study of within-country differences in work and life values: The case of Spanish business students. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 4(2), 157-180.
- Dose, J. J. (1997). Work values: An integrative framework and illustrative application to organizational socialization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(3), 219-240.

- Drummond, R. J., & Stoddard, A. (1991). Job satisfaction and work values. *Psychological Reports*, 69(3, Pt 2), 1116-1118.
- Drummond, R. J., McIntire, W. G., & Skaggs, C. T., (1977). Work values and job satisfaction of young adult males. *Journal-of-Employment-Counseling*, 14 (1), 23-26.
- Durkheim, E. (1938). *The rules of sociological method* (8th ed.). University of Chicago Press: Chicago. Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, c1938.
- Earley, P. C., & Erez, M. (1997). *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology*. San Francisco, CA, US. The New Lexington Press / Jossey-Bass Inc, Publishers.
- Elizur, D., Borg, I., Hunt, R., & Beck, I. M. (1991). A structure of work values: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12(1), 21-38.
- Elizur, D. & Sagie, A. (1999). Facets of personal values: A structural analysis of life and work values. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(1), 73-87.
- English, H. B., & English, A. C. (1958). *A comprehensive dictionary of psychological and psychoanalytical terms: a guide to usage*. Oxford, England: Longmans, Green
- Exploring employee recruitment and retention by non-profit organizations: A survey of the Pittsburgh area university graduates*. (n.d.) Retrieved October 10, 2005, from <http://www.gspia.pitt.edu/CLDProject/copelandexsum.pdf>
- Fischer, R., & Smith, P. B. (2004). Values and organizational justice: Performance and seniority based allocation criteria in the United Kingdom and Germany. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35(6), 669-688.
- Furnham, A., Petrides, K.V., Tsaousis, I., Pappas, K., & Garrod, D. (2005): A cross-cultural investigation into the relationships between personality traits and work values. *The Journal of Psychology*, 139(1), 5-32.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1996). The experience of work and turnover intentions: Interactive effects of value attainment, job satisfaction, and positive mood. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 318-325.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1997). Experiencing work: Values, attitudes, and moods. *Human Relations*, 50(4), 393-417.
- Ghei, A. (1997). A cross-cultural analysis of interpersonal work values: Field-theoretic evidence from American and Indian managers. Dissertation-Abstracts-

International-Section-A:-Humanities-and-Social-Sciences. 57 (11-A), 4818, US: Univ Microfilms International.

- Ginzberg, E. (1971). Work: The eye of the hurricane. *Humanitas*, 7(2), 227-242.
- Goldthorpe, J. H., Lockwood, D., Bechhofer, F., & Platt, J. (1969). The affluent worker in the class structure. Cambridge, England. Cambridge University Press.
- Gomez, C. (2004). The influence of environmental, organizational, and HRM factors on employee behaviors in subsidiaries: a Mexican case study of organizational learning. *Journal of World Business*, 39, 1-11.
- Gopalan, S., & Rivera, J. B. (1997). Gaining a perspective on Indian value orientations: Implications of expatriate managers. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 5(2), 156-179.
- Gupta, S. P. (1975). Changes in the food habits of Asian Indians in the United States: A case study. *Sociology-and-Social-Research*, 60(1), 87-99.
- Harris, S. & Ghauri, P. (2000). Strategy formation by business leaders: Exploring the influence of national values. *European Journal of Marketing*, 34(1-2): 126-142.
- Harvey, J. Carter, S. & Mudimu, G. (2000). A comparison of work values and motives among Zimbabwean and British managers. *Personnel Review*, 29(6), 723-742.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (2004). Move the Body, Change the Self: Acculturative Effects of the Self-Concept. 2004; Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Hines, A. (2000). The postmodern shift in values and jobs and the implications for HR. *Employment Relations Today*, 26(4), 35-51.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values (abridged edition). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2002). The pitfalls of cross-national survey research: A reply to the article by Spector et al. on the psychometric properties of the Hofstede Values Survey Module 1994. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51(1), 170-173.
- Inglehart, R., & Abramson, P. R. (1994). Economic security and value change. *American Political Science Review*, 88(2), 336-355.
- Kapoor, S., Hughes, P. C., Baldwin, J. R., & Blue, J. (2003). The relationship of individualism-collectivism and self-constructs to communication styles in India and United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(6), 683-700.

- Karabati, S., & Say, A. I. (2005). Relating work values to societal values: Evidence from the Turkish business context. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 12(2), 85-107.
- Kirkman, B. L. & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(3), 557-569.
- Kluckhohn, F. R. & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). Variations in value orientations. Oxford, England: Row, Peterson.
- Knoop, R. (1991). Achievement of work values and decision-making. *Psychological Reports*, 68(3, Pt 1), 775-781.
- Knoop, R. (1994). Organizational commitment and individual values. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 78(1), 200-202.
- Knoop, R. (1994). Work values and job satisfaction. *The Journal of Psychology* 128(6), 683-690.
- Korman, A, K. (1985). Cultural consequences: International differences in work related value. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 6(3), 243-244.
- Kuo, B. C., & Roysircar, G. (2004). Predictors of Acculturation for Chinese Adolescents in Canada: Age of Arrival, Length of Stay, Social Class, and English Reading Ability. *Journal-of-Multicultural-Counseling-and-Development*, 32(3), 143-154.
- Lacassagne, M. F., Castel, P., & Fu, P.P. (2004). Influence strategies in work situations in China and France. *European review of applied psychology*, 54(3), 165-171.
- Lee, Y., & Larwood, L. (1983). The socialization of expatriate managers in multinational firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(4), 657-665.
- Lee, Y. (1984). A comparative study of managers' perceptions in Korea and the U.S. on selected socio-cultural dimensions. *Dissertation-Abstracts-International*, 43(8-A), 2724-2725.
- Leong, F. T. L., (1995). Career development and vocational behavior of racial and ethnic minorities. Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Lofquist, L. H. & Dawis, R. V. (1978). Values as second-order needs in the theory of work adjustment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 12(1), 12-19.
- Meglino, B. M., Ravlin, E. C., Adkins, C. L. (1989). Work values approach to corporate culture: A field test of the value congruence process and its relationship to individual outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(3), 424-432.

- Menon, S. T. (2004). Introduction to ISSWOV special section: Culture's consequences for 21st century research and practice. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 4(2), 135- 140.
- Mortimer, J. T. & Lorence, J. (1979). Occupational experience and the self-concept: A longitudinal study. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 42(4), 307-323.
- Nord, W. R., Brief, A. P., Atieh, J. M., & Doherty, E. M. (1988). Work values and the conduct of organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10, 1-42.
- Offermann, L. R. & Hellmann, P. S. (1997). Culture's consequences for leadership behavior: National values in action. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 28(3), 342-351.
- Oishia, S., Hahn, J., Schimmack, U., Radhakrishnan, P., Dzokoto, V., & Ahadi, S. (2005). The measurement of values across cultures: A pairwise comparison approach. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 39, 299-305.
- Paik, Y. & Teagarden, M. B. (1995). International human resource management approaches in the Maquiladora industry: A comparison of Japanese, Korean and U.S. firms. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6, 568-587.
- Parsons, J. G. (2000). The relationship of values to performance: A case study of the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission. 2000. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 60(10-A), 3593.
- Parsons, T. (Ed.) & Shills, E. A. (Ed.) (1951). Toward a general theory of action. Cambridge, MA, US: Harvard University Press.
- Pelled, L. H., & Xin, K. R. (1997). Work values and their human resource management implications: a theoretical comparison of China, Mexico and United States. *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, 6(2), 185-198.
- Pine, G. J., & Innis, G. (1987). Cultural and individual work values. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 35(4), 279-286.
- Pryor, R. G. (1979). In search of a concept: Work values. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, 27(3), 250-258.
- Pryor, R. G. (1981). Interests and values as preferences: A validation of the Work Aspect Preference Scale. *Australian Psychologist*, 16(2), 258-272.

- Pryor, R. G. (1982). Values, preferences, needs, work ethics, and orientations to work: Toward a conceptual and empirical integration. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 20 (1), 40-52.
- Punekar, V. B. (1989). Work values and industrial development: A comparison of the Indian and the Japanese experience. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 24(3), 245-257.
- Rafferty, J., & Tapsell, J. (2001). Self-managed work teams and manufacturing strategies: Cultural influences in the search for team effectiveness and competitive advantage. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing*, 11(1), 19-34.
- Ralston, D. A., Egri, C. P., Stewart, S., Terpstra, R. H., & Cheng, Y. K. (1999). Doing business in the 21st century with the new generation of Chinese managers: a study of generational shifts in work values in China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30(2), 415(1).
- Ralston, D. A., Holt, D. H., Terpstra, R. H., & Cheng, Y. K. (1997). The impact of national culture and economic ideology on managerial work values: A study of the United States, Russia, Japan, and China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28(1), 177-207.
- Rao, T. V. (1975). Research on work-values: A summary. *Indian Educational Review*, 10(2), 30-44.
- Roe, R. A. & Ester, P. (1999). Values and work: Empirical findings and theoretical perspective. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(1), 1-21.
- Roysircar, G. (2003). Understanding immigrants: Acculturation theory and research. Needham Heights, MA, US: Allyn and Bacon
- Ryckman, R. M., & Houston, D. M. (2003). Value priorities in American and British female and male university students. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 143(1), 127-138.
- Sagie, (1998). Employee absenteeism, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: Another look. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52(2), 156-171.
- Sagie, A., Elizur D., & Koslowsky, M. (1996). Work values: a theoretical overview and a model of their effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 53-514.
- Sagy, S. (1997). Work values: Comparing Russian immigrants and Israeli students. *Journal of Career Development*, 23(3), 231-243.

- Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(1), 23-47.
- Selmer, J. (1996). What expatriate managers know about the work values of their subordinates: Swedish executives in Thailand. *Management International Review*, 36(3) 231-244.
- Shapira, Z., Griffith, T. L. (1990). Comparing the work values of engineers with managers, production, and clerical workers: A multivariate analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(4), 281-293.
- Sheridan, J. E. (1992). Organizational culture and employee retention. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(5), 1036-1057.
- Singer, & Stefflre, (1954). The relationship of job values and desires to vocational aspirations of adolescents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 38, 419-422.
- Singh, S., & De Man, A. (1991). Personality traits, motivational factors, and work values as correlates of managerial success in Indian managers. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 7, 278-282.
- Sinha, J. B. P. (1982). Dynamics of work value: A comparative analysis of Indian and Japanese perspectives. *ASCI journal of management*, 12(1-2), 36-48.
- Sinha, J. P. B., & Sinha, D. (1990). Role of social values in Indian organizations. *International Journal of Psychology*, 25, 705-714.
- Shimon, L. D., Miriam, D. P., MariLuz, F. A., Antonio M. P., Salustiano M. F. (2004). Exploratory study of within-country differences in work and life values: A case of Spanish business students. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 4(2), 157-181.
- Smola, K. W., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 363-382.
- Sonderegger, R., & Barrett, P. M. (2004). Patterns of cultural adjustment among young migrants to Australia. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 13(3), 341-356.
- Super, D. E. & Mowry, G. J. Jr. (1962). Social and personal desirability in the assessment of work values. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 22(4), 715-719.
- Super, D.E. (1969). Vocational development theory: Persons, positions, and processes. *Counseling Psychologist*, 1(1), 2-9.
- Super, (1973). The Work Values Inventory. Oxford, England: U. Minnesota Press.

- Sverko, B., Jerneic, Z., Kulenovic, A. & Vizek-Vidovic, V. (1987). Work values of students preparing for different occupations: A contribution to validation of the WIS Values Scale. *Revija-za-Psihologiju*, 17(1-2), 59-66.
- Taris, R., Feij, J.A., Van-Vianen, A. E.M. (2005). Met expectations and supplies-values fit of Dutch young adults as determinants of work outcomes. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(3), 366-382.
- Uichol, K. (1995). Psychology, science, and culture: Cross-cultural analysis of national psychologies. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30(6), 663-679.
- Ushashree, S., & Chandraiah, K. (1990). Work values and job satisfaction of professional and non-professional college teachers. *Indian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 27(1), 10-14.
- Verma, J. (1985). Concomitant variables of work values and job attitudes. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 21(1), 86-93.
- Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person–organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 473-489.
- Vondracek, F. W., Shimizu, K., Schulenberg, J., Hostetler, M., & Sakayanagi, T. (1990). A comparison between American and Japanese students' work values. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 36, 274-286.
- Wagman, M. (1965). Sex and age differences in occupational values. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 44(3), 258-262.
- Walsh, B. D., Vacha, H. T., Kapes, J. T., Dresden, J. H., Thomson, W. A., & Ochoa, S. B. (1996). The values scale: differences across grade levels for ethnic minority students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56(2), 263-275.
- Wasti, S. A. (2003). Organizational commitment, turnover intentions and the influence of cultural values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 303–321.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1966). The Minnesota Importance Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, 21, 85.
- Wheeler, K. G. (2002). Cultural values in relation to equity sensitivity within and across cultures. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(7), 612-626.
- White, B. L. (2003). Silicon Valley culture: One dimensional 'Faustian bargain' or multi-faceted forerunner of global society. *Strategic Technology Institute*, July 22.

- Yankelovich, D. (1974). Turbulence in the working world: Angry workers, happy grads. *Psychology Today*, 8(7), 80-87.
- Yavas, U., Luqmani, M., & Quraeshi, Z. (1990). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and work values: Saudi and expatriate managers. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 11(7), 3-10.
- Yu, H. C., & Miller, P. (2003). The generation gap and cultural influence - A Taiwan empirical investigation. *Cross-Cultural Management*, 10(3), 23-41.
- Zwart, F. D. (2000). The logic of affirmative action: caste, class and quotas in India. *Acta Sociologica*, 43(3), 235-249.
- Zytowski, D. G. (1994). A Super contribution to vocational theory: Work values. *Career Development Quarterly*, 43(1), 25-31.

Appendix: Consent Form and Questionnaires

Consent Form

You are being invited to participate in a research survey conducted by me, Kamini Kumar, as part of my Master's Thesis project under the supervision of Dr. Megumi Hosoda at the Department of Psychology at the San Jose State University. The major purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding about people's values as related to their work.

Please be assured that participation in this study is on a voluntary basis; therefore, you have the right to withdraw at any point in time. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a work values questionnaire and a demographic information questionnaire. The work values questionnaire will ask you to rate the importance of various work values and the demographic questionnaire will ask you a few questions about yourself.

We will not be asking for your name or address and I will be the only individual to have access to the responses; therefore, your responses to the questions will be completely confidential and anonymous. The data from the study will be reported in group totals; no individual responses will be identified. This will also ensure that the responses are not traced back to the individual.

There are anticipated risks involved in this study; probability of harm or discomfort is no greater than those encountered in daily life. If you have additional questions you can call me at (415)625-4432 or Dr. Megumi Hosoda at (408)924-5600. Questions or complaints about research, participant rights, or research-based injury may be presented to Dr. Nabil Ibrahim, Associate Academic Vice President for Graduate Studies & Research (408)924-2480.

Please sign below to indicate your voluntary consent to participate. Thank you very much for your participation.

Name (Please Print)

Signature

Date

Work Values Questionnaire

Please complete the following questionnaire and demographic information. The information requested will be used as part of a research project. Your responses will be confidential and anonymous.

Listed below are some values that may be important in your work life. ***Using the scale below, please indicate how important each of these values is to your work-life by circling the appropriate number.*** Please do not leave any statement blank and select only one answer for each statement.

	Not at all Important 1	Slightly Important 2	Somewhat Important 3	Moderately Important 4	Very Important 5	Extremely Important 6
1	Having a fair and considerate supervisor					1 2 3 4 5 6
2	Having a lot of responsibilities in my work.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
3	Doing meaningful work.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
4	Being able to utilize my abilities on the job.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
5	Being able to do high quality work.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
6	Being able to get ahead on the job.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
7	Bring able to help others.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
8	Having a position of authority.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
9	Being able to try my own ways of doing my job.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
10	Having a good compensation package.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
11	Being able to express my lifestyle openly.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
12	Having the opportunity fo personal growth.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
13	Being valued as an important employee.....					1 2 3 4 5 6
14	Being able to take risks in my job.....					1 2 3 4 5 6

15	Working with people I like and respect.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	Getting along with my coworkers.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	Having good working conditions.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	Doing a variety of things on the job.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
19	Knowing that I have a stable job.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	Working for a company that I am proud of.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	Being rewarded for good performance.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	Getting support and feedback from my coworkers.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	Having the opportunity to express myself fully and creatively.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	Being able to avoid working overtime or on weekends.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	Working for a company that has good business ethics.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	Not having to be accountable for others.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
27	Doing important work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
28	Being able to utilize my knowledge on the job.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
29	Having a sense of accomplishment for a job well done.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
30	Having a lot of opportunities for advancement.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
31	Being able to contribute to society.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
32	Being able to influence others.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
33	Having a lot of autonomy in doing my work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
34	Having a guaranteed income.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
35	Being involved with coworkers in social and recreational activities.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
36	Being able to have a life outside of work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
37	Working for a company that is loyal to its employees.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

38	Being able to learn and grow in my work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
39	Knowing that I am respected in my work group.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
40	Having a challenging and exciting job.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
41	Being accepted as a work group member or a team member	1	2	3	4	5	6
42	Being in a comfortable work environment.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
43	Doing many different things on the job.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
44	Being able to take pride in company's position in the industry.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
45	Being recognized for the work I do.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
46	Having high job security.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
47	Receiving feedback from my supervisor on my work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
48	Being able to do new and original things.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
49	Having a job that allows me time with my family.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
50	Working for a company that contributes to the society.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
51	Having a supervisor that I can respect.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

Demographic Information

The following is a series of questions about yourself and your background. Please read each question and mark or write the appropriate response.

1. Gender _____Male _____Female

2. Age _____Yrs

3. Were you born in the US? _____ Yes _____No

 If you answered No to the above question, how long have you been in the US?

 _____Yrs

4. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

_____High School

_____Masters Degree

_____College Graduate – AA

_____PhD/Doctorate

_____College Graduate – BA/BSc

_____Other

5. What is your ethnic background?

_____African American

_____Native American

_____Asian/Asian American

_____Pacific Islander/Asian Indian

_____Caucasian

_____Hispanic

_____Middle Eastern

_____Other

_____Mexican American

6. What is your present job title? _____

7. How many years have you worked in this company? _____

8. How many total years of work experience do you have? _____