

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Meagan Houston entitled “The Development and Validation of the Houston Experience Measure (HEM): A Culturally Sensitive Instrument Measuring Variables Related to Developing Work Drive”. I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

John Lounsbury, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and
recommend its acceptance:

Jake Levy

Richard Saudargus

Tricia McClam

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges
Vice Provost and Dean of the
Graduate School

The Development and Validation of the Houston Experience Measure

(HEM):

A Culturally Sensitive Instrument Measuring Variables Related to

Developing Work Drive

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University Of Tennessee, Knoxville

Meagan Nicole Houston

August, 2008

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Robert Lee Houston and Rosemary Houston, my strength, my courage, my pillars and to my the rest of my family and great friends who have supported me, guided me, mentored me, and inspired me in achieving all of my goals and successes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In writing this dissertation, there were many people who provided unconditional support and encouragement that lead to this final product. I would first like to thank my dissertation committee John Lounsbury (chair), Tricia McClam, Ph.D., Jacob Levy, Ph.D. and Richard Saudargus, Ph.D. who provided continuous comments and suggestions on my dissertation project that improved and expanded the scope of the paper. I would especially like to thank my chair, my adviser, and most importantly my mentor John Lounsbury, whose belief and confidence in my ability to accomplish all of the goals I set for myself, got me to this point. John's words of encouragement and support have resonated with me since I began my Ph.D. program. He has provided more support and guidance than any graduate student could ask for. Thank you again John. I would like to thank Tricia McClam for always being available and supportive when I needed her there and I would also like to thank her for providing her expertise in the area of multiculturalism. I would like to thank Jacob Levy, who provided wonderful feedback and expertise in the area of assessment development and multicultural issues. And I would like to thank Richard Saudargus for his detailed editorial comments. The committee's expertise helped me to develop specific research skills that will be needed for future research projects.

I would also like to thank all of my colleagues and friends who assisted me in the data collection process of this dissertation, without them I would not have been able to complete this project. Words, cannot express how grateful I am to have their support. I especially want to thank everyone who provided me with their precious time in completing the interviews with this researcher which led to the creation of the Houston

Experience Measure. By way of providing their cherished life experiences these individuals made one of the biggest contributions to this study.

I would especially like to thank my mom and dad, for their emotional, mental, and financial support throughout my education, especially during my last years of graduate training. I would also like to thank Anthony Goggins who was always there when I needed words of encouragement, guidance and support.

ABSTRACT

Developing instruments that are more culturally sensitive and taking a multicultural approach to scale development is encouraged in order to appropriately assess and conduct research with ethnic minorities. African Americans are prone to many negative stereotypes in the world of work which usually involve a lack of work drive and motivation achievement. The present research investigated the differences between African American and European American participants on a culturally sensitive instrument developed for this study and a measure of Work Drive: the Houston Experience Measure (HEM) and the Work Drive Scale.

This study was conducted in three phases. Phase one, the HEM was developed based on qualitatively-informed interviews with 15 African Americans. Each interview transcript was rigorously analyzed and thematized. Results of this content analysis revealed three main scale constructs that formed the HEM (pressure to perform, family socialization related to work drive, and competitiveness). In Phase two, the HEM was administered to 163 college students to determine validity and reliability of the scales. Results determined that each scale was reliable and valid; coefficient alpha for Pressure to Perform scale was .83; .92 for Family Socialization for Work Drive and .88 Work-Related Competitiveness scale. In phase three, differences between 96 African American and 203 European American participants from various career fields, on the HEM and the Work Drive Scale were examined.

Results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the correlations for African Americans and European Americans on the scale pressure to

perform and work drive and family socialization related to work drive and work drive. However, there were statistically significant differences between the correlation competitiveness and work drive for African Americans and European Americans. European Americans indicated a higher correlation between these variables compared to African Americans. These findings do not support the main hypotheses of this study. It is proposed that generally these variables related to Work Drive are more universally felt and expressed by members of different racial, ethnic, and gender sub-groups; pointing toward equality of work drive and correlates of work drive for African Americans and European Americans.

The study on African American and European American differences is complex and will not lend itself to simple racial differences but by specific constructs and underlying processes of these constructs being studied. Further research is needed regarding the use and replicability of findings with the HEM.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: Introduction	1
Introduction.....	1
Overview	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Phase One.....	7
Overview and Method	7
Content Analysis Results	8
Scale Development	18
Phase Two.....	192
Overview and Method	19
Results	20
CHAPTER II: Literature Review.....	24
Literature Review.....	24
Work Drive	24
Vocation and Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT)	26
Multiculturalism and Assessment	36
Summary	45
Rationale and Hypotheses of Phase Three	46
Research Questions	47
CHAPTER III: Methodology.....	48
Method	48
Participants	48
Instruments	48
Procedure	50
CHAPTER IV: Results	52
Introduction.....	52
Summary Descriptive for the Total Sample and Subgroup	52
Evaluation of the Hypotheses	56
Research Questions.....	57
CHAPTER V: Discussion.....	65
Discussion.....	65
Development of the HEM	66
Pressure to Perform	67
Family Socialization related to Work Drive	69
Competitiveness	71
Limitations	75
Directions for Future Research	77
Summary	80
LIST OF REFERENCES	84
APPENDIX.....	92
Researchers Statement	93
Questionnaire	94

Researchers Statement (Study 2)	95
Informed Consent Form.....	96
Demographic Information.....	97
Informed Consent Form.....	98
BACKGROUND INFORMATION	99
Houston Experience Measure	100
VITA.....	102

LIST OF TABLES

1.Coefficient Alpha and Corrected Item-Total Correlations for the Pressure to Perform Scale.....	21
2.Corrected Item-Total Correlations for the Family Socialization Scale	21
3.Corrected Item-Total Correlations for the Competitiveness Scale	22
4.Information about Respondents	22
5.Houston Experience Measure Scale Sample Items by Subscale	23
6.Demographics of Participants	49
7.Summary of Descriptive Statistics for the Total Sample on the Study Variables	53
8.Summary of Descriptive Statistics on the Study Variables with Results of Independent Samples t test to Compare African American and European American Subjects	54
9.Mean scores, Standard Deviations, and Results of t test to Compare African Americans and European Americans on Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization, and Competitiveness.....	54
10. Intercorrelations of Study Variables for All Participants (N = 316).....	55
11. Intercorrelations of Study Variables for African American Participants (N = 96).....	55
12. Intercorrelations of Study Variables for European Americans Participants (N = 203)	56
13. Correlations between the variables Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization related to Work Drive, Competitiveness and Work Drive for African American and European American Subjects	58
14. Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses for African American and European Americans.....	59
15. Correlation of Study Variables for Females and Males.....	61
16. Correlation of Variables for African American and European American Males	61
17. Correlation of Variables for Females.....	62

18. Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses for African American and European American Males and Females.....	64
--	----

PREFACE

Interest and need for multicultural assessment measures has recently become acknowledged and somewhat researched. There is little research available with respect to multicultural instrument development or instruments normed on ethnic minority populations. There is also little research available in the domain of career and work with ethnic minorities. Given that different cultures have different life experiences and possess various values and beliefs, it is important to develop instruments designed to capture and incorporate these various life experiences. African Americans and other ethnic minorities have been left out in the validation of testing measures and most measures are normed on Eurocentric experiences.

Work Drive is a newly developed construct that still remains to be researched and explored. There may be several underlying factors that contribute to a development of a Work Drive. There has also been sparse research with this construct in relation to ethnic minorities.

This study represented the first attempt to discover underlying factors involved in the development of a work drive from an afrocentric perspective and an attempt to develop a reliable and valid culturally sensitive instrument normed on African Americans that involves the area of career and work. This study also contributes to the limited research that has developed culturally based testing measures. Moreover, future research is needed that deals with Work Drive and its underlying processes for all individuals.

CHAPTER I: Introduction

Introduction

Overview

Within the world of work and career development, African Americans face many challenges and hurdles, including diverse forms of racist attitudes and behaviors (Fox & Stallworth, 2005; Sears, 1988; Rowe, 1990). More overt forms of racist behaviors and attitudes in the workplace have been replaced by more subtle behaviors and actions such as “neglect, ostracism, and inequitable treatment” (Fox & Stallworth, p. 439). Fox and Stallworth (2005) refer to these subtle forms of discrimination as “racial/ethnic bullying.” They found that higher percentages of Hispanic, Black, Latino and Asian Americans employees reported being targeted by “racial/ethnic bullying” than did White employees. Many African Americans said that they experienced more significant emotional strain as a result of being targets of racial/ethnic bullying.

Another challenge facing African Americans is how to gain employment, obtain satisfactory jobs and gain entry into occupations. African Americans are more likely than Whites to suffer from unemployment and underemployment (Broman, Hamilton, Hoffman & Mavaddat, 1995; Hamilton, Broman, Hoffman, 1990); moreover, they are overrepresented in unskilled and low status occupations (Farley & Allen, 1987; Swinton, 1989; Wilson, 1987) and jobs with low wages, poor working conditions, and less security (Broman, 2001; Bowman, 1991; Halpern, 1987). The unemployment and underemployment of African Americans are often associated with problems in their home and family lives (Broman, 2001). African Americans have not yet achieved equal opportunity with their White counterparts in the workforce (Jones, 1986; Monroe, 1986; Tomkiewicz,

Brenner & Adeyemi-Bello, 1998). Even though African Americans make up at least 12% of the United States population, only about 1% hold corporate executive positions (Braham, 1987; Johnson, 1987). Based on literature from many different sources, it is evident that African Americans have a long history and current status of being negatively evaluated and represented with respect to work.

Katz and Hass (1988) reported that African Americans are often viewed by the majority as having more negative attitudes toward work. One particular negative stereotype involves the Protestant Work Ethic. Campbell (1971) concludes that the Protestant work ethic is deeply rooted in American values by Whites who possess a high Protestant work ethic and tend to view African Americans as being lazy, lacking ambition, and failing to take advantage of job opportunities. He found that many White respondents who felt there was job discrimination in their communities blamed economic woes of African Americans on their lack of ambition, laziness and failure to take advantage of opportunities. Katz and Hass (1988) examined the relationship between Pro-Black and Anti-Black attitudes and Protestant Work Ethic beliefs and humanitarianism-egalitarianism beliefs. They found that there was a positive correlation between humanitarian-egalitarian values and Pro-Black attitudes and there was a positive correlation between Protestant Ethic values and Anti-Black attitudes.

One problem with measures of attitudes toward work and work values such as the Protestant Work Ethic is that they assess beliefs and attitudes concerning work for people in general or for a population of people, not an individual person's tendency to work hard. By way of illustration, one sample item from the Protestant Work Ethic scale (Mirels & Garret, 1981) asks if the respondent believes that "*Any man who is able and*

willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.” However, a person who has experienced racial discrimination in the workplace may disagree with that item not because they are unwilling to work hard, but because they have personally observed cases, including their own, where a person works hard but does not have a good chance of succeeding. One of the implicit assumptions of general attitude and belief scales like the Protestant Work Ethic is that competitive opportunities and incentives are equal for all individuals, which is not true for African Americans. Lack of success in the workplace for many African Americans may be due to racial stereotyping and discrimination by Whites (Clark, 1985; Gaertner & McLaughlin, 1983).

An alternative approach, and the one adopted in the present study, is to focus on a person’s tendency to actually work hard to achieve success. This can be accomplished by measuring a person’s *work drive*. As conceptualized by Lounsbury, Gibson, and Hamrick (2004) work drive represents an individual’s disposition to work long hours and extend oneself, when needed, to meet job demands and achieve job success. Work drive is viewed as a personality trait; that is, as a relatively enduring characteristic of the individual that extends over time and across situations. It is not conceptualized as a short-term state or psychological need or motivational condition that one can consummate or satiate. It is also not a generalized value or belief like the Protestant Work Ethic. Work Drive has been found to be positively related to job performance across a wide range of occupations as well as job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and academic performance from 6th grade thru college. (Lounsbury, Gibson, & Hamrick, 2004). The Work Drive measure which entails 12-15 items demonstrated as internal consistency reliability of over .80 using diverse sample of over 10,000 working adults (Lounsbury & Gibson, 2005).

Accordingly, one purpose of the present study was to evaluate whether African Americans and Whites differ on Work Drive.

Another important question addressed by the current study was to examine factors that may influence and contribute to Work Drive for African Americans. After, having identified factors related to Work Drive for African Americans, the present study developed measures of these factors. Several researchers, including Helms (1997), Leong, (1993), Sue, (1994), Sedlacek, (1995), recommended developing instruments that include cultural sensitivity as vital to understanding various racial/ethnic groups. Currently, most instruments that measure work drive or factors involved in work drive do not take cultural factors into consideration and thus cannot be accurately used to make interpretations about an individual. Sedlacek and Sue (1995) contend that if different people have differing cultural and ethnic life experiences that may demonstrate their abilities in diverse ways, then it is unlikely that a single instrument could be created which would work in an equal way for all that completed the instrument. Test construction and cultural factors have been an ongoing debate, and much evidence has been presented that most assessment tools do not include in their development norms for ethnic minorities. Ethnic minority samples are either used as an afterthought, meaning they are either used in order to determine if the instrument can be generalized to other groups or they are dismissed from the sample, which can lead to inappropriate decisions and conclusions about the appropriateness of the measure with ethnic minorities. In order to truly understand a person's culture, you must understand their worldview and life experience. To assess a culture that may experience life different from the dominant culture you need to gather these experiences from the voice of the people (Morrow,

2003). Accordingly, the present study also attempts to contribute to the culturally relevant assessment base that is greatly needed in understanding ethnic minority issues and experiences.

Statement of the Problem

This research project investigated factors related to the development of a work drive based on the experiences of African Americans, by way of developing a measure to quantify their life experiences. Using a mixed-methods approach, the Houston Experience Measure (HEM) was designed based on quantifying experiences provided by way of conducting qualitatively-informed interview methods with high achieving African Americans. Based on these interviews, constructs were developed on the recurring themes that emerged from the interviews. The research variables were based on responses to the items representing these constructs.

The purpose of this project was to develop an instrument that was culturally sensitive and useful in conducting career /work-related research with ethnic minorities. This instrument was also designed to assist in understanding variables that are related to the development of a Work Drive as well as add research that was culturally relevant to the construct of Work Drive. Since Work Drive is a relatively new construct, there has been virtually no research on factors that contribute to Work Drive, especially from an African-American perspective. Therefore, Phase One of the present study employed the method of phenomenologically-informed interviewing to identify such factors through a thematized analysis of verbal content and developed items for each scale. These items were determined by the content provided by the interviews. Phase Two involved refining

the internal consistency reliability of each scale by means of psychometric analyses of data collected on each scale.

The HEM contains three scale constructs--*pressure to perform*, *family socialization related to work drive*, and *competitiveness*. The HEM was developed by the author specifically for this research project and will be discussed more extensively later in the paper.

A second goal of the present investigation was to identify differences between African American and European American participants in endorsing these experiences related to work drive. The current study also assessed participants' responses to the developed scales based on Lounsbury and Gibson's (2004) measure of Work Drive, as well as information derived from phenomenological interviews.

As noted by Leong and Brown (1995), most dominant theories and inventories used in vocational and counseling psychology were developed on white, English speaking, male samples with political, economic, psychological and cultural individualities having been either ignored or marginally addressed. Ethnic minorities have been greatly underrepresented in vocational research. One basic deficiency in this context is a lack of constructs that reflect the differing worldviews, discrimination, oppression and meaning of career for members of different minority groups. The present research addressed this lacuna by developing and assessing constructs that were specifically designed from the experiences of African Americans.

Phase One

Overview and Method

In this phase, the Houston Experience Measure was developed to assess experiences in developing a work drive based on African Americans' worldview. Fifteen high-achieving African American men and women were asked a series of questions about their experiences in developing their own work drive. These individuals answered questions pertaining to their personal experiences with respect to the world of work and career development throughout their lives. Gathering information by way of in-depth interviews allowed the researcher to acquire an "insider account" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983) in the development of Work Drive for these high-achieving individuals. High-achieving was defined as individuals holding job positions that required at least a minimum of a Bachelor's degree in order to qualify for the position and holding a job in the field for a minimum of two years. These individuals were described by others as being hard working and high achieving based on their current positions within a company and receiving above average earnings. In addition to the previously stated qualifications, most of the respondents held or were currently acquiring some type of graduate training degree (i.e. Masters, and /or Doctorate). A summary of the participants is provided in Table 4. Upon analyzing the interviews and thematizing their verbal content, three factors were identified as being important to the acquisition of Work Drive: perceived pressure to perform, family socialization related to Work Drive, and work-related competitiveness. Thematizing the verbal content involved transcribing each of the interviews and analyzing the interviews for content. After a detailed analysis, emerging themes common in all fifteen of the interviews were recognized. These themes were then presented to the

dissertation chair in order to verify their authenticity. Once the themes were agreed upon, the three constructs were developed.

Based on information provided by participants via interview questions, the researcher developed three separate scales to measure these constructs. The items for these scales were developed based on common verbal content from the interview protocols. The resulting themes, which represent the names of the constructs for each scale, were as follows: Perceived Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization for Work Drive, and Work-Related Competitiveness. These constructs are consistent with the extant literature on how African Americans experience work and career. The literature will be discussed in following sections of this dissertation. The results of the content analysis for each theme are presented below.

Content Analysis Results

This section presents the results from the interviews in combination with the construct specification of the test items. Item responses for the three subscales-- Perceived Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization for Work Drive and Work-Related Competitiveness--were made on a five-point Likert scale where 1 represents Strongly Disagree, 2 represents Disagree, 3 represents In-Between, 4 represents Agree and 5 represents Strongly Agree. The items for each of the three scales are provided in Table 5.

Pressure to Perform

Pressure to perform is defined here as the pull or force to demonstrate competence in fulfilling an obligation or requirement with respect to performance in a work setting. This can involve feeling pressured to work harder than peers or co-workers in order to demonstrate satisfactory ability to perform in a job. Pressure to Perform can posit

negative and positive implications. The notion of stereotype threat proposed by Steele and Aronson (1999) is an example of the negative effects of being pressured to perform. Stereotype threat requires being aware of a negative stereotype about a group to which one belongs. In this respect, it is possible for cognitive disruption to occur in a minority group member feeling pressured to perform well in order to disconfirm negative societal stereotypes established by society, such as a perceived lack of intellectual ability or lack of work ethic. With pressure to disconfirm, individuals may not be able to perform at optimal levels owing to their inability to give full cognitive attention to the presented task, such as taking a test. Steele and Aronson (1999) propose that stereotype threat may explain why there is a gap in standardized test scores between Blacks and Latinos compared to Whites.

The disconfirmation of stereotypes may have positive implications with respect to Pressure to Perform. Oswald and Harvey (2000) found that women who were exposed to a sexist cartoon about mathematics and did not receive a stereotype removal message (i.e. there is no scientific evidence that boys are better in math than girls) demonstrated a “motivating” response in answering math problems correctly. The women appeared to be motivated to do better on the math problems as a result of the effects of perceived bias. The participants were viewed as “rising to the challenge in the social ecology of their situation” (18) and wanting to outperform the negative stereotype. For example, Harvey and Crandall (1998) also found that Native Americans reported higher levels of motivation to do well on a test when they perceived the test as being biased against their cultural group. The results of their study provide implications for feeling Pressure to Perform in a competent manner in a job setting

With respect to work drive, pressure to perform was often viewed by respondents as a contributing factor in the establishment of a work drive. For example, many African Americans interviewed for this study reported feeling constantly scrutinized on the job and feeling as if they must perform above and beyond negative, stereotypical expectations in order to be viewed as a “good worker.” They reported constant pressure to prove their abilities on the job and feeling as if they are expected to fail, which can also be perceived as a form of stereotype threat. Perceived pressures to perform can exist in several forms with respect to the area of working. By way of example, Porter, Donnell, Edwards and Moore (2002) studied minority doctoral candidates seeking academic positions. They discussed some of the challenges in academia with respect to the recruitment and attrition of minority professors as being supported by faculty and diversity within faculty and mentoring new minority faculty members. Even in the more liberal environments of academe, new minority faculty members perceive an added pressure to perform well in order to avoid fulfilling an implicit negative stereotype and gaining acceptance from their colleagues. There is pressure to prove they belong or “fit in” in order to secure approval from their peers due to their minority status. Pressure to perform in the job situation may also result from the experience of some type of discrimination in the work force. For example, Tomekiewicz, Brenner, and Adeyemi-Bello (1998) reported that managers were perceived to possess characteristics more commonly ascribed to Whites than to African Americans. Participants in their study described this internalized belief in having to work harder and feeling pressured to perform in comparison with their white counterparts in several of the

interviews. This consistent feeling of having to be “better than” can be seen in the information provided by the study participants’ during the interview process.

Interviewer: As an African American what has been your experience of establishing a work drive?

6: I feel like you constantly have people watching you closely...standing over you, checking on you, and I feel like you have to prove that you can do the job...no one wants to be micromanaged.

6: As a Black female I constantly feel as if I am under the microscope. You have to prove that you are capable. I always feel like I am proving myself...It’s like getting ready for war everyday. I tell myself ‘you have to put on your camouflage shoes, your gear, everything and get ready for war’. I feel like in a way you are getting geared up to be a soldier so you can go out there on the field and prove who you are over and over again.

3: Our experience is legendary, we have a history, we have this notion that we have to do a little bit more to succeed and in many ways that is true...because even if that’s not true in a particular situation, in the back of your mind you are thinking ‘the only reason that so-in-so is because of affirmative action or whatever, so I have to kick it in gear’. You have to prove that you belong in a lot of situations and I hate to say this, but you are motivated sometimes to break the stereotypes.

14: My experience has been that...and I am sure this goes for a lot of African Americans, that you feel like you have to work harder than your White counterparts in the work force just based on the fact that it seems that you are two steps behind so to even get even you have to work harder and dress better and smile more...

Interviewer: As an African American what have been some obstacles in acquiring success?

2: Some obstacles I face go with proving myself. They look at me like I can’t do something. I feel like I am questioned about everything I do and say. I always have to document what I do and have to stay on top of it. I never want to prove them right, but because of this, I earn everything I do.

5: When you first go into a job they already expect you to fail, so as an African American you already have that cloud over your

head before you even go into the job, so you have to go in knowing you have to do your best, meaning even doing better than the person that's above you.

14: My main obstacle again is knowing I have to work harder than the next person, knowing that that's my only way to catch up to them or achieve all that I want to do...

Interviewer: As an African American what are some factors that have influenced your work drive?

2: When you move up from within a company there are always obstacles and it's very hard...first of all they didn't want to give it to me because I didn't have experience, so one obstacle was gaining experience. How do you do that when they want you to start from the bottom? But I did it, I learned the job to the best of my abilities, so I showed them I can do this...I felt that I had to work extra hard just because I knew the management team was watching and they were like 'well maybe she is management material, but we still need to keep an eye on her, lets make sure she's going down the right road'...As a Black female I noticed that there were other White females coming in with no experience going straight into management positions, so the obstacle for me as a Black woman was, I gotta work harder to get it, you gotta do what you gotta do definitely.

2: I have been driven to defy stereotypes people have about us, like the angry Black woman type...you already get stereotyped as an African American PERIOD! They look at us as being lazy, anybody, I'm not just pointing out one culture, I'm just saying White people, even other Black folks, might do it, but we are stereotyped as being lazy, not working hard enough and as an African American those little stereotypes are almost like a push for you to work harder, so you won't be stereotyped...and that's a fact!

13: I know I have to work harder than everybody else...being an African American you already are lower ranked on the totem pole, not just in America, but world-wide, so because you have to prove yourself you can't just give 100% you have to give 120%, in everything you do.

8: Being in a 'Glass Room', not so much dealing with a Glass Ceiling, but a Glass Room where you feel like you are always under a microscope and sometimes you feel yourself performing vs. just doing what you know how to do best and many times the

frustration comes from being twice as good to get the same recognition as the average White American. If its not driven by the culture of an organization, its driven by what's inside of you knowing what you have faced in your life and experienced in your life, that if you are equal to you are less than...

8: Growing up in the South provides real challenges for an African American because you were always told what you couldn't do or what you don't have the capabilities of doing and these were negative things that I was able to turn around into more positive things, when somebody told me I couldn't, my inner drive was saying, 'I will show you what I can do.

3: I think there is an age issue...I am not 30 and I'm, not 35 and I'm not 45, I have some life experiences and so I have some life experiences where I feel very secure and if something is not 100% I would like for them to be on my side, but I don't care if they're not on my side. Like in my 30's I would have cared...because I had not had enough experience and I would still be saying 'I need to prove, I need to prove'...but now I feel a little more comfortable.

Another theme that was found consistently to emerge from the interviews in the study was family socialization for Work Drive. Several authors (e.g., Brown, 2004; Pearson & Bieschke, 2001) have discussed the importance of family in the career development of African Americans. This theme remained consistent throughout the interview process. A description of this construct will be discussed in detail.

Family Socialization for Work Drive:

Cohen-Scali (2003) proposed that socialization for work involves attitudes, values and intellectual abilities obtained before one enters into the workforce. In this process, family socialization, in addition to social and school socialization, plays a large role in the development of a professional identity in adolescents. Adolescents' knowledge, representations and attitudes towards work are heavily influenced by the family. For

example, Gottfredson (1994) reported that social experiences, including those experiences occurring in the context of the family, have a very influential impact on an individual's career identity development. In this vein, Myburgh, Niehaus, and Poggenpoel (2002) conducted a study on the development of work values in Black South African adolescents. They found that the way adolescents perceive their work values is based on parental involvement. Parents are considered to be some of the most important individuals in their children's lives and parental involvement communicates acceptance, trust, and interest and support with everyday situations. In setting examples and demonstrating "work-related standards, norms, and rules of conduct of their children" (535), parents play a crucial role in their professional identity development.

In summary, adolescents develop cognitive maps of stereotypes and representations of work and professions. Adolescents use this cognitive map to begin to understand the world of work. It is logical to expect that work drive would also be influenced by family socialization. Thus, it was not surprising to find consistent themes from the interview portion of this study that families played a prominent role in how the individuals established their Work Drive. As noted earlier, the influence of one's family appears to play a major role in the career decisions and choices they make. The interviewees shared this in their experiences of developing a work drive.

Interviewer: Did you find that individuals in your family possessed high work drive or held work drive as an important asset?

3: My family held a high work drive. My father never called in, he always worked and never called in. Those values stayed with me...I was taught that you are to be serious about work. People entrust you to do a job and you should do it. 80% of my family values affect my work drive...you never settle for less...you never settle for less, don't listen to anybody else...negative things...you just don't listen to that...

7: My parents always told my sister and me to pursue our dreams. I have always been very encouraged in my life; even today they have a big impact on my life.

10: My mother always told me 'you define success.

1: My mother has expectations for me and I can't let her down...I won't let her down.

9: I want to make my parents proud...they were hardworking and sacrificed for the family...they instilled a strong work ethic in me, especially my dad, when I was growing up laziness was not accepted.

6 : Pride comes from within, growing up I always wanted to do the best I could do...my mom taught me that...we all knew we had to do the best we could otherwise you were going to be overlooked for a promotion, you're not going to move forward, so I have to do the best.

15: Your values stem from childhood. I believe work drive is something that is instilled in you at an early age...that definitely plays a key role.

2: My mother had a high work drive and work ethic that definitely rolled down to me in my spirit as well. She was a very hard working woman and I could see that growing up, especially with her being a single mother and seeing what she went through. I am just like my mom; I've got to do the same thing.

1: My lifestyle makes me want to be successful...my family, to be able to take care of my family.

7: My family values influenced my work drive 99.9%. I want to take care of my family. That's how I was raised, my mother always said 'you have to give 110%, literally...give 110%, be professional at all times, you know, wherever you are just do your job and everything will be cool.' I live by that.

15: My sister and my mother and my whole family work hard and as a child I saw my mother at times "rob Peter to pay Paul" and I don't want that.

4: Being a role model for my family. I want my family to see me as a hard worker then hopefully they will do the same.

5: We didn't like hand-outs and to do well was to work everyday and bring home what you could bring home, no matter how little it was...it was still what you went out and earned. Individuals in my family possessed high work drive.

5: I want my children to have what I didn't have and for them to get that it took more than one person in the family to work.

Interviewer: How much did/does your family values influence your work drive?

4: My work drive is influenced in making my mother proud of me, making my family proud of me, understanding what it feels like not to have things and being a role model for my children.

12: My dad drives me to be successful. He is successful and I have big footsteps to walk behind, that's my motivation.

3: My mother, father and grandmother believed in work and they emphasized that you go to work. My daddy just retired this year, he's 71 and he just retired from the school system. Every morning my daddy got up and went to work. My grandmother still works, she's worked everyday. She would get up at 4.00 in the morning to go to work...That's how I grew up, the work perspective is you do what you can, you put in a fair amount of time and you try to do good work.

14: My family values play a big role. I was fortunate enough to grow up in a dual household, with a mother and a father and both worked. I was the kid that came home and nobody's there they are out working. My parents instilled a lot of pride in what I was doing. My parents sacrificed and moved out of their comfort zone so that my family could have a better way of life.

14: My work drive has increased since my father's death. My father died 2 years ago and when he passed away I just remembered a lot of things and I want to make him proud. That changed my work drive quite a bit. My inner drive increased quite a bit just based on remembering everything he tried to teach us.

Competitiveness was the third theme to emerge from the verbal content analysis. Most of the participants described being compelled to be “the best” on their job. This construct describes performance goals and some ego involvement (Dweck, 1986)

Competitiveness:

Work-related competitiveness is a persistent striving to outperform other employees at work or do better than work peers in one’s chosen occupation. Beigin and Cooks (2000) viewed competition as “the focus on demonstrating competence by performing better than others” (442). Competitiveness in the workplace may include performance goals and ego involvement. Dweck (1986) suggested performance goals involve attempting to gain positive judgments and to avoid negative judgments with respect to competence. This notion of being competitive can be clearly seen in the interviewee’s description of work and development of a work drive. Based on these interviews there appears to be a sense of being driven to the point of competitiveness becoming a “must” in interacting at the workplace.

Interviewer: As an African American what has been your experience of establishing a work drive?

8: I’m never satisfied with my work. I have to keep going. For me satisfaction equals complacency which equals not striving to be the best.

13: You have to do the best you can at all times.

14: You have to do the job right all the time so you don’t have to re-do something. I have to and will go above and beyond.

8: You represent your work and in order for your work to be the best then you have to be the best. People recognize hard work and you want to represent yourself well.

1: I am very involved in my work. I am constantly striving to obtain my own personal goals as well as the company goal.

12: You have to be willing to give 150% to your work. You can't have any shortcomings...you have to make it happen

2: I never wanted to be a loser. I have always been competitive...I need that respect.

12: I can't let people down; they expect me to do my best.

9: When you go that extra mile to make it happen, you love what you do. It's the best, its being the best, that's what makes you feel good. You should show your best work at all times.

11: I'm very conscious of doing work right.

6: I want to be the best...I want my name in LIGHTS!

8: I'm committed to going to that next level, everything is done right. I do everything to the best of my capabilities.

Interviewer: How do you define achievement?

1: I want to be successful, meaning everything I do, my work drive; my work ethic depends on me being the best. If I am bad at those tings, I won't be successful, so I have to be good at them.

6: I need to be the best, so at times I do compare myself to others and if I need to I will step it up."

5 : I will do the best and be the best because I don't like failure, I don't want to be a failure, but then sometimes I can take failure and learn from it, but I don't like failure.

3: I am competitive by nature. Is it genetic? I don't know, but I am competitive. I will be the best. Success is competition, but I try not to become so competitive that I am arrogant.

Scale Development

For each of the above constructs, initial scale items were developed based on the literature review and by the personal experiences described by the participants. Each item

was developed to represent a single concept representing an aspect of the construct, written in one short sentence following item-writing guidelines provided by Lounsbury, Gibson, and Saudargas (2006). Each item was reviewed by a subject matter expert, the dissertation chair, and, where needed, items were revised in order to ensure consistency of the test items with their respective construct specifications.

Phase Two

Overview and Method

During this phase 163 college students in an introductory psychology course were given test packets containing a research statement, informed consent form, demographics survey (see Appendix E) and the Houston Experience Measure. The research statement informed them of the purpose of the study, that their participation was voluntary, and that they may withdraw from participating in the study at any time without fear of penalty (see Appendix C). Participants were informed that no identifying information (i.e. name or phone number or address) would be collected and that all individual responses would remain confidential. Contact information for this researcher and the dissertation chair was provided to all participants. They were also asked to sign an informed consent form, which also indicated the purpose of the study and informed participants of their voluntary participation rights (see Appendix D).

The survey consisted of 3 scales comprising 33 items. Each item was rated using a 5 point Likert Scale (1 --Strongly Disagree, 2 --Disagree, 3 --In-Between, 4 --Agree and 5 --Strongly Agree). These three scales were combined to create the Houston Experience Measure (see Appendix F). The first scale included 10 items and was labeled the Pressure to Perform Scale. The second scale included 12 items and was labeled the Family

Socialization for Work Drive scale. The third scale included 11 items and was labeled the Work-Related Competitiveness scale. These items are listed in Table 2. An internal consistency reliability analysis was performed and Cronbach's coefficient alpha was computed on each scale using SPSS Version 14.0 (SPSS INC, 2006).

Results

Following guidelines designated by (Lounsbury, Gibson, & Saudargas, 2006), it was desired that Cronbach's coefficient alpha for each scale would be at least $\geq .80$. The items in each scale, the initial Corrected-Item-Total-Correlation for each item, and estimates of coefficient alpha if the item were deleted are presented in Tables 3-5. For each scale, the coefficient alpha could not be improved by deleting any items. As can be seen from Tables 1 through 3, respectively, coefficient alpha for the Pressure to Perform scale was .83; .92 for the Family Socialization for Work Drive and .88 for the Work-Related Competitiveness scale. The scale was given to African American and European American participants in Phase Three.

Table 1.

Coefficient Alpha and Corrected Item-Total Correlations for the Pressure to Perform Scale

Item	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
1) At work, I feel like my performance is constantly being judged.	.481	.812
4) I feel like my progress at work is monitored more closely than my coworkers.	.483	.812
7) I often feel pressured to perform well at work.	.495	.811
10) At work, I feel like I have to constantly prove that I am competent and capable.	.365	.823
12) I often feel as if I have to work harder than my coworkers to meet performance standards	.526	.808
15) My employer seems to hold me to a higher standard of performance than other employees	.547	.805
18) I feel like I will be more readily reprimanded at work than other employees for performance deficits	.550	.805
21) I feel like my supervisor is less tolerant of mistakes by me than other employees	.545	.805
24) I feel as if my competence is constantly being questioned at work.	.577	.802

Table 2.

Corrected Item-Total Correlations for the Family Socialization Scale

Item	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
2) The values of my family played a large role in my having a positive attitude toward work	.611	.902
5) I was taught by my parents to work hard.	.705	.898
8) My parents taught me to give extra effort whenever needed to meet job demands	.708	.898
11) One of the motivations for me to work hard in any job is to live up to the values of my parents	.499	.910
13) My parents always emphasized to me the value of hard work.	.805	.894
16) High achievement at work was highly valued in my family.	.613	.902
19) I learned the value of hard work from my parents.	.838	.892
22) My parents encouraged me to work hard at anything I did at school or work	.704	.899
25) My parents instilled in me a strong work ethic.	.801	.894
28) I was encouraged by my parents to always do my best at any job I performed	.771	.896
30) I learned from my parents to work long hours whenever needed to complete tasks and projects	.462	.910
32) My parents disapproved of people who were lazy.	.363	.916

Table 3.

Corrected Item-Total Correlations for the Competitiveness Scale

Item	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
3) I have a strong desire to excel in my line of work	.347	.886
6) I want to be the best job performer in my company	.494	.879
9) I have always been competitive at work.	.690	.867
14) I want to be the best employee in my company	.669	.868
17) I want to do better than my coworkers.	.663	.869
20) I like to compete with other employees.	.731	.863
23) I am constantly striving to be better than my peers at what I do for a living	.645	.870
26) Some of my fellow employees view me as being too competitive.	.491	.880
29) I can't tolerate other employees doing better than me.	.492	.880
31) It is important for me to outperform my work peers.	.578	.874

Table 4.

Information about Respondents

<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Ethnicity</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Occupation</i>	<i># of years in occupation</i>	<i>Highest Degree obtained</i>
1	AfrAm	Female	Massage therapist	4	MBA
2	AfrAm	Female	Marketing Director	3	MBA
3	AfrAm	Female	Professor	20	PhD
4	AfrAm	Female	Vice Chancellor	10	PhD
5	Afr Am	Female	Sales Manager	8	BS
6	AfrAm	Female	Marketing Rep	5	MBA
7	AfrAm	Female	PhD level Graduate Student	5	MS
8	AfrAm	Male	Vice President	26	MBA
9	AfrAm	Male	Manager	2	BS
10	AfrAm	Male	Supervisor	2	BS
11	AfrAm	Male	Manager	5	BS
12	AfrAm	Male	Government	2	MBA
13	AfrAm	Male	Lawyer	2	JD
14	AfrAm	Male	Regional Manager	9	BS
15	AfrAm	Female	Psychologist	15	PhD

Table 5.

Houston Experience Measure Scale Sample Items by Subscale

Items	
Dimension	
Pressure to Perform	At work, I feel like my performance is constantly being judged. I feel like my progress at work is monitored more closely than my coworkers. I often feel pressured to perform well at work. At work, I feel like I have to constantly prove that I am competent and capable. I often feel as if I have to work harder than my coworkers to meet performance standards My employer seems to hold me to a higher standard of performance than other employees I feel like I will be more readily reprimanded at work than other employees for performance deficits I feel like my supervisor is less tolerant of mistakes by me than other employees I feel as if my competence is constantly being questioned at work. I feel like my employer expects me to do better than other employee
Family Socialization for Work Drive	The values of my family played a large role in my having a positive attitude toward work I was taught by my family to work hard. My family taught me to give extra effort whenever needed to meet job demands One of the motivations for me to work hard in any job is to live up to the values of my family My family always emphasized to me the value of hard work. High achievement at work was highly valued in my family. I learned the value of hard work from my family. My family encouraged me to work hard at anything I did at school or work My family instilled in me a strong work ethic. I was encouraged by my family to always do my best at any job I performed I learned from my family to work long hours whenever needed to complete tasks and projects My parents disapproved of people who were lazy.
Competitiveness	I have a strong desire to excel in my line of work. I want to be the best job performer in my company. I have always been competitive at work. I want to be the best employee in my company. I want to do better than my coworkers. I like to compete with other employees. I am constantly striving to be better than my peers at what I do for a living Some of my fellow employees view me as being too competitive. I can't tolerate other employees doing better than me. It is important for me to outperform my work peers. I can't stand it when somebody else at work does better than me

CHAPTER II: Literature Review

Literature Review

As noted in Chapter 1, multicultural factors in assessment are important to consider when developing new constructs. Minorities have long been underrepresented in vocational research. To understand underlying cultural variables, one must consider theories and instruments that incorporate a multicultural component. This section discusses Work Drive briefly, factors involved in vocation choice in relation to Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT), which encompasses cultural, environmental and familial factors similar to the scale constructs on the HEM and multicultural issues in assessment.

Work Drive

Lounsbury, Gibson, and Hamrick (2004) defined work drive as “an individual’s disposition to work long hours and extend oneself, when needed, to meet job demands and achieve job success.” Work drive carries implications of striving to perform at a high level and being successful, b) not only meeting job demands, but going above and beyond expectations, c) inventing much time and effort into one’s work role, and d) participating in the event of developing a disposition for work. Work Drive is conceptualized as a personality trait; that is a relatively enduring characteristic of the individual that extends over time and across situations. It is not conceptualized as a short-term state or psychological need or motivational condition that one can consummate or satiate. It is also not a generalized value or belief like the Protestant Work Ethic or Work Ethic. Work Drive differs from Protestant Work Ethic or Work Ethic in that Protestant Work Ethic is

usually discussed in terms of a set of attitudes, beliefs, or values about the importance of work overall for the betterment of society instead of working solely for self-gain, morals and character strengths and flaws, viewing laziness and soporific views towards work negatively and revering hard work and tenacity (Feather, 1984; Ganster, 1981; Lounsbury, Gibson, & Hamrick, 2004; MacDonald, 1972; Merrens and Garrett, 1975). The concept of work drive has been found to be a good predictor of job performance, career satisfaction, academic performance, and even life satisfaction (Lounsbury et al., 2004).

The concept of work drive does not specify whether it is influenced by external or internal factors. In developing a work drive, life experiences may play a large role in the development of work drive. These life experiences vary from individual to individual and for ethnic groups. Specifically, African Americans' experience in American culture could possibly have a significant impact on how their work drive is developed. Their experiences are rooted in a society where they are viewed as the minority and for the most part are stereotyped in a negative manner with respect to work/working (Harrington, 1998). These experiences could include, but are not limited to, perceived pressure to perform, family values or family socialization with respect to working hard, perceived outcomes of working hard, and competitiveness. "Going above and beyond expectations," on a regular basis is often ingrained in the African American culture for those individuals who consider themselves successful in Americanized mainstream society.

Vocation and Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT)

The world of work, specifically regarding choice of vocation and career development, holds many implications for African American men and women. Cultural context has a major influence on one's decisions and choices about work and career. As described by Carter and Cook (1992) "from a cultural frame of reference, work is a functional aspect of life in that individuals contribute their skills and labors to their cultural societies and the maintenance of families" (p. 199). Some models of career development describe how society's norms and values (mesosystem) and the context in which one functions (school, work, social settings) interact with an individual to make informed career decisions. Many minorities deal with extraneous factors in their everyday lives that effect their experience of work, such as racism and discrimination.

In the view of Fouad and Byars-Winston (2005), racial/ethnic minority clients enter a job market in which ethnic minority groups are usually concentrated in lower skilled positions, which may influence their perception of opportunities and broaden the perception of barriers. Fouad and Byars-Winston (ibid) conducted a meta-analysis that investigated the relationship between culture and vocational choice factors. They found that race/ethnicity did not contribute to career aspirations or decision-making attitudes, but that there were differences with respect to ethnic minorities' perception of career opportunities and career barriers. They added that these significant differences are consistent with the sociopolitical context in which ethnic minorities live and function. Consequently, Fouad and Byars-Winston concluded that even though individuals demonstrate similar career aspirations, something happens in an ethnic minority's life

development in which opportunities and barriers to these aspirations are experienced and therefore places a large role on the conclusions made about career and vocational choices.

Harrington (1998) proposed factors that may affect African American's career choices including willingness to relocate, Affirmative Action backlash, ability to obtain post-secondary education in order to gain competitive edge in the work force, downsizing by employers, and the impact of technology. However, one of the main factors that play into choice of career made by African Americans is the ability to which the vocation allows one to give back to his or her culture. Kimbrough and Salmone (1993) concluded that "If a person in the Black community has a steady job, provides for the family, supports the church, and is trying to assist the group, then he or she is given high social status and rank highly in the community. The job can be considered menial by mainstream society standards (i.e. barber, beautician, and housekeeper) but the individual is considered successful in the Black community" (p. 267). In each of these articles, the role of family seems to be an important variable in developing a career/vocation interest. In the case of African Americans the importance of family socialization was affirmed by the interviewees and was one of the key themes identified in the content analysis of interviews.

Several researchers have investigated the effects of family on career decision-making for African Americans. Gailbraith-Jones (1989) studied the experiences of 12 African American women writers and found that the family was a major source in their career development path. Members of their families were viewed as being supportive and as a main source of modeling successful behavior. Their families also had expectations related to success and attending college. Byk (1992) examined the experiences of 10

African American female lawyers and also found family to be a major source in developing a successful career path. Pearson and Bieschke (2001) conducted consensual qualitative research methodology in researching how African American women's perceptions of their families influenced their career development. These included economic resources, education, extended family network, family values regarding work, gender roles, nuclear family relations and social resources. Pearson and Bieschke (ibid) concluded that messages received, reinforcement provided, and any learning that occurred in each of these domains had a strong impact on the interviewee's career/vocation choice and the level of success they are experiencing in their chosen profession.

Similar to the area of assessment, most developmental career theories have been based mainly on research with white males, from the middle to upper-middle class of society. As might be expected, the applicability of these theories to women, ethnic minorities, and other socioeconomic classes has been questioned. Developmental models based on white middle-class values make consequential assumptions based on white privilege, such as relative influence, free and open labor market, occupational information and access to education, and work as a central value (Kerka 1998; Leong 1995). In addition, most of the developmental models do not include crucial cultural and structural variables that are relative to ethnic minorities.

To date, there has been no development of a comprehensive career development model for racial and ethnic minorities. However, one of the most promising career theories that may prove to be useful in accounting for cultural variables in career development is Lent, Brown and Hackett's (1994) Social Cognitive Career Theory

(SCCT), which is rooted in Albert Bandura's (1986) Social Cognitive Theory. The main factors in this model include self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals, which are conceptualized as interacting with each other by way of a feedback loop, in that each one influences the other and at times may be reciprocally causative. These three factors are viewed as being applicable across ethnically diverse populations, and might help explain the ways in which race and ethnicity influence career efficacy beliefs, interests, and other variables used in predicting career outcomes.

Hackett and Byars (1996) contend that the SCCT theory views individuals as actively influencing their own career development and surroundings. Self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals can help shape and mold occupational and academic interests, choices, and performances. Moreover, SCCT links three aspects of career development: “ 1) the formation and elaboration of career-relevant interests, 2) the selection of academic and career choice options and performance and 3) persistence in educational and occupational pursuits” (Lent, Brown & Hackett, 1994, p. 79). Even though the SCCT model has not been used much in investigating cultural dynamics, the model includes elements suggesting ongoing and important cultural influences on learning experiences--career self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goal setting. For example, Brown (1995) contends that as a result of discrimination and racism, outcome expectations may be more salient in African Americans' than Caucasians' career development.

Self-efficacy beliefs refer to “people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Bandura 1986, p.391). Self-efficacy beliefs are seen as being the most central and

pervasive element in developing career interests and choices. Within the context of SCCT, self-efficacy involves a dynamic system of self-beliefs that can be linked to certain performance domains and activities with respect to work and academics. Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) conceptualize self-efficacy views as determinative of one's choice of environment and actions, as well as the effort one is willing to put forth in the attainment of goals, their persistence, thought patterns, and emotional reactions when confronted by obstacles. Self-efficacy is assumed to be acquired and changed through four primary informational sources: personal performance accomplishments, vicarious learning, social persuasion, physiological states and reactions. Of these four primary informational sources, personal accomplishments are viewed as having the greatest influence on self-efficacy. Personal performance experience on self-efficacy is dependent upon several factors including variety of conditions under which a task is performed, and the consequences of task performance. The four informational sources will be discussed in detail and in reference to the literature later in this section.

Outcome expectations refer to the beliefs about the consequences or outcomes of performing a particular action. They are derived from a variety of direct and vicariously learned events. An individual either learns to expect something from directly experiencing the situation or from watching others experience an event. As summarized by Bandura (1986, p. 231), "People act on their judgments of what they can do as well as on their beliefs about the likely effects of various actions."

Personal goals can be defined as one's intentions to engage in a certain activity or to produce a particular outcome (Bandura, 1986). Goals represent desired future outcomes. Setting goals makes one an active participant in their life and helps give a

person direction and purpose to their actions, allowing one to endure working over long periods of time without external reinforcement. Lent and Brown (1996) posit that the goals people set for themselves are heavily affected by self-efficacy and outcome expectations. For example, having strong, positive beliefs about one's writing talents and about the perceived outcomes based on these talents, one may be willing to work hard towards the goal of being a writer, which are consistent with their beliefs. Four primary informational sources in self-efficacy include personal performance accomplishments, vicarious learning, social persuasion, physiological states and reactions.

Hackett and Byars (1996) examined SSCT on the context of African American women's career development. In their view, black women experience common types of events in their lives differently compared to white women and these experiences could strongly enhance or diminish career-related and academic self-efficacy.

Given that African American women may experience ambiguity on what behaviors will be rewarded and punished, accurate and consistent feedback is necessary for developing strong and realistic efficacy beliefs. The inability to predict how one will respond to behavior or performance can be attributed to career barriers that are either perceived or real (i.e. sexism, racism). Another career obstacle that African American women may face is dealing with differential standards applied to the same behavior. Hackett and Byars (1996) offer the following example of differential standards: "An African American girl in a classroom is performing on a par with her peers in her high school courses but receives feedback from teachers that is different from that given to her classmates. This differential performance feedback might result in decreased academic self-efficacy, despite successful performance" (p. 3). Dependent on this young girl's

established self-efficacy and awareness of racism and discrimination, this performance experience could either strengthen or weaken her self-efficacy. The authors also cite Smith (1983) and, discuss these discrepant messages on a more universal level in that even if ethnic minorities and women have the same level of education in the U.S., they do not receive the same wages, jobs, and promotions as do middle-class white males.

In the current study, the construct “Pressure to Perform” was developed based on male and female interview respondent’s similar experiences.

6: I feel like you constantly have people watching you closely...standing over you, checking on you, and I feel like you have to prove that you can do the job...no one wants to be micromanaged.

6: As a Black female I constantly feel as if I am under the microscope. You have to prove that you are capable. I always feel like I am proving myself...It’s like getting ready for war everyday. I tell myself ‘you have to put on your camouflage shoes, your gear, everything and get ready for war’. I feel like in a way you are getting geared up to be a soldier so you can go out there on the field and prove who you are over and over again.

3: Our experience is legendary, we have a history, we have this notion that we have to do a little bit more to succeed and in many ways that is true...because even if that’s not true in a particular situation, in the back of your mind you are thinking ‘the only reason that so-in-so is because of affirmative action or whatever, so I have to kick it in gear’. You have to prove that you belong in a lot of situations and I hate to say this, but you are motivated sometimes to break the stereotypes.

14: My experience has been that...and I am sure this goes for a lot of African Americans, that you feel like you have to work harder than your White counterparts in the work force just based on the fact that it seems that you are two steps behind so to even get even you have to work harder and dress better and smile more...

Another important component of the development of self-efficacy is vicarious learning. Observing the failure or achievement of others can play a large role in what an individual aspires to achieve. If a modeled behavior is particularly salient to an individual, it may have a large influence on the development of efficacy. Most vicarious learning takes place early in life when one is observing caregivers, family members, and community members. Hackett and Byars (1996) concluded that in African American families the accomplishments of the parents play a large role in the career and vocation choices of their children. As each generation attains higher career status and level of education, the following generation will be more apt to follow the pattern of success and do better than the previous generation. The pattern of success and attaining higher career status is very true of African American mothers and daughters.

African American women have a long history of working (Greene 1990; Dawkins, 1989) and, for the most part, they learn early that they will likely have to work and help support their family for most of their lives. Coping styles in dealing with double minority status (i.e. black and female) are also modeled in the family system. The way in which parents respond to racism and discrimination is usually modeled by the child as well and is involved in their learning process. The ideal of importance of family was also demonstrated in this current study with respect to the construct “Family Socialization related to Work Drive”. Interviewees described their families and their family experiences as being crucial factors in the development of their work drives. Presented below are some examples of how family experiences affected the development of work drive for interviewees.

4: My work drive is influenced in making my mother proud of me, making my family proud of me, understanding what it feels like not to have things and being a role model for my children.

12: My dad drives me to be successful. He is successful and I have big footsteps to walk behind, that's my motivation.

3: My mother, father and grandmother believed in work and they emphasized that you go to work. My daddy just retired this year, he's 71 and he just retired from the school system. Every morning my daddy got up and went to work. My grandmother still works, she's worked everyday. She would get up at 4.00 in the morning to go to work...That's how I grew up, the work perspective is you do what you can, you put in a fair amount of time and you try to do good work

Another important aspect to the development of self-efficacy that may play a prominent role for African Americans is the notion of social persuasion, which refers to verbal information and messages received by the individual. Social persuasion is often used to influence individuals to maintain certain types of behaviors. These verbal messages can be words of encouragement or discouragement. Encouragement will most likely help strengthen self-efficacy, especially if the encouragement is congruent with actual performance abilities. Hackett and Byars (1996) report that African American parents send their children messages about academic and career achievement as well as messages of how to cope with an unfair sociopolitical structure. It is possible for these messages to affect outcome expectancies of a child when they internalize the received messages. Ogbu (1991) contends that the messages African American children internalize play a prominent role in their ethnic identity development, which in turn may moderate the effects of learning experiences on academic and career self-efficacy.

Physiological states and reactions are proposed as influences on self-efficacy (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). Essentially the idea is based on “feeling” if something is right and “Do I feel good or bad when performing this behavior?” If one is experiencing high levels of anxiety when performing a behavior, they may relate the feelings to a work or academic task and thus be deterred from that particular work or academic task. Or, if someone experiences pleasant arousal while completing a task, self-efficacy about the task may be enhanced. Hackett and Byars (1996) discussed these states in relation to experiencing an African American worldview with respect to learning to deal with the negative affective states associated with experiencing racism and discrimination. Experiences of racism and discrimination can have implications for career-related self-efficacy. Hackett and Byars (1996) summarized the development of strong coping mechanisms in dealing with the reality of racism and discrimination while simultaneously enhancing cognitive appraisal skills (i.e. attributing negative feedback to the reality of racism or sexism). It is possible that in combining the above occurrences that one internalizes this coping style and in turn becomes dogmatic in their ability to perform successfully and achieve. The idea of affective states, reactions and ways of coping, can be seen in the emotionally charged statements interviewees provided in the development of the “Competitiveness” construct, as illustrated by the following:

8: I’m never satisfied with my work. I have to keep going. For me satisfaction equals complacency which equals not striving to be the best.

13: You have to do the best you can at all times.

14: You have to do the job right all the time so you don’t have to re-do something. I have to and will go above and beyond.

8: You represent your work and in order for your work to be the best then you have to be the best. People recognize hard work and you want to represent yourself well.

1: I am very involved in my work. I am constantly striving to obtain my own personal goals as well as the company goals.

12: You have to be willing to give 150% to your work. You can't have any shortcomings...you have to make it happen

Multiculturalism and Assessment

There is a long-standing and unresolved debate about cultural factors and test development. Many researchers have argued that most assessments are based on Anglocentric theories and thus are not appropriate for ethnic minorities (Helms, 1994; Leong, 1995; Leong and Brown, 1995). Gelso and Fretz (2001) contend that the debate has a history beginning from the use of aptitude tests during World War II, in which psychological assessment began to be used as a tool of discrimination rather than of ability. As a result of this misuse of assessment, the area of Counseling Psychology moved away from assessment and in the 1960's assessment use saw a decline due to the emergence of evidence of the adverse impact on employment and education opportunities of women and ethnic minorities.

Assessment research on ethnic minority groups has also had a controversial history, from dealing with comparisons of intelligence and achievement to personality variables, prevalence rates of pathology, vocational interests, and issues of self-esteem and identity development. A major concern of individual differences research on ability and personality constructs is that most of the instruments used to measure the constructs were normed on white samples, and then generalized to ethnic minorities without

conducting empirical research to confirm that the empirical data and interpretations were not significantly different for minority populations. For example, even though the MMPI, which is one of the most popular and widely used clinical instruments, was renormed using 26,000 people in 1989, it still included few minorities and was originally normed in the 1930's on hospital visitors who were between the ages of 16-65, and were white, middle-class males (Hathaway & McKinley, 1940). Early research using the MMPI with African American clients revealed that African Americans typically scored higher than Whites on scales L, F, 8 (schizophrenia) and 9 (hypomania) on the MMPI (Handel & Ben-Porath, 1996). In comprehensive review of the empirical literature, Graham (1999) concluded that there have been mixed findings on varying MMPI scores between black and white clients.

Socio-economic status (SES), age, and education also appear to play a significant role in some of the differences between black and white test takers. Differences in scores on the MMPI as a function of ethnic and cultural factors have also been found, (Dahlstrom, Lachar, & Dahlstrom, 1986). The differences in scores are especially prevalent with respect to young black men, for whom endorsement on some MMPI items reflected various coping and defense mechanisms. The use of coping and defense mechanisms may resemble higher levels of paranoia and distrust, that minorities have to implement in their everyday life in order to deal with the racial discrimination and other circumstances they encounter while living in the United States.

Morris (2000) reports that over 3,000 assessment measures are currently available and most of them have been normed on predominantly Euro-American, college-age students or middle-class individuals. Thus, when African Americans are assessed using

these instruments legitimate concerns may be brought up concerning validity issues, reliability issues, bias, and diagnostic concerns and implications. Because most of these assessments are based on euro-centric populations, the tests construction and the tests results are likely to favor the majority groups upon which they are normed. Ethnic minority group members may be at a disadvantage on these tests because they usually do not have a Eurocentric enculturation and socialization process which would enhance test performance.

Ponterotto (1988) examined all ethnic/racial research published in the *Journal of Counseling Psychology (JCP)* in the eleven year period 1976-1986. He identified forty-nine minority-focused empirical studies and found that only 5 of the studies utilized culture-specific instrumentation. Ponterotto and Casas (1991) examined 80 minority-specific studies within the six year period 1983-1988 in five national journals: The *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, the *Counseling Psychologist*, *Journal of Counseling and Development*, and the *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*. Out of the 80 research articles examined only 25 (31%) used instruments that were developed and designed within a multicultural framework. The other studies used culture-specific instrumentation, which refers to “instruments specifically developed and tested within a conceptual-theoretical base rooted in a “minority experience” (e.g. minority identity theory, acculturation levels) (Sabnani & Ponterotto, 1992).

If race and culture affect the basic building blocks of personality, as is believed from a cultural standpoint, then inventories developed from a primarily Eurocentric viewpoint should not be administered or interpreted in the same ways that they are for

other people unless appropriate empirical research demonstrates that there are no differences in scores and validity patterns between majority and minority groups. Some researchers have found evidence for universality among testing instruments. For example, Day and Rounds (1998) used Holland's vocational construct to assess universality of the use of the RIASEC model. They investigated vocational interests across racial and ethnic groups (Mexican Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans, African Americans, and Caucasians). The participants were all college-bound individuals who had recently taken the ACT. They found that there were no significant differences with respect to race and interests. Assimilation and acculturation were not measured variables in this study; given that these students were all college-bound their level of acculturation and assimilation may have played a large role in their response patterns.

Concerns about the use of assessment have changed over time, as the zeitgeist has moved towards a more culturally-centered approach. Thus, the concern and need to conduct research in the area of culturally appropriate assessment has grown.

Organizations such as the American Psychological Association (APA) and the American Counseling Association (ACA) have modified their standards concerning test development with respect to test construction in order to ensure that more appropriate norms have been developed for the population being tested (Sedlacek, 1994). Even though the field of psychology is experiencing this shift with respect to assessment, it is still an area in which a more enhanced and pervasive multicultural perspective is needed. Many researchers (Helms, 1992; Sabnani & Ponterotto, 1992; Sedlacek & Sue, 1995) have proposed ways in which multicultural issues and components should be incorporated in research and test development. There is a great need for further research

on the validity and reliability of measures for specific multicultural groups.

Consequential variables, that most minorities face on a regular basis, such as racism, discrimination, and cultural support, should be researched further and incorporated into test development, dissemination, and administration. Issues concerning age, physical disability, sexual orientation, etc. should also be included. More valid assessment instruments would better allow health care providers to serve a population in which they may be unfamiliar. Some researchers have also suggested that test developers and health care professionals work together to design more culturally relevant tests.

Sabnani and Ponterotto (1992) reviewed eight minority-specific instruments that have been specifically developed and conceptualized for use in minority-focused research. These instruments were chosen based on past research use and the extent to which these instruments were prevalent in past research articles. The instruments selected also had to be linked to research constructs in cross cultural literature in areas such as acculturation, racial identity development, racism, and cultural mistrust. Instruments used only once or twice or developed solely for dissertation purposes were excluded from the review. The final instruments chosen included The Cultural Mistrust Inventory, The African Self-Consciousness Scale, The Cross Cultural Counseling Inventory-revised, Modern Racism Scale, Value Orientation Scale, The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans, the Racial Identity Attitude Scale, and the Development Inventory of Black Consciousness.

Sabnani and Ponterotto (1992) concluded that further research is needed to more fully evaluate the psychometric properties for each scale and that minority-specific scale development is in a very early stage. The sample chosen to develop these instruments

were college students and used no elderly participants; thus, the instruments may be reliable and valid for one generation but not for another generation. SES is a variable that is incorporated when discussing multicultural assessment, yet only two of the aforementioned measures controlled for SES. Sabnani and Ponterotto (1992) also recommended the incorporation of methodological diversity, rather than only using a quantitative approach to scale development. They suggest that perhaps a mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methods may be better for minority-specific scale development. "Given that both quantitative and qualitative approaches have unique strengths, parallel findings across methodologies would support the convergent validity of the results" (pg.14). The authors also recommended that researchers in minority assessment integrate more qualitative methods which include, but are not limited to, life histories, participant-observation, unstructured and semi-structured interviews, and oral histories.

Several issues have been examined and studied with respect to culture and assessment. Helms (1992) discussed cultural equivalence with respect to the age-old debate concerning the achievement gap between black and white students on cognitive ability tests. Helms discussed factors that have been researched concerning the black/white achievement gap such as the biological perspective; that there are genetic differences that exist between the races. The environmental perspective which proposes that environmental factors (stressors, i.e. SES, educational opportunities) affect the performance on cognitive achievement tests. Helms also suggested that the lack of use of cultural equivalence in test development may be adding to the achievement gap phenomena. She avers that cultural equivalencies have seldom been verified with respect

to test development and test construction. Lonner (1981) discussed four kinds of equivalence: (a) functional equivalence, the degree to which test scores have the same meaning in different cultural groups, and measures psychological characteristics that occur with equal frequency within these groups, (b) conceptual equivalence, are groups equally familiar with the content of the test items and as a result place the same meaning to the items, (c) linguistic equivalence, does the language used in the test development used equally as to hold the same meaning to cultural groups and (d) psychometric equivalence, tests measure the same things at the same levels across cultural groups.

Austin (1999) reviewed culturally relevant testing instruments and tests with norms for cultural groups such as African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Native-Americans and suggested that such multiculturally sensitive assessments can be a valuable tool for those who provide services to ethnic minority members.

Sedlacek (1994) proposed several factors pertaining to standards of test development that may hinder the inclusion of cultural factors, such as the quest for the “golden label.” In searching for “the golden label” researchers and psychometricians spend too much time in attempting to operationally define culture, diversity, and ethnicity. Either way these terms refer to those individuals who are not of white middle-class, of European descent, have less power to control their lives and experience discrimination in the United States. He then refers to falling into “the three musketeers” trap in which there is this underlying belief in the “all for one and one for all” saying, when in fact this statement is untrue given various cultural experiences. It would be impossible to develop one measure for individuals with differing backgrounds,

experiences and variation in how their presentation of these experiences. When developing instruments for ethnic minorities, other forms of intelligence can be considered, such as contextual intelligence, experiential intelligence, and componential intelligence (Sternberg, 1985, 1986). Contextual intelligence involves the ability to adapt to a changing environment and the ability to negotiate the system. Experiential intelligence is the ability to interpret information in varying contexts; the ability to be creative and componential intelligence is the ability to interpret information in a taxonomic and hierarchal way in a well-established and unchanging context. Sedlacek (1991) contends that most non-white individuals demonstrate their abilities in more experiential and contextual ways. Their way of manifesting abilities may be, in part, the result of having to be bi-cultural in order to function and survive in society.

Sue (1996) cataloged ethnocentric errors that regularly occur in test development, administration, and interpretation. These errors can lead to misdiagnosing individuals, making the wrong referrals and providing the working vocational guidance. Providing service providers with instruments that can be appropriately applied to an ethnic group is important for training culturally sensitive and capable persons.

Ethnic identity or culture itself is a highly complex and dynamic system. Over the years it has been assigned numerous definitions. These definitions at times have been ambiguous and unclear due to the multiple meanings across generations. Currently, ethnic minority groups are defined as those individuals that share some common psychological characteristics associated with culture and these shared characteristics are related to personality or pathology (Okazaki & Sue, 1995). In dealing with cultural issues in assessment, such broad terms and definitions make it difficult to specify exactly what

it is that one is including or measuring when discussing ethnic minorities. In the case of African Americans, these cultural differences may significantly impact the way in which they may perform on standardized tests. There is some empirical evidence that demonstrate environmental context affecting the cognitive processing of African Americans. Morris (2000) reported that thought processes are influenced by the activities that are dominant within their culture, such as thoughts about work, career, family, religion, and education. For example, in the African American culture education is viewed as deriving from a variety of sources, not just school. These sources could include teachings from the church, elders, peers, relatives and individuals whom they share a close relationship. The incorporation of various sources and of information may result in a thought process that not only includes teaching from the dominant reference group, but from their own cultural group as well, which as stated earlier leads to the idea of being “bi-cultural.” By including these various forms of information it is possible to develop a thought process that may be intricate and result in viewing information differently from the norm group.

It is these experiences and differences that need to be considered when developing instruments. Individuals that are “bi-cultural” do incorporate a worldview that entails information from various source and experiences. “Bi-culturality” can lead to experiencing different situations and issues when compared to the norm group. Dana (1998) stated that taking these differences into consideration is vital in developing assessment instruments for African Americans.

Summary

The purpose of the literature review was to examine the relevance of understanding cultural factors that are related to developing a work drive for African Americans and the need for a culturally relevant instrument that might help to quantify and measure these experiences. Because of the limited data examining ethnic minority variables in the development of the construct of work drive as well as in career development models, the present review affirmed the need for more research in this area. General conclusions from the review and recommendations are now presented.

The review of the literature identified several important implications for conducting culturally relevant research. African Americans and other minorities may experience many different sociopolitical factors that influence their perceptions of the world and how they function in the world. Issues such as racism, discrimination and a long history of oppression have shaped the way in which African Americans develop and present career and academic interests. Even now they experience such adverse societal treatment as unequal pay and unequal employment opportunities.

Family teachings and learning are a critical aspect in the development of self-efficacy and other beliefs about the world of work. African American children internalize messages received in the home and from the outside world and make sense of them that hopefully, cause them to strive to do better. Family influence can also play a large role in learning to deal with the nature of the environment in which one lives. Coping styles that promote tenacity and strength appear to be necessary in achievement. From the standpoint of the SCCT model, self-efficacy is an important factor, which may be

compromised for African Americans by the experience of racism, sexism, discrimination, and oppression.

Developing measures that are culturally relevant is also a salient aspect of this literature review. In order to understand a culture it is most appropriate to use instruments based on theories, voices and experiences. Multicultural assessment is a fertile and rapidly growing area of study in psychology. Even though there have been guidelines set in place to help decrease testing bias, the tests themselves are still constructed on norms that may or may not be appropriate for ethnic minorities. Culturally-relevant testing is still in an early stage of development and it will take some time to create reliable and valid tests that are appropriate for diverse ethnic and cultural groups. Finally, it is clear from the literature reviewed above that using a mixed method approach is appropriate for developing culturally relevant assessments.

Rationale and Hypotheses of Phase Three

Phase Three was designed to measure differences between African Americans and European Americans in relationships between constructs measured on the Houston Experience Measure. Specifically, the following hypotheses were evaluated:

- 1) The correlation between Pressure to Perform and Work Drive will be higher for African Americans than European Americans.
- 2) The correlation between Family Socialization for Hard Work and Work Drive will be higher for African Americans than European Americans.
- 3) The correlation between Competitiveness and Work Drive will be higher for African Americans than European Americans.

Research Questions

I also investigated the following research questions:

- 1) How much of the total variance in Work Drive can be explained by Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization related to Work Drive, and Competitiveness for African Americans and for European Americans.
- 2) Do the correlations in the main hypotheses differ for males and females. In other words, does gender moderate the correlations examined in the main hypotheses.
- 3) Do the correlations in the main hypotheses differ for males and females as a function of race? In other words, does race and gender moderate the correlations examined in the main hypotheses?
- 4) Does the total amount of variance in Work Drive be explained by Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization related to Work Drive, and Competitiveness differ for male and female African Americans and for European Americans. In other words, does gender moderate the results for Research Question 2?

CHAPTER III: Methodology

Method

Participants

All subjects held jobs in various areas of work including being an undergraduate student, graduate student, office worker, manager, office manager, government worker, Ph.D.(psychologist), professor (psychologist), M.D., medical field associate (medical assistant, RN, LPN, hospital staff), sales associate, clerical worker, vice president, factory worker, restaurant industry worker (server, waitress) and custodial worker. The total sample included 316 participants. Of the 316 subjects, 112 (35.4%) were men and 203 were women (64.2%). (See Table 6). In the sample 96 (30.4%) participants were African American and 203 (64.2%) participants were European American the remaining 17(5.4%) participants were of either, Hispanic, Asian, Arabic, Indian, or bi-racial descent. (See Table 6).

Instruments

The measures used in this study were:

1. Demographic Information
2. Houston Experience Measure (HEM)
3. Work Drive Survey Short Form

1. Demographic Information. The demographic information section asked questions regarding the participant's sex, age, race, educational level, career, years on the job, hours worked per week, vacation days taken, race of immediate supervisor and co-workers. (See Appendix G).

Table 6.

Demographics of Participants

Race	Gender
African American N= 96 30.4%	Males N= 112 35.4%
European American N=203 64.2%	Females N=203 64.2%
Hispanic, Asian, Arabic, Indian, or bi-racial N= 17 5.4%	
N= 316	

2. Houston Experience Measure. This scale was developed specifically to quantify experiences described by African Americans related to developing a work drive. It was used in the study to determine whether or not there were differences in the level of item endorsement on this scale in African Americans and Caucasians. There are 33 items on this scale with responses made on a 5 point-Likert scale ranging from 1—“Strongly Disagree” to 5—“Strongly Agree”. There are three facets in this scale: *pressure to perform*, *family socialization related to work drive*, and *competitiveness*. Coefficient alpha for pressure to perform in this study was .83, coefficient alpha for family socialization related to work drive was .93 and the coefficient alpha for competitiveness was .88 (See Appendix H).

3. Work Drive Survey Short Form. Work Drive measures will used in this study. The Work Drive Scale Short Form was developed by Lounsbury and Gibson (2005). The Work Drive measure is comprised of 12 items and an internal consistency reliability of over .80 using diverse samples of over 100,000 working adults. The scale was structured

on a five-point Likert-type rating scale. High scores indicate an increased tendency toward a having a high work drive. Examples of these items have been provided below:

1. I would keep working even if I didn't need the money.	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1 2 3 4 5	I would <u>not</u> keep working if I didn't need the money.
2. Those who know me well would say I am an EXTREMELY hard-working individual.	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1 2 3 4 5	Those who know me well would <u>not</u> say I am an EXTREMELY hard-working individual.
3. I would <u>not</u> say that I have more work drive and energy than most people.	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1 2 3 4 5	I would say that I have more work drive and energy than most people.
4. I would like to be a high achiever at work, but am not hung up about it.	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ 1 2 3 4 5	I have a burning desire to be a high achiever at work.

Procedure

All subjects were solicited from various occupational sites from several different states in the southeast. These subjects held jobs in various areas of work including being an undergraduate student, graduate student, office worker, manager, office manager, government worker, Ph.D.(psychologist), professor (psychologist), M.D., medical field associate (medical assistant, RN, LPN, hospital staff), sales associate, clerical worker, vice president, factory worker, restaurant industry worker (server, waitress) and custodial worker. Subjects were asked to voluntarily complete a questionnaire package that included: (a) an informed consent form from the investigator describing the nature and purpose of the study; and an explanation that their participation was voluntary and that participating in this study did not pose any type of risk to the participant (See Appendix E); (b) the name and the number of the research advisor if there were any questions regarding the questionnaire and (c) the four instruments, which again included respectively, the demographic survey, the Houston Experience Measure, and the Work Drive Survey Short Form.

The participants were solicited in two ways. 1) The investigator went directly to the work sites and with the verbal consent of the employers, actively recruited subjects, who were provided with verbal information about the purpose and nature of the study. Verbal consent was obtained by approaching various employers (bosses, supervisors) and explaining the nature and purpose of the study. 2) Several acquaintances of the investigator, whom worked in diverse job settings, were given questionnaire packets to distribute at their place of work/business. They were also informed to direct any questions about the study to the investigator, whose contact information was available on the informed consent form, which was attached to the front of every questionnaire packet. Once the packets were completed by co-workers and colleagues of each acquaintance they were instructed to seal the surveys and mail them to the investigator.

The results were analyzed using the following statistical procedures: Descriptive statistics were computed for study variables on the (a) Houston Experience Measure (HEM) (i.e. *pressure to perform scale*, *family socialization scale* and *competitiveness scale*) and (b) Work Drive Measure. Pearson product moment correlations and tests for the difference between independent correlation coefficients (Guildford & Fruchter, 1979) were used to analyze the main hypotheses and research question 2 and 3. Stepwise multiple regression analyses were used to examine research questions 1 and 4.

CHAPTER IV: Results

Introduction

The results were analyzed using the following statistical procedures: descriptive statistical data (i.e. means, frequency counts, standard deviations and ranges) were computed on the study variables on the (a) Houston Experience Measure (HEM) (i.e. *pressure to perform scale*, *family socialization scale* and *competitiveness scale*) and (b) Work Drive Measure. Tables 10, 11 and 12 display means, standard deviations, and their intercorrelations and correlations with Work Drive separately for all participants, African American participants and European American participants in the study, respectively. Pearson product moment correlations and a Fischer's z test to determine whether the correlations were significantly different between independent correlation coefficients (Guildford & Fruchter, 1979) were used to analyze the main hypotheses and research question 2 and 3. Stepwise multiple regression analyses were used to examine research questions 1 and 4. Independent samples t tests were used to analyze the difference between variable means in the main hypotheses. The data were analyzed using SPSS Statistical Program (Norusis, 1993). This chapter reviews the statistical findings when the above analyses were conducted in this study.

Summary Descriptive for the Total Sample and Subgroup

This section reports descriptive statistics for the total sample and for the two subgroups of African American subjects and European American subjects on (a) HEM (*pressure to perform*, *family socialization*, *competitiveness*) and (b) Work Drive Measure. The results presented in Table 7 show the descriptive statistics for the total sample. The

results presented in Table 8 show descriptive statistics for American Americans and European Americans for the study variables.

On the variable of *Pressure to Perform*, the mean score of participants was 3.4 for African American subjects and 3.1 for European American subjects. An independent sample *t*- test (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003) indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores Pressure to Perform and Work Drive for African Americans, $t(297) = -3.2, p < .01$, than European American subjects. This analysis revealed that African Americans were more likely to report higher scores on the Pressure to Perform scale in relation to the Work Drive scale than European American subjects, as can be seen in Table 8. For the variable *Family Socialization*, the mean score was 4.2 for African American subjects and 4.2 for European American subjects. When a *t* test was conducted, the results yielded no statistically significant differences, $t(297) = -.30, p > .01$. (see Table 9). On the variable *Competitiveness*, the mean score was 3.4 for African American participants and 3.5 for European American participants. When a *t* test was conducted, the results yielded no statistically significant differences, $t(297) = -.46, p > .01$. See Table 8.

Table 7.

Summary of Descriptive Statistics for the Total Sample on the Study Variables

Study Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Pressure to Perform	3.2	.67	316
Family Socialization	4.1	.59	316
Competitiveness	3.4	.64	316
Work Drive	3.1	.58	316

Table 8.

Summary of Descriptive Statistics on the Study Variables with Results of Independent Samples t test to Compare African American and European American Subjects

Study Variable	RACE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pressure to Perform	European American	203	3.1	.58
	African American	96	3.4	.79
Family Socialization	European American	203	4.2	.56
	African American	96	4.2	.59
Competitiveness	European American	203	3.4	.64
	African American	96	3.5	.69
Work Drive	European American	203	3.2	.64
	African American	96	3.3	.61

Table 9.

Mean scores, Standard Deviations, and Results of t test to Compare African Americans and European Americans on Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization, and Competitiveness

Variable	<u>African American</u>		<u>Caucasian</u>		<u>t-obs</u>
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Pressure to Perform	3.4	.79	3.1	.58	-3.2*
Family Socialization	4.2	.59	4.2	.55	-.30
Competitiveness	3.4	.61	3.4	.64	-.46

* $p < .01$

N = 96 African Americans; N = 203 European Americans

Table 10.

Intercorrelations of Study Variables for All Participants (N = 316)

VARIABLE		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Pressure to Perform	(1)	1	.28*	.53*	.26*
Mean		3.2			
SD		.67			
Family Socialization	(2)	.28*	1	.41*	.29*
related to Work Drive					
Mean			4.2		
SD			.59		
Competitiveness	(3)	.53*	.41*	1	.40*
Mean				3.4	
SD				.64	
Work Drive	(4)	.26*	.29*	.40*	1
Mean					3.2
SD					.58

* $p < .05$

Table 11.

Intercorrelations of Study Variables for African American Participants (N = 96)

VARIABLE		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Pressure to Perform	(1)	1	.16	.45*	.20*
Mean		3.4			
SD		.79			
Family Socialization	(2)	.16	1	.35*	.22*
related to Work Drive					
Mean			4.2		
SD			.59		
Competitiveness	(3)	.45*	.35*	1	.20
Mean				3.4	
SD				.61	
Work Drive	(4)	.20*	.22*	.20	1
Mean					3.3
SD					.56

* $p < .05$

Table 12.

Intercorrelations of Study Variables for European Americans Participants (N = 203)

VARIABLE		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Pressure to Perform	(1)	1	.36*	.58*	.27*
Mean		3.1			
SD		.58			
Family Socialization related to Work Drive	(2)	.36*	1	.40*	.29*
Mean			4.2		
SD			.56		
Competitiveness	(3)	.58*	.40*	1	.48*
Mean				3.4	
SD				.64	
Work Drive	(4)	.27*	.29*	.48*	1
Mean					3.2
SD					.59

* $p < .05$

Evaluation of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: The correlation between Pressure to Perform and Work Drive will be higher for African Americans than European Americans.

As can be seen in Table 13, the correlation between Pressure to Perform and Work Drive was $r = .20$, ($p > .05$) for African Americans and it was $r = .27$, ($p > .05$) for European Americans. A Fischer's z test was computed to determine whether the correlations for African Americans and European Americans were significantly different. The resulting value of $z = .59$, ($p > .05$), indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the correlations for African Americans and European Americans. Therefore, the first hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 2: The correlation between Family Socialization related to Work Drive and Work Drive will be higher for African Americans than European Americans.

The correlation between Family Socialization related to Work Drive and Work Drive for African Americans was $r = .22$, ($p > .05$) and it was $r = .29$, ($p > .05$) for European Americans. See table 13. A Fischer's z test was also computed to determine differences between the correlations for African American and European American participants. The resulting value of $z = .60$, ($p > .05$) between African American and European American participants indicated that these two correlations were not significantly different from each other; therefore, Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

Hypothesis 3: The correlation between Competitiveness and Work Drive will be higher for African Americans than European Americans.

The correlation between Competitiveness and Work Drive for African Americans was $r = .20$, ($p < .05$) and it was $r = .48$, ($p < .05$) for European Americans. See table 13. A Fischer's z test was computed to determine differences between the correlations for African American and European American participants. The resulting value of $z = 2.54$, ($p < .05$) between African American and European American participants indicated that the correlation for European Americans was significantly higher than the correlation for African Americans, which does not support Hypothesis 3.

Research Questions

Research Question 1: How much of the total variance in Work Drive can be explained by Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization and Competitiveness for African Americans and for European Americans.

To examine this question, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed for both groups with Work Drive serving as the dependent variable and Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization and Competitiveness serving as the independent or predictor

variables. The results of these two analyses are presented in Table 14. As can be seen from this table, for African Americans only one variable--Competitiveness--entered the prediction equation at a significant level, accounting for 23% of the variance ($p < .01$) in Work Drive. For European Americans, also only one variable--Family Socialization entered the prediction equation at a significant level, accounting for 5% of the variance ($p < .01$) in Work Drive.

Research Question 2: Do the correlations in the main hypotheses differ for males and females? In other words, does gender moderate the correlations examined in the main hypotheses?

Fischer's z tests (Guilford & Fruchter, 1979) were computed to determine the differences between the correlations for females and males as displayed in Table 15.

Table 13.

Correlations between the variables Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization related to Work Drive, Competitiveness and Work Drive for African American and European American Subjects

Study Variable	Race	Correlation (r)	Probability	z- scores
Pressure to perform	European American	.27	.000	
	African American	.20	.049	.59
Family Socialization	European American	.29	.000	
	African American	.22	.014	.60
Competitiveness	European American	.48*	.000	
	African American	.20	.050	2.54*

* $p < .05$
N = 299

Table 14.

Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses for African American and European Americans

African Americans; Dependent Variable: Work Drive				
Step	Variable	Multiple R	R ²	R ² Change
1	Competitiveness	.475**	.226**	.226**
European Americans; Dependent Variable: Work Drive				
Step	Variable	Multiple R	R ²	R ² Change
1	Family Socialization	.220**	.048**	.048**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

N = 96 African Americans; N = 203 European American

The results of these analyses indicated that there were no significant difference between Pressure to Perform and Work Drive for females ($r = .30, p > .05$) and males ($r = .19, p > .05$), as indicated by a Fischer's z test: $z = .99, (p > .05)$. Also, there were no statistically significant differences between Family Socialization related to Work Drive and Work Drive for females ($r = .23, p > .05$) and males ($r = .35, p > .05$), $z = -1.09, (p > .05)$ and there were no statistically significant differences between Competitiveness and Work Drive for females ($r = .40, p > .05$) and males ($r = .46, p > .05$), $z = .61, (p > .05)$.

Research Question 3: Do the correlations in the main hypotheses differ for males and females as a function of race? In other words, do race and gender moderate the correlations examined in the main hypotheses?

Fischer's z tests were computed to determine the differences between the correlations for African American males and European American males on the measures

of *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization related to Work Drive* and *Competitiveness*.

The results for research question 3 for males can be found in Table 16.

The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the correlation *Pressure to Perform* and *Work Drive* for African American males ($r = .10, p > .05$) and European American males ($r = .25, p > .05$), $z = .71, (p > .05)$. There were also no statistically significant differences between the correlation *Family Socialization related to Work Drive* and *Work Drive* for African American males ($r = .24, p > .05$) and European American males ($r = .40, p > .05$), $z = 1.95, (p > .05)$. However, there was a statistically significant difference between the *Competitiveness* and *Work Drive* correlations for African American males ($r = .21, p < .05$) and European American males ($r = .53, p < .05$), $z = 2.82, (p < .05)$. This finding indicates that European American male subjects reported a more positive correlation between *Competitiveness* and *Work Drive* than African American male subjects.

With respect to female subjects, Fischer's z tests were also computed to determine the differences between the correlations for African American females and European American females displayed in Table 17.

The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the correlation *Pressure to Perform* and *Work Drive* for African American females ($r = .28, p > .05$) and between the correlations for European American females ($r = .29, p > .05$), $z = .07, (p > .05)$.

Table 15.

Correlation of Study Variables for Females and Males

Variable	Males Work Drive	Females Work Drive	z- scores
Pressure to Perform	.19	.30	.99
Family Socialization	.35	.23	-1.09
Competitiveness	.40	.46	.61

N = 299

Table 16.

Correlation of Variables for African American and European American Males

Variable	African American Male Work Drive	European American Male Work Drive	z- scores
Pressure to Perform	.09	.25	.71
Family Socialization	.24	.40	1.95
Competitiveness	.21	.53*	2.82*

* $p < .05$

N = 109

This finding suggests that both African American Females and European American females demonstrated a similar positive correlation between these two variables. There were no statistically significant differences between the correlations for Family Socialization related to Work Drive for African American females ($r = .19, p > .05$) and European American females ($r = .23, p > .05$), $z = .27, (p > .05)$ as well as between the correlations Competitiveness and Work Drive for African American females ($r = .24, p > .05$) and European American females $r = .45, p > .05$, $z = 1.52, (p > .05)$. These findings suggest that all of the variables, Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization, and

Table 17.

Correlation of Variables for Females

Variable	African American Female Work Drive	European American Female Work Drive	z- scores
Pressure to Perform	.28	.29	.07
Family Socialization	.19	.23	.27
Competitiveness	.24	.46	1.52

N = 189

Competitiveness are correlated with Work Drive at equivalent levels of magnitude for European American female subjects and African American female subjects.

Research Question 4: Whether the total amount of variance in Work Drive is explained by Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization related to Work Drive, and Competitiveness differs for male and female African Americans and for Whites.

In Table 18 are displayed the results of stepwise multiple regression analyses with Work Drive serving as the Predictor and *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization*, and *Competitiveness* as the predictor variables for the four groups: African American females, African American males, European American males, European American females. As can be seen in Table 18, Family Socialization accounted for 6% of the variance in Work Drive for Black males, but, because of the relatively smaller sample size this was not a significant contribution and for Black females accounted for 8% of the variances in Work Drive ($p < .01$). Competitiveness accounted for 28% of the variance in Work Drive for White males and 21% of the variance in Work Drive for White females (both significant at the $p < .01$ level). These results indicated that relatively more

of the variance in Work Drive was accounted for in the case of European Americans (males and females) than African Americans.

Table 18.

Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses for African American and European American Males and Females

African American Females; Dependent Variable: Work Drive				
Step	Variable	Multiple R	R ²	R ² Change
1	Pressure to Perform	.282**	.079**	.079**
European American Females; Dependent Variable: Work Drive				
Step	Variable	Multiple R	R ²	R ² Change
1	Competitiveness	.457**	.209**	.209**
African American Males; Dependent Variable: Work Drive				
Step	Variable	Multiple R	R ²	R ² Change
1	Family Socialization	.238 (n.s.)	.059 (n.s.)	.059 (n.s.)
European American Males; Dependent Variable: Work Drive				
Step	Variable	Multiple R	R ²	R ² Change
1	Competitiveness	.533**	.284**	.284**
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ N = 34 African American males N = 70 European American males N = 62 African American females N = 132 European American females				

CHAPTER V: Discussion

Discussion

The purpose of this project was to develop an instrument that was culturally sensitive and useful in conducting career /work-related research with ethnic minorities. This instrument was also designed to assist in understanding variables that are related to the development of a Work Drive as well as add research that was culturally relevant to the construct of Work Drive. Since Work Drive is a relatively new construct, there has been virtually no research on factors that contribute to Work Drive, especially from an African-American perspective. Therefore, Phase One of the present study consisted of the development of a culturally-relevant instrument normed on African Americans designed to measure factors related to the development of Work Drive.

This instrument was designed using the mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methodology. With respect to the qualitative component, the researcher used the method of phenomenologically-informed interviewing to identify factors through a thematized analysis of verbal content. Phase Two involved refining the internal consistency reliability of each scale by means of psychometric analyses of data collected on each scale. The three resulting scales were: *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization related to Work Drive* and *Competitiveness*.

A second goal of the present investigation was to identify differences between African American and European American participants in endorsing these experiences related to work drive. The current study also assess participants' responses to the developed scales based on Lounsbury and Gibson's (2004) measure of Work Drive, as well as information derived from phenomenological interviews. The present chapter

discusses the development of the culturally-appropriate and normed instrument, the Houston Experience Measure (HEM), the findings for each hypothesis and research questions related to each hypothesis (referred to as “further analysis” in this section), directions for future research, and limitations of the study.

Development of the HEM

The Houston Experience Measure (HEM) was normed on a sample using African Americans. Research on ability and personality constructs are usually normed on European American samples, and then generalized to ethnic minorities without conducting empirical research to confirm that the empirical data and interpretations were not significantly different for minority populations. The HEM takes into account the actual experiences of an ethnic minority group in its development, thus making it more culturally appropriate and culturally sensitive than traditional measures developed on European American samples. Even though the instrument was normed based on the experiences of African Americans, it proved to be a valid and reliable instrument based on the responses of the participants regardless of race and gender. Given that the HEM proved to be generalizable across racial and gender subgroups, it appears that the scale constructs, *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization related to Work Drive* and *Competitiveness* are key variables related to the development of work drive which have equivalent validity for African Americans and European Americans as well as males and females.

Lounsbury, Gibson and Hamrick (2004) found that work drive is related to job satisfaction, career satisfaction, grades, and job performance. Accordingly, one implication of the present findings is that African Americans appear to have

approximately equal potential for academic and career success given their scores on either Work Drive or the three factors related to Work Drive-- *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization related to Work Drive* and *Competitiveness*. Findings for each of the scale constructs are discussed below. The results of the present study presented a mixed pattern with respect to the original predictions.

Pressure to Perform

It was expected that African Americans would display higher scores on the scale Pressure to Perform compared to European Americans. As noted by Harrington (1998), African Americans' experiences in the world of work are rooted in a society where they are viewed as the minority and for the most part are stereotyped in a negative manner with respect to work behavior and work ethic. "Going above and beyond expectations," on a regular basis is often ingrained in the African American culture for those individuals who consider themselves successful in mainstream society. Tomekiewicz, Brenner, and Adeyemi-Bello (1998) found that many African Americans were more likely to have internalized beliefs in having to work hard and feeling pressured to perform in comparison with their white counterparts. In the present investigation, African Americans, unexpectedly, did not have higher scores on the Pressure to Perform scale.

One possibility for the results bearing on the first hypothesis is that the phenomenon of feeling pressured to perform is similar across various cultures and may simply be characteristic of those individuals who report having a high work drive. The way in which individuals experience this pressure may vary with respect to individual context, but not with respect to racial or gender subgroups. For example, the only female

in a group of males may feel more pressured to perform well and have a higher level of Work Drive as might the only African American in a work setting, but these are not the norm. Rather, individuals in families that pressure children to perform well are more likely to have children with high levels of Work Drive as are work settings that induce competitiveness. Feeling pressured to perform may simply be a perception held for all people who report having a high sense of work drive. According to Lounsbury, Gibson, and Hamrick (2004), work drive carries implications of striving to perform at a high level and being successful, b) not only meeting job demands, but going above and beyond expectations, c) inventing much time and effort into one's work role, and d) participating in the event of developing a disposition for work. Such a description of work drive can apply to someone who would have a sense of feeling pressured to perform, especially given that feeling pressured is related to some form of anxiety-like feelings wherein decreasing these anxious feelings would be found in performing the functions descriptive of Work Drive presented by Lounsbury, Gibson, and Hamrick (2004).

With respect to European American participants, another possible explanation for the findings regarding the first hypothesis may involve the Protestant Work Ethic belief. Protestant Work Ethic is usually discussed in terms of a set of attitudes, beliefs, or values about the importance of work overall for the betterment of society instead of working solely for self-gain, morals and character strengths and flaws, viewing laziness and soporific views towards work negatively and revering hard work and tenacity (Feather, 1984; Ganster, 1981; Lounsbury, Gibson, & Hamrick, 2004; MacDonald, 1972; Merrens & Garrett, 1975). There may be a pressure here to live up to the expectations presented by Protestant work ethic for both European American males and females. Given that

Protestant Work Ethic is based in a set of attitudes, beliefs and values, it is more trait-oriented; thus it may become ingrained in the individual's personality and become a characterological aspect of the individual, impacting several aspects of their life, including the realm of work. Campbell (1971) observed that the Protestant work ethic is deeply rooted in American values by Whites who possess a high Protestant work ethic. Individuals, who foster beliefs and attitudes consistent with Protestant Work Ethic may, in turn possibly acquire a higher work drive. Therefore, feeling pressured to perform may be an effect of feeling a sense of urgency to do well in a work setting based on more positive and stronger views held about working.

The lack of difference in correlation between Pressure to Perform and Work Drive for African American and European American participants may be the result of participants possessing certain characteristics related to having a strong sense of Work Drive which include, striving to perform at a high level and being successful, not only meeting job demands, but going above and beyond expectations, investing much time and effort into one's work role, and participating in the event of developing a disposition for work. Thus, pressure to perform may simply be a perception held for most people who have a higher sense of work drive, just as individuals who have a lower sense of pressure to perform also have a lower work drive.

Family Socialization related to Work Drive

It was assumed that African Americans would have higher scores on the scale Family Socialization related to Work Drive than European Americans. Gailbraith-Jones (1989) found that the family was a major source of information and support in their career development path. Byk (1992) and Pearson and Bieschke (2001) also found family

to be a major source of influence on developing a successful career path for African Americans. The authors reported that a pattern of success and attaining higher career statuses is highly characteristic of African American mothers and daughters. Allen (1978) observed that the career goals of Black males were related to their father's occupation/careers and their reported alliance with their parents. Unexpectedly, however, in the present study African Americans did not have higher scores on the Family Socialization related to Work Drive scale. The correlations between Family Socialization related to Work Drive and Work Drive were positive for both groups and were not significantly different from each other.

One possibility for the result found for the second hypothesis may be related to the importance family has on career development. Specifically, it may be that those individuals who reported having a higher work drive were reared in households where working and a sense of work drive were strongly held values of the family regardless of race and gender. With respect to the importance that families play in our career choices, Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) developed by Hackett and Byars (1996) contends that self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and personal goals can help shape and mold occupational and academic interests, choices, and performances. This "molding" usually occurs by individuals who are actively involved and hold some influence in the family system or are viewed as being an important model for the individual. Hackett and Byars also theorized that observing the failure or achievement of others can play a large role in what an individual aspires to achieve. If a modeled behavior, such as the behavior of working producing the by-product of high work drive, is particularly salient to an individual, it may have a large influence on the development of efficacy. Most vicarious

learning takes place early in life when one is observing caregivers, family members, and community members. It may be that high work drive is learned early in development within the family system and become pervasive in how one subsequently relates to and functions in the world of work.

In reference to European American participants, the notion of Protestant Work Ethic may also be salient in the development of family socialization for developing work drive. The Protestant Work Ethic is a concept that is family-rooted and taught to children in the household. Not only are these beliefs taught to children, but the behaviors associated with these beliefs are modeled within the family structure. Thus, not only are the children learning certain values, beliefs and attitudes associated with the Protestant Work Ethic, but they are also learning what behaviors to engage in to support this ethic. Given that there were no differences between African American and European American participants on Work Drive or the correlation between Work Drive and Family Socialization for Work Drive, it may be that the role of family dynamics, values, beliefs and family modeling on the development of a high work drive are equally important for different racial and gender subgroups.

Competitiveness

It was predicted that there would be a higher correlation between Competitiveness and Work Drive for African Americans than European Americans. In contrast to the third hypothesis, however, higher correlation between Competitiveness and Work Drive was observed for European American male participants. One possibility for this result may be related to the prevalence and pervasiveness of the Protestant Work Ethic belief for European Americans, specifically its salience to European American males. One of the

implicit assumptions of general attitude and belief scales like the Protestant Work Ethic is that competitive opportunities and incentives are equal for all individuals and that if you work hard enough, you can have whatever it is that you desire. Thus, being competitive in a work setting may be related to values and beliefs that are instilled in an individual at an early age.

It is well known that in traditional, European American families, the family structure is centered around patriarchal practices (McGoldrick, Giodano & Garcia, 2005). Given that the male is customarily viewed as the provider of the household, the ideas of work ethic, work values and presumably, work drive are going to be more emphasized for the male children in the home. Gender roles are established early in children and are fostered and modeled throughout one's early career development. If the father is present in the home, his role as provider is clearly defined not only by the father's actions, but is reinforced by family members' responses to the father in this role. (e.g. recognizing him as a hard-worker, being financially dependent on father's income). The role of worker is not only taught to the children, but is also demonstrated with respect to behaviors that model work.

Being reared in an environment that models this male dominated, head of the household mentality may lead to internalizing views and behaviors indicative of competitiveness. Competitiveness is involved in "competing" for jobs that will allow one to provide adequate resources for their home and their family. Being competitive as a European American male usually leads to benefits and rewards (i.e. promotion, job status), and thus the competitive way of behaving at work is positively reinforced. This

same behavior of “competing” may not be as beneficial for ethnic minorities and women and thus may not have been correlated highly with Work Drive.

Competition and being competitive involves certain assertive characteristics. Certain attributes of being assertive such as being tenacious, directive, straight-forward, strong willed, opinionated, and strong-minded are going to be demonstrated in the setting or situation in which one is being competitive (Jackson, J. S., Keiper, S., Brown, K. T., Brown, T. N., Manuel, W., 2002). For ethnic minorities and women this assertiveness can be viewed by others as being aggressive and thus threatening (Cheek, 1976; Minor, 1978). Researchers have recognized that cultural differences in the tolerance of assertive behaviors exist and in particular can be related to situational context. Some environments reinforce assertive behavior, but other contexts penalize for assertive behavior. For example, it may be appropriate for an African American male to express assertiveness with respect to playing sports, but this same assertiveness could possibly be viewed as threatening in an office work setting (Lineberger & Calhoun, 1983). Duncan (1976) examined European American’s perceptions of intergroup group violence. Participants in this study viewed four videotaped exchanges between two men. These exchanges occurred between (1) two European Americans (one being labeled harm-doer and the other being labeled victim), (2) two African Americans (one being labeled harm-doer or victim) (3) African American (labeled harm-doer) and European American (labeled victim) and (4) African American (labeled victim) and European American (labeled harm-doer) At the end of the interaction a “heated” exchange occurred and was followed by a shove from one person (labeled harm doer) to the other person (labeled victim). He found that 75% of the participants in the study placed behavior in the violent

behavior category in exchange with African American harm-doer and European American victim and only 17% of the participants placed the behavior in the violent category when it was European American harm-doer and African American victim. Sixty-nine percent of participants placed behavior in the violent category in the African American harm-doer/African American victim scenario and 13% of participant's labeled behavior as violent in the European American harm doer/ European American victim scenario. These findings indicate that the more aggressive and violent behavior was attributed to the African American males.

Historically, African Americans and women have been, for the most part, penalized for appropriate assertiveness, and thus have learned that this behavior is not beneficial, particularly in a work setting. With respect to women, the most common form of sexual harassment is what is referred to as *gender harassment* (Fitzgerald, L. F, Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, A., et. al, 1988). Gender harassment is a form of hostile environment harassment that appears to be a product of hostility towards women who deviate from gender ideals of what a woman is in the work setting. This type of harassment usually involves sexist jokes, materials, derogating pranks etc. The women targeted in this harassment pattern are usually viewed as being assertive, domineering, high-performing, and successful. This harassment is hypothesized to stem from the need to derogate the assertive woman in an attempt to protect the male self image and identity in this power role. Berdahl (2007) found that women with more masculine characteristics (independent, assertive, and dominant)) experienced the most sexual harassment and women in more male-dominated work environments were harassed more than women in female-dominated work settings. Similar to assertive

women, African American males are also prone to being perceived negatively when possessing certain attributes.

Bryson (1998) found that race is a significant factor in determining how African American men are perceived. In this study, African American and European American participants varied significantly on their reports on their perceptions of Black men. At least 50% of White participants viewed African American males as being irritating, resenting other people, having a chip on their shoulder, that you have to be careful about what you say around a Black man, and people generally feel uncomfortable when associating with Black men. Given the perceptions of others about Black men, it is presumed that assertive behaviors would not be looked upon as being a proactive and healthy behavior, but rather a response that is possibly being motivated by one of the above characteristics (i.e. chip on shoulder, resentment, being irritating). Thus, given that competition involves a certain degree of assertiveness, this construct may not be viewed as being the most valuable or salient in the development of a Work Drive for those individuals in which negative outcomes may result or may be perceived as resulting from competitiveness.

Limitations

There are several limitations of the present study. First, even though, initially the researcher set out to include an equal sample size of both African American and European American participants, there was still a relatively low number of African American subjects (N =96) compared to European Americans(N = 203). It is possible that a larger, more diverse (age, educational status, etc.) sample size could have affected the findings and changed the results. With respect to the diversity of the sample, there

was also not enough other ethnic minority participants to make statistical comparisons, so we do not know if the present results are generalizable to other ethnic groups. For example, would the present results be observed for Asians or Hispanic participants or would they be different? Examination of different ethnic groups would have made the study richer in terms of its goal of creating measures which are culturally-appropriate. The present study did not measure level of educational attainment; thus it is not known whether the observed results would still be obtained if educational attainment had been controlled for. Similarly, the social economic status of study participants was not measured, which precluding controlling for it in the correlational and regression analyses.

Another limitation involves using a single occasion of measurement. A longitudinal study would have permitted assessment of the causal relations among the variables *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization related to Work Drive*, *Competitiveness* and *Work Drive* and allowed observation of how these variables change over time. For example, *Pressure to Perform* may become more highly correlated with *Work Drive* with increased time.

Third, in developing this instrument the researcher should have included some way during the interview portion to gather information about socioeconomic status (SES). SES is a factor that is usually not included in research in this area, but should be, given the impact that class has on financial support and other variables that are included in obtaining success (Hackett & Byars, 1996). It would have been particularly helpful with respect to the observation that European American males had a higher correlation between *Competitiveness* and *Work Drive*, to know if social class and SES played a factor here. Knowing if study participants were 1st, 2nd or beyond generation to attend

college or pursue a career, would have also been an important factor to consider when developing items for the scales, given that their familial role could have affected the participants' ambition and motivation in the world of work.

Fourth, with respect to scale development, during the initial phases of data collection using interview methods, the 15 African Americans interviewed were "high-achieving", meaning most of them had advanced degrees (Ph.D., M.S.) and they were in higher-level positions in their jobs (V.P., lawyer, etc.). The particular population chosen is not representative of the majority of African Americans in the work force. According to Chung, Baskin and Case (1999) the unemployment rate for African Americans was 10.4 % in 1995. Researchers (Karweit, 1977) have also indicated that African Americans are reported to have lower educational aspirations, pursue non-degree related courses, and are underemployed compared to their European American counterparts. The individuals in this study may have presented with different life experiences than those who may not have been "high achieving." Individuals with less complex, lower paying, less challenging, and lower status jobs were not included in the development of the HEM.

Directions for Future Research

Future research could try to study the HEM in longitudinal designs, and with measures of SES and other kinds of variables one could study to help clarify and enrich the present results and scope of inquiry, such as: personality variables, stereotype threat, self-esteem, and achievement motivation, number of children, role conflict, and work/non-work balance.

It is possible that for those students who demonstrate higher scores on the scales *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization related to Work Drive*, and *Competitiveness*

on the HEM and having a high work drive may be better suited for certain career demands and challenges, such as in the domains of business, math, science, or engineering. There is little research on the career development of African Americans. It maybe helpful to use the HEM when working with African Americans in career counseling, specifically in order to understand what factors are most salient for them at the time and, in turn, may be influencing their chosen career decisions. It might also be good to measure Work Drive and other variables for personal assessment and career planning. In addition, the HEM might be a useful tool for research on students who remain undeclared and undecided for long periods of time. Perhaps, there is a lack of work drive or if they report low scores on the HEM, this may be indicative of low motivation and need for achievement. Such information could also help the career counselor guide the student to careers of jobs that are commensurate with their work style.

Future research in this area of inquiry could also examine some type of SES indicator in order to determine if obtained results are generalizable to lower SES groups, specifically for African Americans. A measure of SES could also be used as a covariate in research involving other constructs. As the HEM is found to be more generalizable, it may be used to provide more information about an individual that is useful in the career planning and development process.

The HEM could also be used in conjunction with perhaps a state-trait anxiety measure or other personality measure in order to determine what personality traits are more characteristic of those who score highly on any of the three scales on the HEM or who score lower on the three scales. It would be interesting to investigate personality

differences between college age students who take this measure and those individuals already in the work force that take this measure, and see if there are any types of differences with respect to trait and state anxiety in order to examine if factors on the HEM are possibly more or less characteristic for those who present with a more overall anxious predisposition versus more of situational anxiety reaction. Other personality variables that may be interesting and important in relation to the HEM are the Big Five personality factors. There is extensive literature and research on the Big Five and various work-related variables (Crock & Brown, 2004), but the Big Five has not been used in conjunction with the HEM and the Work Drive measures. There may be certain personality traits that are more prevalent for those who score relatively high or low scores on the HEM. In relation to personality measures, using the Protestant Work Ethic scale in conjunction with the HEM may provide more evidence to support findings related to SES, work drive and the propensity to highly endorse the items on the measure or not endorse items on the HEM.

Another key area of research with the HEM includes using this measure with other ethnic minorities and international groups, in order to determine its usefulness and generalizability to a wider multicultural range of participants. Expanding the sample size in terms of geography may also prove useful in demonstrating differences or similarities among individuals in various professions, jobs, and regions of the country.

It was unknown if the participants were reared in single parent homes or homes in which both parents were present. This variable is important because researchers (Ching, Baskin, & Case, 1999; Collison, 1999; Hill, 2002) have indicated that career aspirations of Black males correlated with their father's occupation and closeness to their parents.

However, it is common in Black families to find absent fathers or fathers that do not provide a stable income, thus this lack of modeling leads to low career expectations and poor work-related choices. Had dual versus single parent homes been considered in the study, it may have been possible to see how homes in which the father was absent or present correlated with scores on the HEM and on the Work Drive measure in relation to race and gender.

Summary

The study was designed to develop an instrument that was culturally sensitive and useful in conducting career /work-related research with ethnic minorities. This instrument was also designed to assist in understanding variables that are related to the development of a Work Drive as well as add research that was culturally relevant to the construct of Work Drive. Variables were identified as *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization related to Work Drive* and *Competitiveness* and developed into the Houston Experience Measure (HEM). The phenomenologically based scales were found to be reliable using internal consistency measures of reliability for all three HEM scales.

A second goal of the present study was to identify differences between African American and European American participants; specifically, differences between correlations of the variables *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization related to Work Drive*, *Competitiveness* and *Work Drive* (Lounsbury and Gibson, 2004).

Overall, the study found that there were no statistically significant differences between the correlations on the variables *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization related to Work Drive* and *Work Drive* for African American and European American participants. However, there were statistically significant differences between the two

groups on the correlation between Competitiveness and Work Drive. The correlation between Competitiveness and Work Drive was higher for European American male participants than European American females, African American male and African American female participants. Also, European American participants had higher Competitiveness scores than African American participants. On the other hand, there were no statistically significant differences between the correlations on the variables Pressure to Perform, Family Socialization related to Work Drive, Competitiveness and Work Drive for female and male participants.

Perhaps the primary conclusion of the current study is that the HEM appears to be a measure that is generalizable to African Americans and European Americans as well as males and females; scoring high or low on the scales, *Pressure to Perform*, *Family Socialization related to Work Drive* and *Competitiveness* do not appear to primarily be a function of race or gender. Even though the three scales of the HEM were developed based on experiences of African Americans, the findings were not different for African Americans compared to European Americans. It may be that such experiences are more universally felt and expressed by members of different racial, ethnic, and gender sub-groups. Although the findings described here were not supportive of the researcher's initial hypotheses, they are still important in that they point toward an equality of work drive and correlates of work drive for African Americans and European Americans.

If the present results can be replicated, they would directly contradict some of the negative stereotypes attributed to African Americans, such as them being lazy, indolent, or shiftless. By way of illustration, Campbell (1971) concludes that the Protestant work ethic is deeply rooted in American values by Whites who possess a high Protestant work

ethic and tend to view African Americans as being lazy, lacking ambition, and failing to take advantage of job opportunities. The results of the present study indicate that such stereotypes are untenable and are contradicted by empirical findings. Even though the hypotheses were not supported by the findings in the research, the current findings disconfirm negative stereotypes and views about African Americans in relation to work. Hopefully, future research will reveal whether there are any empirical data which support such stereotypes or whether they are indefensible, as indicated by the findings of the present study.

The findings in this study also appear to implicate that individuals are reaching the same goals and outcomes (high work drive-high scores on variables related to work drive), even though the reasons and mechanisms driving the goal-directed behavior may be very different from each other. Lockwood and Sadler (2005) examined cultural differences in motivation by positive and negative role models. Highly motivated individuals all meet the same goals and outcomes –success, but do it by way of varying mechanisms. He found that highly motivated Asian Canadians were motivated by a negative role model and thus motivated by way of avoidance of failure. A negative role is described as an individual who has failed at something and/or experienced shame from family members for failure. Highly motivated European Canadians were motivated by a positive role model, who demonstrated how to be successful; these individuals focused on the positive outcomes they hoped to attain. This research demonstrated that both groups demonstrated high motivation, but the source of this motivation came from varying places. With respect to this research project, pressure to perform appears to be a factor involved in Work Drive for all of those who report possessing a high work drive.

All of the participants report feeling this pressure to perform, but the root or cause of this pressure may be different for each group. Feeling pressured for my African Americans, may in essence come from wanting to disconfirm stereotypes where as feeling pressured for a European American may come from Protestant work ethic values and for a female, may come from being the only female employee in a male-dominated career field. Even though the reasons for feeling pressured vary for all of these individuals the end result is the same- high Work Drive. Further research will be necessary in order to better understand the underlying mechanisms and processes that are involved in developing and high work drive and the variables pressure to perform, family socialization related to work drive and competitiveness for various groups.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Austin, J. T. (1999). Culturally sensitive career assessment: A quandary. *ERIC Digest*, No. 210, 1-2.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Berdahl, J. L. (2007). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 425-437.
- Bergin, D. A., & Cooks, H. C. (2000). Academic competition among students of color: an interview study. *Urban Education*, 35, (4), 442-472.
- Bowman, P. (1991). Joblessness. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *Life in Black America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Braham, J. (1987). Is the door really open? *Industry Week*, 235 (4), 64-70.
- Broman, C. L. (2001). Work stress in the family life of African Americans. *Journal of Black Studies*, 31 (6), 835-846.
- Broman, C. L., Hamilton, V.L. & Hoffman, W. S. (1990). Unemployment and its effects on families: Evidence from a plant closing study. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 643-659.
- Broman, C. L., Hamilton, V.L., Hoffman, W. S., & Mavaddat, R. (1995). Race, gender and the response to stress: Long term unemployment among autoworkers. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 813-842.
- Brown, M. T. (1995). The career development of African Americans: Theoretical and empirical issues. In F. T. L. Leong (Ed.), *Career development and vocational behavior of racial and ethnic minorities* (pp. 7-36). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Bryson, S. (1998). Relationship between race and attitudes toward black men. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 26, 282-294.
- Byars, A. M. & Hackett, G. (1996, March). *Career self-efficacy and women of color*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for Women in Psychology, Portland, OR
- Byk, L. (1992). *Professional Black women's family patterns and career development: An exploratory case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.

- Campbell, A. (1971). *White attitudes toward black people*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Carter, R. T. & Cook, D. A. (1992). A culturally relevant perspective for understanding the career paths of visible racial/ethnic group people. In H. D. Lea & Z. B. Leibowitz (Eds.) *Adult career development: Concepts, issues, and practices* (pp.192-217). Alexandria, VA: The National Career Development Association.
- Cheek, D.K. (1976). Assertive Black...puzzled White: a black perspective on assertive behavior. San Luis Obispo, CA: Impact.
- Clark, M. L. (1985). Social stereotypes and self-concept in Black and White college students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 125, 753-760.
- Cohen-Scali, V. (2003). The influence of family, social and work socialization on the construction of the professional identity of young adults. *Journal of Career Development*, 29 (4), 237-249.
- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S., Aiken, L. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Dana, R. H. (1999). An assessment-intervention model for research and practice with multicultural populations. In Dana, R. H. (Eds.) *Handbook of Cross-Cultural and Multicultural Personality Assessment*. (pp.5-17). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Day, S. X. & Rounds, J. (1998). Universality of vocational interest structure among racial and ethnic minorities. *American Psychologist*, 53(7), 728-736.
- Dawkins, M. P. (1989). The persistence of plans for professional careers among Blacks in early adulthood. *Journal of Negro Education*, 587, 220-131.
- Dahlstrom, W. G., Lachar, D., & Dahlstrom, L. E. (1986). *MMPI patterns of American minorities*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (3rd Ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Duncan, B. L. (1976). Differential social perception and attributes of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of blacks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 590-598.
- Dweck, C.S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*,

- Farley, R. & Allen, W. R. (1987). *The color line and the quality of American life*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Fitzgerald, L. F, Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, A., et. al. (1998). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152-175.
- Fouad, N. & Byars-Winston, A. (2005). Cultural context of career choice: A meta-analysis of race/ethnicity differences. *Career Development Quarterly*, 53, (3), 223-233.
- Fox, S. & Stallworth, L. E. (2005). Racial/ethnic bullying: Exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 66, 438 - 456.
- Gailbraith-Jones, M. K. (1989). *A study of factors that influence the career decisions of Black writers*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Gaertner, S., & McLaughlin, J. P. (1983). Racial stereotypes, associations and ascriptions of positive and negative characteristics. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 46 (1), 23-30.
- Gottfredson, L. S. (1994). Gottfredson's theory of circumspection and compromise. In Brown, D., & Brooks, L. (Eds.) *Career Choice and Development* (pp.179-232). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Graham, J. R. (1999). *MMPI-2: Assessing Personality and Psychopathology* (3rd edition). New York: NY, Oxford University Press.
- Greene, B. A. (1990a). What has gone before: The legacy of racism and sexism in the lives of Black mothers and daughters. *Women and Therapy*, 9, 207-230.
- Guilford, J. P. & Fruchter, B. J. (1979). *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hackett, G. & Betz, N. E. (1996). A self-efficacy approach to career development of African American women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 18, 326-339.
- Hackett, G. & Byars, A. M. (1996). Social cognitive career theory and the career development of African American women. *Career Development Quarterly*, 44, 322-340.
- Halpern, R. (1987). Major social and demographic trends affecting young families: Implications for early childhood care and education. *Young Children*, 42, 34-40.

- Hammersly, M. & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. New York: Tavistock.
- Handel, R. W. & Ben-Porath, Y. S. (2000). Multicultural assessment with the MMPI-2: Issues for research and practice. In Dana, R. H. (Eds.) In Dana, R. H. (Eds.) *Handbook of Cross-Cultural and Multicultural Personality Assessment*. (pp.229-247). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harrington, S. G. (1998). *The factors affecting the career choices of African Americans and three career counseling suggestions*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, 438-487.
- Harvey, R. & Crandall, C. (1997). The effects of stigma and devaluing on self-esteem and achievement motivation among Native-Americans and European-Americans. Unpublished manuscript, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO.
- Hathaway, S. R. & McKinley, J. C. (1940). A multphasic personality schedule (Minnesota): I. Construction of the schedule. *Journal of Psychology*, 10, 249-254.
- Helms, J. E. (1992). Why is there no study of cultural equivalence in standardized cognitive ability testing? *American Psychologist*, 47, (9), 1083-1101.
- Jackson, J. S., Keiper, S., Brown, K. T., Brown, T. N., Manuel, W. (2002). Athletic identity, racial attitudes, and aggression in first year black and white intercollegiate athletes. In Gatz, M. (Ed); Messner, M. A. (Ed); Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (Ed), *Paradoxes of youth and sport* (pp. 159-172). Albany, NY, US: State University of New York Press.
- Johnson, A. (1987). Black managers still have a dream. *Management Review*, 76 (12), 20-27.
- Jones, E. W. (1986). Black managers: The dream deferred. *Harvard Business Review*, 64 (3), 84-93.
- Katz, I. & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55 (6), 893-905.
- Kerka, S. (1998). Career development and gender, race, and class. *ERIC digest No. 199*, 1-5.
- Kimbrough, V. D. & Salomone, P. R. (1993). African Americans: Diverse people, diverse career need. *Journal of Career Development*, 19 (4), 265-279.

- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 45, 79-122.
- Lent, R. W. & Brown, S. D. (1996). Social cognitive approach to career development: An overview. *Career Development Quarterly*, 44 (4), 310-322.
- Leong, FTL. (Ed.) (1995). *Career development and vocational behavior of racial/ethnic minorities*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Leong, FTL. & Brown, M. T. (1995). Theoretical issues in cross-cultural career development: Cultural validity and cultural specificity. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.), *Handbook of Vocational Psychology: Theory Research, and Practice* (2nd ed., pp. 143-180). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lineberger, M. H. & Calhoun, K. S. (1983). Assertive behavior in black and white undergraduates. *The Journal of Psychology*, 113, 139-148.
- Lockwood, P. & Sadler, P. (2005). Promoting success or preventing failure: cultural differences in motivation by positive and negative role models. *PSPB*, 31, (3) 379-392.
- Lounsbury, J. W. & Gibson, L. W. (2005). *Personal Style Inventory: A work-based personality measurement system*. Knoxville, Tennessee: Resource Associates.
- Lounsbury, J. W., Gibson, L. W., & Hamrick, F. L., (2004). The development and validation of a personological measure of work drive. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18, (4) 427-450.
- Lounsbury, J. W., Gibson, L. W., & Saudargas, R. W. (2006). Scale development. In F. T.L. Leong & J. T. Austin (Eds). *Psychology Research Handbook: A Guide for Graduate Students and Research Assistants (Second Edition)* (pp. 125-146). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- McGoldrick, M., Giordano, J., & Garcia-Preto, N. (Ed.). (2005). *Ethnicity and Family Therapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Minor, B. J. (1976). A perspective for assertiveness training for Blacks. *Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance*, 6, 63-70.
- Mirels, H. L. & Garrett, J.B. (1971). The protestant work ethic as a personality variable. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 36 (1), 40-44.
- Monroe, R.A. (1986). How to chat the right career path. *Vital Speeches*, 52 (13), 407-409.

- Morris, E. F. (2000). Assessment Practices with African Americans: Combining standard assessment measures within Africentric orientation. In Dana, R. H. (Eds.) *Handbook of Cross-Cultural and Multicultural Personality Assessment*. (pp.573-605). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Myburgh, C. P. H., Niehaus, L., Poggenpoel, M. (2002). Showing of the work ethics of South African black adolescents is determined by parent involvement, their time, and efficacy. *Education*, 122 (3) 531-555.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1988) Black education: A cultural-ecological perspective. In H. P. McAdoo (Ed.), *Black Families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Okazaki, S. & Sue, S. (1995). Methodological issues in assessment research with ethnic minorities. *Psychological Assessment*, 7, (3) 367-375.
- Oswald, D. L. & Harvey, R. D. (2000). Hostile environments, stereotype threat and math performance among undergraduate women. *Current Psychology* 19, 338-355.
- Pearson, S. M. & Bieschke, K.J. (2001). Succeeding against the odds: an examination of familial influences on the career development of professional African American women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43 (3) 301-309.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (1988a) Racial/ethnic minority research in the Journal of Counseling Psychology: A content analysis and methodological critique. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 35, 410-418.
- Ponterotto, J. G. & Casas, J. M. (1991). *Handbook of racial/ethnic minority counseling research*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Porter, D. F., Donnell, C. M., Edwards, Y. V., Moore, C. L. (2002). Challenges faced by minority doctoral candidates seeking academic positions. *Rehabilitation Education*, 16 (1), 37-43.
- Rowe, M.P. (1990). Barriers to equality: The power of subtle discrimination to maintain unequal opportunity. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 3, 153-163.
- Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P.A. Katz & D.A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy*, NY: Plenum Press.
- Sabanani, H. B. & Ponterotto, J. G. (1992). Racial/ethnic minority-specific instrumentation in counseling research: A review, critique, and recommendations. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 24 (4), 161-187.

- Sedlacek, W. E. (1991). Using noncognitive variables in advising nontraditional students. *National Academic Advising Association Journal*, 2 (1), 75-82.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (1994). Advancing diversity through assessment. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72, 549-553.
- Sedlacek, W. E. & Sue, K. H. (1995). Multicultural assessment. *Eric Digest*, 1-6.
- Smith, E. J. (1983). Issues in racial minorities' career behavior. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.) *Handbook of vocational psychology: volume 1* (pp. 161-222). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Steele, C. M. & Aronson, J. (1999). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69 (5), 797-811.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1985). *Beyond IQ*. London, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). What would better intelligence tests look like? In *Measures in the college admission process* (pp.146-150). New York: The College Entrance Examination Board.
- Sue, S. (1996) Measurement, Testing, and Ethnic Bias: Can solutions be found? In *Multicultural Assessment in Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, (pp.7-36), edited by G. R. Sadowsky and J. C. Impara. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Swinton, D. H. (1989). Economic status of Blacks in 1987. In J. Dewart (Ed.), *The state of Black America 1988*, New York: National Urban League.
- Tomekiewicz, J., Brenner, O. C., & Adeyemi-Bello, T. (1998). The impact of perceptions and stereotypes of the managerial mobility of African Americans. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138 (1), 88-92.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Researchers Statement

Hello--

My name is Meagan Houston. I am a graduate student attending the University of Tennessee. I am writing to invite you to participate in a University of Tennessee Pre-Dissertation study. I am attempting to develop culturally bound scales in relation to developing a Work Drive for African Americans in contrast to current work ethic scales that were developed based on primarily European American samples. Some of the questions require short answers and some of them require more detailed answers. The answers you provide will be most beneficial to the study if answered in detail; however, any information you can provide will be helpful and appreciated. No names or identifying information will be recorded. Your responses will be kept anonymous. You are under no obligation whatsoever and are free to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact Meagan Houston via Email at mhouston@utk.edu or call at (865) 470-8224 or Dr. John Lounsbury, my major professor, via Email at Jlounsbury@aol.com.

This research study has been approved by the University of Tennessee Institutional Review Board which governs the use of human participants in university-related research.

Your contribution is vital to the success of my study. I want to thank you in advance for your time and attention.

Appreciatively,

Meagan Houston
Doctoral candidate in the Counseling Psychology Program

Appendix B

Questionnaire

- 1) How do you define success?
- 2) How do you define work drive?
- 3) What does commitment to work mean for you?
- 4) As an African American what has been your experience of establishing a work drive?
- 5) How has your work ethic changed in the past ten years?
- 6) What drives you to be successful?
- 7) Are you currently satisfied in your field of work? If yes, what makes it satisfying? If no, what makes it unsatisfying?
- 8) Do you feel that work ethic is related to job satisfaction?
- 9) How do you think work ethic is related to job satisfaction?
- 10) How do you define “pride in your work”? How do you think “pride in your work” is related to your work ethic?
- 11) What is your occupation?
- 12) How long have you had this occupation?
- 13) What are the benefits of working hard?
- 14) How do you define achievement?
- 15) Do you consider yourself very involved in your work?
- 16) Do you consider yourself a workaholic?
- 17) As an African American what are some factors that have influenced your work drive?
- 18) Have there been any significant life experiences (positive or negative) that have influenced your work drive. If so, please describe
- 19) Did you find that individuals in your family possessed high work drive or held work drive as an important asset?
- 20) How does success impact your work drive?

Appendix C

Researchers Statement (Study 2)

Hello--

My name is Meagan Houston. I am a graduate student attending the University of Tennessee. I am inviting you to participate in a University of Tennessee Pre-Dissertation study. I am attempting to develop culturally bound scales related to the development of Work Drive. Please follow the instructions attached to the test items. No names or identifying information will be recorded. Your responses will be kept anonymous. You are under no obligation whatsoever and are free to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact Meagan Houston via Email at mhouston@utk.edu or call at (865) 470-8224 or Dr. John Lounsbury, my major professor, via Email at Jlounsbury@aol.com.

This research study has been approved by the University of Tennessee Institutional Review Board which governs the use of human participants in university-related research.

Your contribution is vital to the success of my study. I want to thank you in advance for your time and attention.

Appreciatively,

Meagan Houston
Doctoral candidate in the Counseling Psychology Program

Appendix D

Informed Consent Form

I am a graduate student at The University of Tennessee, and I am inviting you to participate in a Pre-dissertation research study. I am attempting to develop culturally bound scales related to development of Work Drive. If you agree to participate in this part of the study, you will be asked to complete Houston Experience Measure and demographics survey. This part of the study will take only take 20 minutes.

Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from this study at any time. There are no risks from participating in this study. Through your participation you will also learn more about how the research process works. Your responses to the survey(s) will remain confidential. Your confidentiality will be maintained at all times.

If you grant me permission by signing this document, the anonymous data you and others provide will be part of my pre-dissertation report. It may also be submitted for publication in a psychological journal.

Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not prejudice your future relations with The University of Tennessee.

For any questions you have that I do not answer at this time, or concerns about your participation in this study, please contact Dr. John Lounsbury at Jlounsbury@utk.edu

Thank you very much for your time and willingness to participate in this study.

Meagan Houston

Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Candidate

The University of Tennessee

YOU ARE MAKING A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO PARTICIPATE. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICIPATE, HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE.

Signature of Participant

Date

Witness

Date

This study has been approved by the UT Human Subjects committee. It poses no risks, and protects participant's confidentiality.

Appendix E

Demographic Information

The following survey is part of a research study on the development of culturally bound scales related to Work Drive. The information obtained will be used for research purposes only and all responses will remain anonymous.

Thank you for your participation.

1. Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. Race:	African American	☐	Caucasian/ White	☐	Hispanic	☐
	Asian	☐	Aleut/Pacific Islander	☐	Arabic	☐
	India(n)	☐	Native North American	☐	Other	☐

3. Class Standing: ☐ Freshmen ☐ Sophomore
☐ Junior ☐ Senior
☐ Grad Student ☐ Other

4. What is your major in college: _____

5. Age Group: ☐ under 20 ☐ 31-35
☐ 20-24 ☐ over 35
☐ 25-30

6. What is your overall GPA in college? (Check one):
☐ less than 1.5 ☐ 1.5-2.0 ☐ 2.0-2.49 ☐ 2.50-2.99
☐ 3.00-3.49 ☐ 3.50-3.99 ☐ 4.00

Appendix F

Informed Consent Form

I am a graduate student at The University of Tennessee, and I am inviting you to participate in a Dissertation research study. I am attempting to validate culturally bound scales related to development of Work Drive. If you agree to participate in this part of the study, you will be asked to complete the Houston Experience measure, Work Drive measure, Life Satisfaction measure and demographics survey. This part of the study will take only take 10-15 minutes.

Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from this study at any time. There are no risks from participating in this study. Through your participation you will also learn more about how the research process works. Your responses to the survey(s) will remain confidential. Your confidentiality will be maintained at all times.

If you grant me permission by signing this document, the anonymous data you and others provide will be part of my Dissertation report. It may also be submitted for publication in a psychological journal.

Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not prejudice your future relations with The University of Tennessee.

For any questions you have that I do not answer at this time, or concerns about your participation in this study, please contact Dr. John Lounsbury at Jlounsbury@utk.edu

Thank you very much for your time and willingness to participate in this study.

Meagan Houston

Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Candidate

The University of Tennessee

YOU ARE MAKING A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO PARTICIPATE. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICIPATE, HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE.

Signature of Participant

Date

Appendix G

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Sex (check one): ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. What is your racial/ethnic status: (Check One)

 ☐ Caucasian/White ☐ Black/African American ☐ Hispanic/Latino
 ☐ Asian ☐ Aleut/Pacific Islander ☐ Arabic
 ☐ India(n) ☐ Native North American ☐ Other
3. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (check one)
☐ None ☐ Some college
☐ Grade 1-7 ☐ Professional or trade school degree
☐ Grade 8 (grade school) ☐ 4-year college degree
☐ Some high school ☐ Some graduate education beyond college
☐ Completed high school or GED ☐ Advanced degree (MS, PhD, MD, etc.)
4. What is your job title? _____
5. For how many years (altogether) have you worked for your present employer
(or how long have you had your business)? _____ years
6. On the average, how many hours a week do you work on your job? _____ hours/week
7. Approximately how many weeks or days of vacation did you take during the last year?

 _____ weeks or _____ days
8. My boss/immediate supervisor/or advisor is:
 ☐ Caucasian/White ☐ Black/African American ☐ Hispanic/Latino
 ☐ Asian ☐ Aleut/Pacific Islander ☐ Arabic
 ☐ India(n) ☐ Native North American ☐ Other
9. Most of my coworkers or colleagues are:
 ☐ Caucasian/White ☐ Black/African American ☐ Hispanic/Latino
 ☐ Asian ☐ Aleut/Pacific Islander ☐ Arabic
 ☐ India(n) ☐ Native North American ☐ Other

Appendix H Houston Experience Measure

Directions:

Read each sentence. **Circle** the answer that describes you best. Use the following scale to help you answer each statement:

1 = **Strongly Disagree** – you strongly disagree with the sentence; it really does not describe you at all.

2 = **Disagree** – you disagree with the sentence; it does not describe you.

3 = **In-between** – you are not sure whether you agree or disagree with this sentence; you are undecided.

4 = **Agree** – you agree with this sentence; it describes you.

5 = **Strongly Agree** - you strongly agree with the sentence; it really describes you.

Remember, answer all of the questions honestly. **All of your answers will be kept confidential.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	In-Between	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I feel like my employer expects me to do better than other employees.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The values of my family played a large role in my having a positive attitude toward work.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I have a strong desire to excel in my line of work.	1	2	3	4	5
4. At work, I feel like my performance is constantly being judged.	1	3	3	4	5
5. I was taught by my family to work hard.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I want to be the best job performer in my company.	1		3	4	5
7. I feel like my progress at work is monitored more closely than my coworkers	1	2	3	4	5
8. My family taught me to give extra effort whenever needed to meet job demands.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I have always been competitive at work.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I often feel pressured to perform well at work.	1	2	3	4	5
11. One of the motivations for me to work hard in any job is to live up to the values of my family.	1	2	3	4	5
12. At work, I feel like I have to constantly prove that I am competent and capable.	1	2	3	4	5

13. My family always emphasized to me the value of hard work.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I want to do better than my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I often feel as if I have to work harder than my coworkers to meet performance standards.	1	2	3	4	5
16. High achievement at work was highly valued in my family.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I want to be the best employee in my company.	1	2	3	4	5
18. My employer seems to hold me to a higher standard of performance than other employees.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I learned the value of hard work from my family.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I like to compete with other employees.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I feel like I will be more readily reprimanded at work than other employees for performance deficits.	1	2	3	4	5
22. My family encouraged me to work hard at anything I did at school or work	1	2	3	4	5
23. I am constantly striving to be better than my peers at what I do for a living.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I feel like my supervisor is less tolerant of mistakes by me than other employees.	1	2	3	4	5
25. My family instilled in me a strong work ethic.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Some of my fellow employees view me as being too competitive.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I feel as if my competence is constantly being questioned at work.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I was encouraged by my family to always do my best at any job I performed.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I can't tolerate other employees doing better than me.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I learned from my family to work long hours whenever needed to complete tasks and projects.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I can't stand it when somebody else at work does better than me	1	2	3	4	5
32. My family disapproved of people who were lazy	1	2	3	4	5
33. It is important for me to outperform my work peers.	1	2	3	4	5

VITA

Meagan Nicole Houston was born in Cedar Rapids, Iowa on March 17, 1979. She graduated from Coastal Carolina University located in Myrtle Beach, S.C. in 2001 with a major in Psychology. She then attended Auburn University-Montgomery in Montgomery, AL. wherein she received her Masters of Science in Psychology degree. During her tenure here she obtained extensive experience in the area of psychological assessment, as she worked as an assessment specialist in a private practice and for a children's developmental clinic.

In August 2004, Ms. Houston entered the Ph.D. graduate program in Counseling Psychology at the University of Tennessee. During her tenure here, she obtained extensive experience and training in the area of Counseling Psychology. She completed a variety of practicum and training experiences, including placements at the University Counseling Center, Career Services Center, the Psychological Training Clinic (training site for clinical psychology students) and Cherokee Health Systems (community mental health facility). Through the guidance of diverse training supervisors and training experiences she was able to acquire an internship at the University of Houston, Houston, TX for the 2007-2008 year. She will be awarded the Doctor of Philosophy degree with a major in Counseling Psychology, upon completion of her internship in August 2008.