To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Jack Martin Brickey entitled "Development of a White-Collar Criminality Questionnaire and Evaluation of Employee Theft Acceptability in Relation to Personal Variables and Work Satisfaction." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Industrial Management.

Richard D. Arvey

Richard D. Arvey, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

John M. Larsen

W. E. Goodman

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

DEVELOPMENT OF A WHITE-COLLAR CRIMINALITY QUESTIONNAIRE AND EVALUATION OF EMPLOYEE THEFT ACCEPTABILITY IN RELATION TO PERSONAL VARIABLES AND WORK SATISFACTION

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Jack Martin Brickey

June 1975

1220457

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express his sincere appreciation to his Committee Chairman, Dr. R. D. Arvey, for his invaluable advice and assistance in the preparation of this thesis. Gratitude is also due Dr. J. M. Larsen and Mr. M. K. Goodman for their helpful criticisms and comments as members of the committee. The author is also indebted to his wife, Sharon, for her support and assistance during the preparation of this study.

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose in this study was to develop an attitude scale that would quantify employee acceptance of theft activities. These activities ranged in severity from harmless to clearly criminal acts. A secondary objective was to utilize questionnaire information for evaluation of the relationships among theft acceptability, work satisfaction, and personal employee variables. Two specific hypotheses were proposed. The first hypothesis used was that individuals expressing low job satisfaction would tend to show greater theft acceptance than those expressing high job satisfaction. The second hypothesis was that employees expressing positive religious affiliation would show less acceptance of criminal acts than individuals with no affiliation.

The questionnaires were distributed to 128 retail store employees by store management at three separate retail stores; however, only 39 employees responded to the survey. Questionnaire content examined the specific areas of theft acceptability, personal variables, and job satisfaction as perceived by the employee.

As a means of testing the hypotheses, Pearson correlation coefficients and Chi-square values were computed for numerous factors. The results of this analysis provided support for one of the hypotheses stated. The questionnaire did supply useful information pertaining to the acceptance of white-collar crime. A significant negative correlation was obtained between job satisfaction and theft acceptability. Religious

affiliation provided no meaningful relationship with criminal acceptance. Additional information was also obtained on items related to theft acceptability.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	General Introduction	1
	The Need for Field Studies	3
	Related Literatures	4
	Motivation for White-Collar Criminality	5
	Field Study Methodology	10
	Objectives of the Study	11
II.	METHODOLOGY	12
	Experimental Setting	12
	Subjects	12
	Distribution	13
	Questionnaire Content	13
	Procedure	14
	Response Rate	16
III.	RESULTS	17
	Statistical Analysis of the Attitude Survey	17
	Theft Attitude Item Analysis	17
	Correlation of Satisfaction Items With the Overall Theft Attitude Score	24

CHAPTER PAGE

Relationship Between Religious Affiliation and the Overall Theft Attitude Score 26

Crosstabulation of Personal Characteristics With Theft Acceptability 27

Intercorrelation of Theft Attitude Items 32

IV. DISCUSSION 33

Areas for Further Study 36

V. SUMMARY 39

REFERENCES 40

APPENDICES 43

Appendix A 44

Appendix B 49

Appendix C 60

VITA 67

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Analysis of Satisfaction Items	15
II.	Statistical Result of Attitude Survey	18
III.	Theft Attitude Item--Total Score Correlation	21
IV.	Intercorrelation of Satisfaction Items With the Summated Theft Attitude Score	25
V.	Crosstabulation of Church Attendance With Theft Acceptability	27
VI.	Crosstabulation of Theft Acceptability by the Number of Jobs Held Within the Previous Three Years	28
VII.	Crosstabulation of Theft Acceptability by Future Work Plans Five Years After Taking Questionnaire	28
VIII.	Crosstabulation of Theft Acceptability by Attitude Concerning Aspects of Job Considered Most Important	30
IX.	Descriptive Characteristics of Respondents	45
X.	Intercorrelation of Theft Attitude Items, 001-013	61
XI.	Intercorrelation of Theft Attitude Items, 014-026	63
XII.	Intercorrelation of Theft Attitude Items, 027-037	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Although white-collar crime is not a recent phenomenon, the large extent of employee involvement and the increasing magnitude of losses have given it greater focus than ever before. Newsweek (1971) indicated that annual industry losses may exceed $4 billion. Lipman (1973), however, states that the current figure may be double or triple that amount. Ash (1971) cites a study revealing retail store losses resulting from employee and customer theft as being a significant figure in relation to pretax profits. The cost of security systems, detection devices, and screening tests also add to the increasing burden created by white-collar crime.

Zeitlin (1971) states that merchandise theft is approximately 5 percent of the annual retail sales in the United States. He further claims that "employees steal three times as much as do shoplifters."[1] The scale of involvement is emphasized by his statement that more than 75 percent of all employees are involved in some aspect of theft.[2]

---

[1]Lawrence R. Zeitlin, "A Little Larceny Can Do a Lot for Employee Morale," Psychology Today, June, 1971, p. 22.

[2]Ibid., p. 24.

Employee theft (Money, 1974) is growing at the rate of 15 percent annually. Within five years white-collar crime may exceed street crime in the number of participants and dollar losses. In one study (Money, 1974) involving 200 major corporations, the majority of theft involved supervisory and executive personnel. Apparently, the reduced security and increased theft opportunity created a favorable environment for successful theft.

Extensive efforts have been made to control losses created by employee theft. Ash (1971) includes the following methods:

1. Apprehension and prosecution of the offender.
2. Institution of security methods.
3. Screening of employee applications.

Although considerable financial and manpower costs are invested in the use of these techniques, success has been limited. Ash (1970) states that less than 20 percent of the crimes result in apprehension. New security methods and devices are overcome with improved criminal techniques. Screening of employee applications and backgrounds have produced limited success in the identification of attitudes fostering theft. Apparently, employer awareness of theft situations has not seriously diminished the ability or willingness of employees to commit white-collar crime.

The concept of white-collar crime, as developed in this paper, explores theft from within an organization rather than from external sources. Included in this category would be internal criminal acts ranging in diversity from accepted minor abuses of company time and

property to major criminal actions. Excluded are external criminal acts, such as shoplifting, burglary, and vandalism, that are performed by individuals not working for the organization.

II. THE NEED FOR FIELD STUDIES

Limited field research has been conducted in the area of white-collar crime. Most work has centered on general discussions of criminal activities and exploration of the underlying motivation for theft. Several factors inherently complicate field research in this area. However strong the assurances of anonymity, attitude surveys and questionnaires may not evoke candid answers. Limited knowledge of testing procedures and fear of exposure influence questionnaire responses. The transient nature of retail store employees creates difficulties in the administration of test-retest procedures.

Although problems are inherent in the use of questionnaires, this technique and the resulting statistical data offer a method for reducing the information to quantifiable data. Field research must be conducted in order to study this phenomenon in more realistic situations rather than laboratory or artificial settings which may provide limited value in the analysis of white-collar crime. Field research must supplement theoretical analysis of white-collar crime if valid and reliable evidence linking work attitudes and actual criminal acts is to be obtained.

III. RELATED LITERATURES

Although limited work has been accomplished in the analysis of white-collar crime, more research is being conducted. Sutherland (1940) conducted an early study related to white-collar crime in which he focused more upon criminal acts against society in contrast to crimes internal to an organization. Sutherland contended that the popular stereotype of criminal characteristics was inaccurate in that a large segment of criminal activity was overlooked. Sutherland contended that this distorted view neglected the criminal acts of business and professional people, whose activities were conceived to be above suspicion.

Sutherland proceeded to implicate the merchant princes and captains of finance and industry in such diverse areas of criminal dealings as railways, insurance, banking, utilities, oil, real estate, and similar activities. The author indicated that the cost of white-collar crime was significantly greater than the cost of nonbusiness and related theft.

Senator Hart (1972) declared that corporate lawbreakers have achieved the ability to commit crime without risk of significant punishment. Most accused white-collar criminals never reach criminal court. Red tape, uncertain jurisdiction, and loopholes aid the accused through reduced punishment prescribed by inspectors, hearing examiners, boards, and commissions.

Sutherland (1940) cites the "illegal sale of alcohol and narcotics, abortion, illegal services to underworld criminals, fraudulent reports and testimony in accident cases, extreme cases of unnecessary treatment,

fake specialists, restriction of competition, and fee-splitting"[3] as examples of specific white-collar crime in the field of medicine, a field of considerable public trust and confidence. Hart (1972) also critically discusses activities of the American Medical Association and physicians. Doctor-owned pharmacies and drug repackaging plants create potential legal and ethical conflicts.

Although considerable evidence of white-collar crime exists at the executive level, Lipman (1973) states that all levels of the organizations are involved. Length of service apparently does not strengthen company loyalty or reduce the tendency to steal. Lipman indicates that often the most-trusted employee is most likely to steal. The employee most knowledgeable of company practices, procedures, and methods has a considerable advantage in planning and executing criminal acts. Detection and prosecution are more difficult. Even if the employee is detected, his long service record may weaken the impact of theft.

IV. MOTIVATION FOR WHITE-COLLAR CRIMINALITY

The conditions for theft are created both by the employee and the employer. Lack of job enrichment by employers enhances the climate for theft in industry and retail stores. Permissive security and control measures provide increased opportunity for employee theft. Lax enforcement of existing security systems offers theft-oriented employees a greater probability of remaining undetected.

---

[3]Edwin H. Sutherland, "White-Collar Criminality," American Sociological Review, Vol. 5, No. 1 (February, 1940), p. 3.

If the organization fails to provide a suitable climate for employee development as outlined in Maslow's description of the need hierarchy,[4] frustration could alter the behavior of the employee. If the frustrating situation persists, it may become internalized. Maier (1949) states that responses under frustration are compulsive and either nonconstructive or destructive. Dollard indicates that frustration ". . . inevitably leads to some form of aggression."[5]

Zeitlin (1971) cites lack of job enrichment as a significant cause of white-collar crime. The practice of upgrading jobs to a level consistent with employee skills has not been extensively followed. Superior workers are sometimes denied recognition through promotion or increased responsibility. Achievement and job growth are often neglected. Zeitlin concludes that some employers increase pay and benefits such that dissatisfied employees cannot afford to resign.

Management acceptance of Theory X assumptions as outlined by McGregor (Harvard Business Review, 1972) may cause the individual to adapt to the organization by a combination of the following methods:

1. Leave the organization.
2. Climb the organization ladder.
3. Use defense mechanisms.
4. Become apathetic.

---

[4]A. H. Maslow, "A Dynamic Theory of Human Motivation," Psychology in Administration, Timothy Costello and Sheldon Zalkind (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963), p. 60.

[5]Elton B. McNeil, "Psychology and Aggression," Psychology in Administration, Timothy Costello and Sheldon Zalkind (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963), p. 141.

Costello and Zalkind (1963) state that the individual will seek reinforcement from the group in executing these adaptive measures. If the group norm is oriented toward acceptance of white-collar crime, an employee who has adapted his behavior may be encouraged to commit white-collar crime (Costello and Zalkind).

In the absence of management incentives, white-collar crime may provide a sense of challenge that serves to enrich the employee's job. The U.S. News & World Report magazine (1973) states that computer-oriented crime is the fastest growing type of white-collar crime. Equity Funding Corporation used computers to generate false insurance policies exceeding $42 billion in value. These policies were later sold to other unsuspecting insurance companies. When the fraud was discovered, losses exceeded $100 million. Although the monetary quantity cited in the previous example of corporate white-collar crime exceeds most losses incurred through individual employee theft by computer, the number of computer criminals may be large. One specialist on computer crime estimates that more than 85 percent of these crimes may not be detected. The magazine article states that these highly-trained ". . . criminals are likely to be between 18 and 30 years of age, and usually outwardly loyal and trustworthy and usually have never been in legal trouble. They are generally very bright and highly motivated and seem to be challenged by the prospect of beating a complex system and overcoming protective devices, as much as by any monetary reward."[6] The article concludes

---

[6]"Using Computers to Steal--Latest Twist in Crime," U.S. News & World Report, June 18, 1973, pp. 39-42.

that most computer criminals do not equate theft from corporations with theft from other individuals. The typical computer criminal tends to steal more frequently and in larger amounts from large corporations.

Retail experience (Sears South, 1974) reveals no discernible profile concerning employee theft. Interviews with discharged white-collar criminals revealed weak security, lax supervision, and greed rather than need, as the circumstances common to most theft. The article also states that merchandise theft is not the sole source of criminality. Falsified credit slips and sales tickets also contribute to financial losses.

Equity theory as developed by Adams (1963) may be used to develop a framework for understanding white-collar crime. In the exchange between employee and employer, the employee expects a return commensurate with his contribution to the organization. The employee may perceive his inputs differently than his employer. If the perceived outcomes are not consistent with the perceived inputs, cognitive dissonance will affect the behavior of the employee. Adams (1963) indicates that ". . . there is a strong, but perhaps weakening, predilection for the belief that effort and reward must be positively correlated."[7] This value system contributes to the occurrence of white-collar crime.

Adams states that the motivation to reduce the inequity will vary directly with the magnitude of the perceived inequity. Interaction with other employees in comparable work situations creates a relative

---

[7]J. Stacy Adams, "Toward an Understanding of Inequity," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 67, No. 5, p. 425.

conception of inequity. As the relative perception of inequity increases, the motivation to decrease the difference strengthens.

Efforts to reduce the inequity can follow many patterns. The employee may decrease his inputs, distort his conception of inputs and outputs, change his basis of comparison, and use a variety of other means. Theft, misuse of company funds and property, and other criminal acts may also serve as a method for the reduction of inequity by increasing the outcomes of the individual.

Telly, French, and Scott (1971) analyzed several conditions that affect employee perception of inequity. Poor supervisory practices was a key factor in creation of an inequitable work situation. Inflexibility, poor judgment, lack of employee support, inconsistencies in problem solving, and other acts of inferior management activities tend to increase awareness of inequities. Poor leadmen, who may be comparable to department managers in retail stores, also exert significant influence on employee attitudes. Working conditions such as safe tools, adequate lighting, absence of noise and odors, spacious work areas, and similar factors affect equity perceptions. Lack of pride in workmanship, difficulty in obtaining a transfer, lack of help and understanding from the personnel department, poor co-worker efforts, and limited interest in group effort produced strong feelings of inequity.

Telly, French, and Scott (1971) concluded that inequity perceptions are related to employee turnover. Their findings indicate that employees will not contribute fully to organizational goals under conditions of perceived inequity. If the perceived inequity is strong, the employee

may withdraw from the organization in the form of low production and absenteeism as well as actual resignation. The willingness to commit white-collar crime also might be viewed as a form of withdrawal from the organization.

V. FIELD STUDY METHODOLOGY

Treadwell (1965) conducted a study to measure employee attitudes toward personal gain resulting from misuse of company time and property. This study developed a scale to measure attitudes toward "cumshaw" acts, activities that result in personal gain at the expense of the organization. The three objectives of the study were to develop an effective measure of cumshaw tolerance related to varying degrees of personal gain, to measure the relationship between group variables and personal cumshaw tolerance, and to measure the relationship between cumshaw tolerance and personal characteristics.

Twenty-six examples of specific cumshaw acts were selected as behavioral examples that were available to the employees. Each respondent rated the behavior represented by the cumshaw incidents on a seven-point scale, which represented a continuum from completely unacceptable (one) to completely acceptable (seven).

Analysis of the cumshaw tolerance items revealed an association with personal variables such as age and education; however, occupational groups did not produce significant differences toward these acts. Personal psychological differences did not significantly correlate with individual variation in acceptance of cumshaw acts.

VI. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary objective in this research is to develop an attitude scale that will indicate acceptability of white-collar criminal behavior. A secondary objective is to examine the relationships that exist among various elements of criminal acceptability, employee satisfaction, and other personal variables. To this end, the following hypotheses will be examined:

1. Individuals who express lower job satisfaction will show greater acceptance of criminal acts than those with higher job satisfaction.
2. Individuals who express positive religious affiliation will show less acceptance of criminal acts than those with no religious affiliation.

In addition, the relationships between a number of other organizational and personal variables and the acceptability of cumshaw tolerance will be examined.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

I. EXPERIMENTAL SETTING

The data for this paper were gathered at three retail stores in East Tennessee. Questionnaires were distributed to 128 employees by store management. Selection of individuals who received the questionnaires was made exclusively by store management. Included with each questionnaire was a stamped envelope to be mailed directly to the University of Tennessee, and a cover letter stressing the anonymity of the information.

II. SUBJECTS

The 39 subjects who responded represented a cross-section of retail personnel. Twenty-two males and 17 females representing a mean age between 30 and 35 years completed the questionnaire. Only five respondents were not married, and 26 were married with one or more children. Thirty-three employees were Protestants; however, no members of the Catholic, Jewish, or Mormon faith participated. Only 27 respondents indicated that they attended church. Three employees held college degrees; however, four had not completed high school. Further data concerning these subjects may be found in Appendix A.

III. DISTRIBUTION

The questionnaires were distributed at random to sales personnel by store management. Included with each questionnaire was a cover letter stressing the anonymity of the information. An envelope, stamped and addressed to the University of Tennessee, was provided for each questionnaire.

IV. QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENT

Thirty-seven items representing the questionnaire content were generated through discussions with selected retail store employees. These employees suggested specific behavioral situations that typically confront most store employees. Included in the questionnaire were a limited number of innocuous statements that served to reassure the participants that the questionnaire was concerned with broad work attitudes rather than individual acceptability of criminal activities.

The questionnaire itself was divided into three broad areas. The first area involved responses to individual acceptance of specific white-collar criminal acts. The second area explored personal variables such as age, sex, and other factors that were detailed in Appendix A. The third area examined employee satisfaction derived from perceptions of the job itself. Each participant was also provided the opportunity to indicate a judgment of the validity of the questionnaire.

Response alternatives to acceptance of white-collar criminal acts were generated on scales ranging from one to nine. Number one represented

an act that was completely unacceptable, and number nine represented an act that was completely acceptable. The numbers between one and nine signified acts that became more acceptable as response alternatives increased. The acceptability scale developed for specific acts of retail store white-collar criminal acts closely paralleled that of the "Cumshaw Tolerance" scale developed by Treadwell (1965).

The second part of the questionnaire involved specific personal variables such as age and sex. Also included in this section were responses related to personal perception, such as the most important feature of a job and the degree of store acceptance toward shoplifting. Value judgments involving personal attitudes toward the acceptability of theft by other employees were questioned. This area included responses that indicated whether the employee had observed theft by other employees or not, and the action taken.

The final area centered on satisfaction derived from the job itself. Each of the 21 items provided a response ranging from very dissatisfied (number one) to very satisfied (number five). A list of these items and the associated statistical data are shown Table 1.

V. PROCEDURE

The tolerance scale developed in this study was used to gauge the acceptability of retail store theft by employees. An overall total score was developed by summing over all 37 items on the tolerance scale. Correlations were computed between each of the items and the overall score.

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF SATISFACTION ITEMS

Work Attitude	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance
On my present job, this is how I feel about:			
1. Being able to keep busy all the time	4.10	1.02	1.05
2. The chance to work alone on the job	4.26	0.68	0.46
3. The chance to do different things from time to time	4.08	0.98	0.97
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community	3.90	1.05	1.09
5. The way my boss handles his employees	3.97	1.20	1.44
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	4.10	0.97	0.94
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	4.23	0.81	0.66
8. The way my job provides for steady employment	4.13	1.10	1.22
9. The chance to do things for other people	4.15	0.78	0.60
10. The chance to tell people what to do	4.00	0.80	0.63
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	3.69	1.19	1.43
12. The way company policies are put into practice	3.72	1.05	1.10
13. My pay and the amount of work I do	3.90	1.10	1.20
14. My chances for advancement	3.72	1.17	1.37
15. The freedom to use my own judgment	4.03	0.90	0.82
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	3.94	0.97	0.95
17. The working conditions	3.97	1.01	1.03
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other	4.26	1.02	1.04
19. The praise I get for doing a good job	3.77	1.01	1.02
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	3.90	1.10	1.20
21. Enjoying the work itself	4.00	1.03	1.05

N = 39

To test the hypothesis that satisfaction would be positively related to theft tolerance, correlations were computed between scores on the satisfaction items and the overall tolerance score.

To determine the relationship between various nonlinear personal characteristics and theft acceptability, Chi-square tests were performed.

Efforts to obtain information about actual store losses were fruitless. Each retail store displayed reluctance to reveal departmental or total inventory losses. Losses were regarded as confidential information that was available solely for inhouse use.

VI. RESPONSE RATE

Although assurances of complete anonymity were stressed, only 39 out of 128 questionnaires were returned. Fear of exposure, lack of interest, and other factors apparently created a reluctance to participate in the survey. The limited number of questionnaires that were returned resulted in statistical analysis being performed on participants from all three stores as a group, rather than as three separate groups.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

I. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ATTITUDE SURVEY

Development of the questionnaire section related to the degree of acceptability of white-collar criminality was based on cumshaw tolerance studies as developed by Treadwell (1965). Table II details the statistical means and standard deviations for the 37 acts of cumshaw tolerance stated in the questionnaire.

Responses to each statement were based on a numerical continuum from one to nine, which respectively represented tolerances ranging from completely unacceptable to completely acceptable.

II. THEFT ATTITUDE ITEM ANALYSIS

The concept of item analysis as developed by Guilford and Fruchter (1973) may be applied to each theft acceptability question. Item-total score correlations were performed as a means of selecting items that would increase the internal-consistency reliability of the questionnaire. Pearson's coefficient of correlation was used to index the relationship between each item and the total score. The results are presented in Table III. Twenty-nine of the 37 correlations were significantly different from zero ($p \leq 0.05$), thereby indicating support for their inclusion in the tolerance scale. The median correlation was 0.55,

TABLE II

STATISTICAL RESULT OF ATTITUDE SURVEY

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Taking inexpensive office supplies, such as paper clips, pens, pencils, for home use.	2.30	2.09
2. Discuss your store's pricing with someone from another store.	3.59	3.16
3. Using the Xerox machine for personal business.	2.89	2.47
4. Taking some fairly expensive equipment from store inventory (radios, tools, etc.) for home use and later returning them.	1.64	1.72
5. Opening the door for a customer (not yours) with an armload of packages.	8.82	0.68
6. Using the telephone for personal business.	4.25	2.63
7. Talking to friends during work hours while customers are waiting.	1.69	1.62
8. Replacing an item that a customer accidentally dropped on the floor in another department.	6.92	2.75
9. Taking returned (but not defective) products for home use.	1.74	1.83
10. Taking extra time on house calls for personal business.	2.51	2.41
11. Using company stamps for personal mail.	1.66	1.92
12. Calling a janitor to remove chewing gum stuck on the floor near the door.	6.43	2.84
13. Giving employee discounts to friends.	1.66	1.66
14. Using a store secretary to type a personal letter.	1.84	1.69
15. Refunding full purchase price to a customer who returns an item that does not appear defective.	7.12	2.59
16. Marking down prices on items for friends or immediate family.	1.66	1.64

TABLE II (continued)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
17. Taking credit for sale previously made by another sales person.	1.53	1.87
18. Misrepresenting inventory in order to balance books.	1.56	1.65
19. Having the store increase prices above guidelines established for inflationary control.	1.76	1.79
20. Covering a blemish in a product by placing a tag, a decal, or polish over the defect.	2.05	2.31
21. Claiming extra mileage on company trips.	1.51	1.55
22. Taking work-related training classes, not sponsored by your store, that will improve your salesmanship.	8.41	1.18
23. Using a boat or color television on home demonstration for personal use.	2.17	2.08
24. Leaving work early and have another employee clock out time card.	1.38	1.44
25. Switching the current season's merchandise ticket for an old ticket that will allow the merchandise to be purchased at a reduced price.	1.46	1.47
26. Helping another division straighten their merchandise before the store opens. Assume your merchandise is satisfactory.	7.59	2.47
27. Using receipt tickets that customers leave in order to claim merchandise.	1.77	1.89
28. Notifying a customer that he left his parking lights burning. Assume that he will not buy any item from your department.	8.38	1.85
29. Taking extra candy from the Candy Shop or free coffee from the snack shop.	2.10	2.08
30. Using store phonograph records to produce stereo tapes for personal use.	2.71	2.44
31. Recommending to friends that they check for items they might need in a department having a sale.	8.00	2.09

TABLE II (continued)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
32. Putting merchandise back from display so that it may be purchased during a later sale.	4.05	3.10
33. Telling a friend to wait until an item is on sale before buying it.	4.84	3.20
34. Suggesting to the Store Manager ways to improve another department's display.	6.02	2.74
35. Cutting short a lunch break in order to wait on customers during a big sale. Assume you receive no commission.	6.59	2.86
36. Reporting out-of-town expenses usually five or ten dollars over the actual expenses.	1.89	1.84
37. Taking home badly worn but still usable office supplies scheduled for discard.	4.25	2.98

TABLE III

THEFT ATTITUDE ITEM--TOTAL SCORE CORRELATION

Item	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	Significance
1. Taking inexpensive office supplies, such as paper clips, pens, pencils, for home use.	0.82	0.001
2. Discuss your store's pricing with someone from another store.	0.58	0.001
3. Using the Xerox machine for personal business.	0.48	0.001
4. Taking some fairly expensive equipment from store inventory (radios, tools, etc.) for home use and later returning them.	0.80	0.001
5. Opening the door for a customer (not yours) with an armload of packages.	0.18	0.136
6. Using the telephone for personal business.	0.39	0.007
7. Talking to friends during work hours while customers are waiting.	0.54	0.001
8. Replacing an item that a customer accidentally dropped on the floor in another department.	0.04	0.387
9. Taking returned (but not defective) products for home use.	0.77	0.001
10. Taking extra time on house calls for personal business.	0.54	0.001
11. Using company stamps for personal mail.	0.64	0.001
12. Calling a janitor to remove chewing gum stuck on the floor near the door.	0.10	0.260
13. Giving employee discounts to friends.	0.82	0.001
14. Using a store secretary to type a personal letter.	0.52	0.001

TABLE III (continued)

Item		Pearson Correlation Coefficient	Significance
15.	Refunding full purchase price to a customer who returns an item that does not appear defective.	-0.22	0.082
16.	Marking down prices on items for friends or immediate family.	0.86	0.001
17.	Taking credit for sale previously made by another sales person.	0.56	0.001
18.	Misrepresenting inventory in order to balance books.	0.70	0.001
19.	Having the store increase prices above guidelines established for inflationary control.	0.75	0.001
20.	Covering a blemish in a product by placing a tag, a decal, or polish over the defect.	0.64	0.001
21.	Claiming extra mileage on company trips.	0.77	0.001
22.	Taking work-related training classes, not sponsored by your store, that will improve your salesmanship.	0.15	0.169
23.	Using a boat or color television on home demonstration for personal use.	0.57	0.001
24.	Leaving work early and have another employee clock out time card.	0.75	0.001
25.	Switching the current season's merchandise ticket for an old ticket that will allow the merchandise to be purchased at a reduced price.	0.64	0.001
26.	Helping another division straighten their merchandise before the store opens. Assume your merchandise is satisfactory.	0.23	0.079

TABLE III (continued)

Item		Pearson Correlation Coefficient	Significance
27.	Using receipt tickets that customers leave in order to claim merchandise.	0.67	0.001
28.	Notifying a customer that he left his parking lights burning. Assume that he will not buy any item from your department.	0.28	0.042
29.	Taking extra candy from the Candy Shop or free coffee from the snack shop.	0.59	0.001
30.	Using store phonograph records to produce stereo tapes for personal use.	0.55	0.001
31.	Recommending to friends that they check for items they might need in a department having a sale.	0.33	0.017
32.	Putting merchandise back from display so that it may be purchased during a later sale.	0.47	0.001
33.	Telling a friend to wait until an item is on sale before buying it.	0.44	0.002
34.	Suggesting to the Store Manager ways to improve another department's display.	-0.04	0.382
35.	Cutting short a lunch break in order to wait on customers during a big sale. Assume you receive no commission.	0.14	0.184
36.	Reporting out-of-town expenses usually five or ten dollars over the actual expenses.	0.77	0.001
37.	Taking home badly worn but still usable office supplies scheduled for discard.	0.60	0.001

thereby indicating support for their inclusion in the tolerance scale. The median correlation was 0.55, which suggested that at least some of the requirements for an internally consistent scale were fulfilled.

In order to soften the impact of questions solely related to theft and other negative aspects of employee conduct, filler items were included in the questionnaire. Such statements as replacing an item that had dropped on the floor, having a janitor remove chewing gum from the floor, and notifying a customer that his automobile lights were accidentally left burning have little or no relationship to theft acceptability.

III. CORRELATION OF SATISFACTION ITEMS WITH THE OVERALL THEFT ATTITUDE SCORE

Since the questionnaire provides a series of responses dealing with satisfaction, the correlation of each satisfaction item with the summated theft attitude responses for the 37 acts of white-collar crime offers the opportunity to examine job factors that may influence the acceptability of criminal acts. The correlation of each satisfaction item with the overall theft attitude response is detailed in Table IV.

Observing the 0.05 level of significance (one-tailed test) used throughout for evaluation, several satisfaction items correlate significantly with the composite theft acceptability score. These items are the following:

1. Being able to keep busy all the time.
2. The chance to work alone on the job.

TABLE IV

INTERCORRELATION OF SATISFACTION ITEMS WITH THE SUMMATED THEFT ATTITUDE SCORE

Satisfaction Item		Correlation	Significance
	On my present job, this is how I feel about:		
1.	Being able to keep busy all the time	-0.45	0.002
2.	The chance to work alone on the job	-0.51	0.001
3.	The chance to do different things from time to time	-0.22	0.088
4.	The chance to be "somebody" in the community	-0.41	0.028
5.	The way my boss handles his employees	-0.08	0.321
6.	The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	-0.01	0.475
7.	Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	-0.26	0.056
8.	The way my job provides for steady employment	-0.12	0.230
9.	The chance to do things for other people	-0.23	0.082
10.	The chance to tell people what to do	-0.37	0.009
11.	The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	-0.22	0.085
12.	The way company policies are put into practice	-0.23	0.081
13.	My pay and the amount of work I do	-0.30	0.031
14.	My chances for advancement	-0.23	0.083
15.	The freedom to use my own judgment	-0.30	0.030
16.	The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	-0.39	0.007
17.	The working conditions	-0.32	0.023
18.	The way my co-workers get along with each other	-0.28	0.042
19.	The praise I get for doing a good job	-0.14	0.191
20.	The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	-0.25	0.065
21.	Enjoying the work itself	-0.46	0.001

3. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.
4. The chance to tell people what to do.
5. My pay and the amount of work I do.
6. The freedom to use my own judgment.
7. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
8. The working conditions.
9. The way my co-workers get along with each other.
10. Enjoying the work itself.

Almost half the satisfaction responses correlated negatively at a significant level. These results support the hypothesis that lower job satisfaction is conducive to increased acceptability of white-collar crime. This hypothesis is further supported by a negative correlation of -0.37 significant beyond the 0.01 level between an overall statisfaction score based on the summation of the satisfaction items and the overall theft acceptability scores.

IV. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION AND THE OVERALL THEFT ATTITUDE SCORE

Respondents indicating positive religious affiliation, expressed in terms of church attendance, demonstrated no significant correlation with theft acceptance. Individuals who attended church revealed similar attitudes toward theft as those who did not attend. A crosstabulation of religious affiliation with theft acceptance is presented in Table V.

TABLE V

CROSSTABULATION OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE WITH THEFT ACCEPTABILITY

Theft Acceptance	Attend Church	Do Not Attend Church
Low acceptability	16 (0.41)	8 (0.21)
High acceptability	11 (0.28)	4 (0.10)

Chi-square = 0.181 with one degree of freedom ($p > 0.93$)

V. CROSSTABULATION OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS WITH THEFT ACCEPTABILITY

The Chi-square analysis of the relationship between theft acceptability and other personal variables revealed only two statistically significant relationships. These relationships are presented in Tables VI and VII.

Table VI explores the relationship between theft acceptability and the number of jobs held during the previous three years. Questionnaire responses were possible for one, two, three, four, five, and greater than five jobs; however, the limited number of questionnaires that were returned forced a collapse of the matrix to compare theft acceptability for respondents who had held one job or more than one job during the previous three years. The Chi-square value obtained was significant. Individuals who had held only one job tended to be less approving of theft acceptability than those who had held two jobs or more.

TABLE VI

CROSSTABULATION OF THEFT ACCEPTABILITY BY THE NUMBER OF JOBS HELD WITHIN THE PREVIOUS THREE YEARS

Theft Acceptance	One Job	Two or More Jobs
Low acceptability*	17 (0.44)	7 (0.18)
High acceptability**	5 (0.13)	10 (0.25)
	N = 22	N = 17

*N = 24

**N = 15

Chi-square = 5.40 with one degree of freedom ($p < .05$)

TABLE VII

CROSSTABULATION OF THEFT ACCEPTABILITY BY FUTURE WORK PLANS FIVE YEARS AFTER TAKING QUESTIONNAIRE

Theft Acceptance	Same Work	Job Change
Low acceptability*	16 (0.41)	8 (0.21)
High acceptability**	4 (0.10)	11 (0.28)
	N = 20	N = 19

*N = 24

**N = 15

Chi-square = 5.94 with one degree of freedom ($p < .05$)

Table VII compares theft acceptability for individuals who expect to hold the same job for the next five years as opposed to individuals who expect a job change. Questionnaire responses were possible for the same job, promotion, a job change, and other areas such as retirement or return to school. The matrix was also collapsed to compare individuals who expected to remain in the same work and those who expected a job change for any reason. Individuals who expected to remain in the same work area tended to be less approving of theft than respondents expecting a job change. Since the results were significant at the 0.05 level, individuals who expected a job change within the next five years demonstrated greater theft acceptability than individuals who expected to remain in the same job.

Table VIII compares theft acceptability in relationship to job factors that are conceived to be most important. The list of job factors included the kind of work, money earned, job status, security, and the ability to use the present job as a means to obtain a better one. Although the level of significance was slightly greater than 0.05, the question generated interesting responses. Individuals who selected pay as the most important factor of a job demonstrated a low theft acceptability. Respondents who selected security as the most important factor also demonstrated low acceptability toward theft. Although high and low acceptability were nearly equally represented with respect to individuals who selected work itself and the opportunity to obtain a better position, no person selected job status as the most important feature of their job

TABLE VIII

CROSSTABULATION OF THEFT ACCEPTABILITY BY ATTITUDE CONCERNING ASPECTS OF JOB CONSIDERED MOST IMPORTANT

Theft Acceptance	A	B	C	D
Low acceptability*	4 (0.10)	6 (0.15)	10 (0.26)	4 (0.10)
High acceptability**	5 (0.14)	0 (0)	4 (0.10)	6 (0.15)
	N = 9	N = 6	N = 14	N = 10

*N = 24

**N = 15

Chi-square = 7.39 with three degrees of freedom ($p < 0.06$)

A represents kind of work done.

B represents money earned.

C represents job security

D represents ability to use present job to obtain superior job.

Crosstabulation of various other factors failed to generate significant intercorrelations. Age, sex, marital status, education, and other personal characteristics did not provide any useful link to theft acceptability.

Individuals expressing the belief that the store's policy toward shoplifting was too easy displayed no greater acceptance of theft than individuals who indicated that the policy was correct. Evaluation of all responses revealed no statistically significant results. Interestingly, none of the responses indicated that the shoplifting policy was too strict.

Belief that the store's policy toward inventory losses is too strict as compared to shoplifting did not increase theft acceptability. Although six individuals expressed this attitude, no significant relationships developed.

Employees who stated that monetary compensation was the most important feature of their job demonstrated no supportable evidence toward theft acceptability.

Respondents who expressed the attitude that their supervisor did not understand their problems did not show a tendency to express greater theft acceptance. Thirty-six employees perceived that their supervisor was understanding of their problems.

Although the results were not statistically significant, the responses concerning the observation of other employees committing theft revealed that only four employees had witnessed criminal acts. The four observations were equally split between individuals expressing high and

low theft acceptability. A related question concerning the action that would be taken if the employee witnessed shoplifting produced interesting responses. No respondent indicated that the theft would be ignored. Twenty-nine employees would inform store management of the theft, seven employees would ask the thief to purchase the item, and three employees would inform another employee of the department in which the merchandise was stolen. Of the 29 employees who would inform store management, 20 demonstrated low theft acceptability.

Thirty-two respondents indicated that their upbringing had been strict and fair. Of these 32 respondents, 20 demonstrated low theft acceptability; however, the results again were not significant.

Thirty employees indicated that the questionnaire accurately surveyed work attitudes. The remaining nine employees offered little concrete proposals for amending the questionnaire.

VI. INTERCORRELATION OF THEFT ATTITUDE ITEMS

A substantial number of significant intercorrelations were generated between theft acceptability items. The Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the 37 acts of theft are detailed in Appendix C. The intercorrelations provide useful information for inclusion of theft items in future questionnaires.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The primary goal of this paper was to develop an attitude scale that would reveal acceptability of white-collar criminal behavior. A secondary goal was to test various hypotheses about the relationships that exist among theft acceptability, employee satisfaction, and personal variables.

Questionnaire results, as stated in Chapter III, indicate that the theft acceptability scale was able to discriminate attitudinal differences among white-collar employees. Acceptable variances and item-total score correlations, shown in Table III (p. 21), were generated. Significant intercorrelations between theft acceptability items, shown in Appendix C, were also obtained. Test results sustained the primary objective of developing a white-collar criminal behavior acceptability scale.

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient between the summation of theft acceptability items and the summated satisfaction scale was (-)0.37 with a significance of 0.01. The negative relationship indicates that as satisfaction increases, the acceptability of theft decreases. This relationship might support the theory of inequity (Adams, 1963). If the employee perceives that his job inputs are not balanced by the job outcomes, the incongruity will induce the individual to reduce it. If the employee perceives that his inputs are greater than the outcomes,

acceptance of white-collar criminal acts would tend to reduce the dissonance by increasing job outcomes.

Crosstabulation of church attendance with theft acceptability produced no significant correlation. Although 27 respondents indicated regular church attendance, Chi-square analysis yielded a significance of 0.93.

Job stability reflected a tendency toward reduced theft acceptability. Crosstabulation of respondents who had held the same job for the previous three years in comparison to those who had held two or more jobs revealed a significant relationship. White-collar workers who held only one job showed less approval of theft than workers who had held two or more jobs.

Crosstabulation of the other personal characteristics and perceptions did not produce any significant correlations with acceptance of white-collar crime. These characteristics and perceptions include the following:

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Marital Status
4. Education
5. Father's Occupation
6. Number of Marriages
7. Number of Friends
8. Reason for Occupational Selection

Although the results were not significant, the crosstabulation of the longest period worked on a single job with theft acceptability

produced interesting information. Individuals answering five years or less demonstrated high theft acceptance; however, employees answering more than five years demonstrated low theft acceptance. This result, although not significant, is compatible with the crosstabulation of theft acceptability with the number of jobs held within the previous three years. That result, which was significant, revealed that employees holding only one job during that period were less approving of theft. Since employees who have held the same job for the previous three years may tend to have accumulated more longevity on a single job, the relationship appears reasonable.

Various elements combine to reduce the potential validity of this study. Participants were selected by store management; therefore, the questionnaires may have been distributed to selected employees such as company-oriented sales personnel or even members of store management. Respondents may have been requested to express favorable employee relations. Fear of arousing employee suspicions may have prompted store managers to depreciate the need for employee honesty or even a response to the questionnaire. Employee morale and relationships with store management may have varied in relationship to the other stores.

Although the questionnaire responses were specific, perceptual awareness of criminal acts may vary among employees. The kind of childhood upbringing, the number of friends in comparison to other people, and the degree of satisfaction may be perceived differently by store employees. Although strong assurances of employee anonymity were stated, doubt concerning test confidentiality may precipitate answers

falsely disclaiming theft. Loyalty to other employees may generate responses that deny theft actions by other employees. No information is available from store management that would reinforce the existence or lack of white-collar crime.

The limited response to the questionnaire forced the employees of all three stores to be consolidated into one group rather than to be treated as members of three separate groups. A substantial response to the questionnaire would have permitted interesting comparisons among the three retail stores; however, the small sample size that resulted served to reduce the power of statistical analysis.

No retest information was obtained, and the transient flow of retail employees would hamper administration of retest measures.

I. AREAS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Additional work should be directed toward a broader spectrum of white-collar employees. Since store managers may tend to channel questionnaires to selected employees rather than distribute them to a general group, questionnaire recipients should not be solely selected by store management.

Correlation of theft acceptability with departmental inventory losses would provide a measure for testing the validity of the questionnaire. Any study that develops this correlation must include analysis of inventory losses in order to reduce the contamination of this variable. Since absolute values of inventory losses may vary considerably between departments, actual dollar losses can be misleading in relating attitudes

to actual theft. A history of inventory losses combined with the judgment of store management should yield better information concerning the relative magnitude of inventory losses.

Future investigations should attempt to increase the response from white-collar employees. Cover letters stressing the confidentiality of questionnaire answers apparently do not suffice as the medium for assuring respondent anonymity. Verbal assurances should be given by the questioner prior to his distribution of questionnaires. By distributing the questionnaires personally, the questioner will tend to disassociate store management from involvement.

Concurrent data should be taken at two or more stores that offer a large sample size. This action will permit interesting comparisons of theft attitudes, satisfaction, and personal variables between stores. Stores staffed by workers who have exhibited greater mobility may well show greater acceptance of theft activity.

Useful information may also be obtained by development of a management questionnaire to supplement information concerning employee attitudes. This second questionnaire should explore management attitudes toward job enrichment, supervisory styles, and other factors that affect the work environment. The investigator should also explore management philosophy for a willing acceptance of a limited amount of theft as an informal job outcome for employees.

An attitude test should be submitted to employees prior to introduction of job enrichment techniques and, after adoption of enrichment techniques, a second test should be administered. Pretest

correlation with posttest results may provide some index of success for the techniques.

Future investigations should attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of security measures that are used to deter white-collar crime. Lax security may encourage theft, thereby adding to inventory losses; however, tight security may serve to reduce losses. The effects of security should be considered in correlating theft attitudes with inventory losses.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Limited investigation of the rapidly growing phenomenon of white-collar crime has been attempted. Previous research has largely involved estimates of theft loss, motivation for theft, management techniques for theft reduction, and similar issues. This paper attempted to develop a questionnaire that would discriminate between attitudinal differences related to theft acceptability by white-collar employees.

Approximately 120 store employees were surveyed for attitudes involving theft acceptability, job satisfaction, and personal variables. Evaluation of the 39 responses demonstrated that the questionnaire did provide useful statistical data in gauging the acceptability of white-collar crime.

Several hypotheses were presented for consideration as secondary objectives. Individuals expressing lower job satisfaction demonstrated greater theft acceptability than individuals expressing higher job satisfaction. Religious affiliation failed to produce a significant relationship with theft acceptability. Chi-square analysis revealed two personal variables that were statistically significant. Individuals who had held one job for the previous three years were less approving of theft than those who had held two or more jobs. Employees who expected to be on the same job for the following five years showed lower acceptance of white-collar criminality than those who expected a job change.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. Toward an Understanding of Inequity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 422-436.

Ash, Philip. Screening Employment Applicants for Attitudes Toward Theft. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 161-164.

Bennis, W. G. Chairman Mac in Perspective. Harvard Business Review, September-October, 1972, 140-149.

Costello, T. W., and Zalkind, S. S. Psychology in Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Dunnette, M. D. Personnel Selection and Placement. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1966.

French, W. L., Scott, W. G., and Telly, C. S. The Relationship of Inequity to Turnover Among Hourly Workers. Administrative Science Quarterly, June, 1971, 16, 164-172.

Fructher, Benjamin, and Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Hart, P. Swindling and Knavery, Inc. Playboy, August, 1972, 155-162.

How to Steal $4 Billion. Newsweek, May 1, 1967, 76-78.

Lipman, M. Stealing. New York: Harper's Magazine Press, 1973.

Maier, R. F. Behavior Under Frustration and Motivation Contrasted. Psychology in Administration, Costello and Zalkind (Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, 137-138.

Maslow, A. H. A Dynamic Theory of Human Motivation. Psychology in Administration, Costello and Zalkind (Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, 60.

McNeil, E. B. Psychology and Aggression. Psychology in Administration, Costello and Zalkind (Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, 141.

Office Thievery. Money, July, 1974, 21.

Sutherland, E. White-Collar Criminality. American Sociological Review, 1940, 5, 1-12.

The Rip-Off. Sears South, November, 1974, 12-13.

Treadwell, Y. Development and Analysis of a "Cumshaw Tolerance" Scale. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 126-130.

Using Computers to Steal--Latest Twist in Crime. U.S. News & World Report, June 18, 1973, 39-42.

Zeitlin, L. R. A Little Larceny Can Do a Lot for Employee Morale. Psychology Today, June, 1971, 23-26, 64.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TABLE IX

DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Characteristic	Category	Responses
Age	20-25	8
	25-30	10
	30-35	3
	35-40	3
	40-45	5
	45-50	6
	50+	4
Sex	Male	22
	Female	17
Marital Status	Single	5
	Married (no children)	6
	Married (one or more children)	26
	Divorced or Separated	2
Religion	Protestant	33
	Catholic	0
	Jewish	0
	Other	6
Jobs Held in Last Three Years	One	22
	Two	14
	Three	2
	Four	0
	Five	1
	Five +	0
Longest Period Worked on One Job	Zero	1
	One	4
	Two	2
	Three	3
	Four	4
	Five	2
	Six	2
	Seven	2
	Eight	3
	Nine	1

TABLE IX (continued)

Characteristic	Category	Responses
	10	7
	12	2
	14	1
	15	1
	16	1
	20	1
	24	1
	25	1
Salary in Relation to Job Benefits	Equal	27
	Less	9
	Greater	3
Future Job Expectations	Same	20
	Promotion	6
	Job Change	8
	Other	5
Church Attendance	Yes	27
	No	12
Highest Level of Formal Education	Less than High School	4
	High School graduate	12
	Some College	20
	College	3
	Graduate Degree	0
Supervisor Understanding of Problem	Yes	36
	No	3
Section of Country of Birth	South	25
	East	11
	North	2
	West	1
Father's Chief Occupation	Unskilled	2
	Semi-skilled or Skilled	21
	Sales	2
	Office Work	2
	Farmer	4
	Supervisory Work	4
	Sub-professional	0
	Professional	0

TABLE IX (continued)

Characteristic	Category	Responses
	Scientist	0
	Businessman	2
	Business Executive	2
Father's Level of Education	Less than High School	25
	High School graduate	9
	Some College	3
	College Degree	2
	Graduate Degree	0
Satisfaction from Peers	More	38
	Less	1
Childhood Location	Farm	11
	Town less than 2,000	2
	2,000 to 10,000	10
	10,000 to 100,000	15
	100,000+	1
Age at Marriage	Not Married	5
	Less than 18	5
	18 to 20	17
	21 to 25	10
	26 to 30	2
	30+	0
Number of Marriages	None	7
	Once	28
	Two or More	4
Previous Experience	No Previous Job	5
	Independent without Supervision	4
	Under Supervision	14
	Supervised One or Two	6
	Supervised Three or More	10
Upbringing	Strict and Fair	32
	Strict and Unfair	1
	Inconsistent	4
	Not Very Strict	2
	Little Discipline	0

TABLE IX (continued)

Characteristic	Category	Responses
Parental Guidance	Strong Guidance	2
	Moderate Guidance	16
	No Guidance	18
	No Interest	3
	Opposed to Career	0
Number of Close Friends	Very Few	8
	Less than Average	6
	More than Average	11
	Many	14
Occupation Choice	Interest	6
	Parental Influence	1
	Influence of Friends	18
	Opportunities	14
	Other	0
Observation of White-Collar Theft	Yes	4
	No	35
Action Following White-Collar Theft	Would Ignore It	29
	Would Notify Management	3
	Would ask Employee to Buy Item	4
	Would Notify Supervisor	3
Most Important Feature of Job	Kind of Work	9
	Money Earned	6
	Status	0
	Security	14
	Opportunity	10
Store's Shoplifting Policy	Too Strict	0
	About Right	22
	Too Easy	17
Store's Policy Toward Inventory Losses as Compared to Shoplifting Losses	Too Strict	6
	About Right	29
	Too Easy	4

APPENDIX B

CONFIDENTIAL

The University of Tennessee

QUESTIONNAIRE INFORMATION

The attached questionnaire will be used to provide information for a graduate thesis at the University of Tennessee. All answers that you provide will be kept strictly confidential. No person, other than a limited number of University personnel, will have access to these forms.

Each person, depending on his background and situation, has a slightly different opinion of work. The objective of using the questionnaire is to improve the understanding of employee attitudes toward work.

Please take a few minutes to answer the questions. Your honesty in answering the questions is essential. Without accurate information, the statistical data will be worthless.

Thank you very much.

PLEASE REMEMBER: ALL INFORMATION WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL

Dr. Richard D. Arvey
Department of Industrial Management
The University of Tennessee

CONFIDENTIAL

This questionnaire is intended to survey general employee attitudes toward their work. The answers to the questions will be kept confidential; therefore, do not put your name on this paper.

This information will be used for a graduate school thesis. Not only will each questionnaire remain anonymous, but the name and location of the store will not be identified.

* * *

Consider the following statements and indicate if the behavior is acceptable or not. Indicate your opinion on the nine-point scale. Assume that you will be undetected in all cases.

1.	Taking inexpensive office supplies, such as paper clips, pens, pencils, for home use.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- acept- ceptable able
2.	Discuss your store's pricing with someone from another store.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- acept- ceptable able
3.	Using the Xerox machine for personal business.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- acept- ceptable able
4.	Taking some fairly expensive equipment from store inventory (radios, tools, etc.) for home use and later returning them.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- acept- ceptable able
5.	Opening the door for a customer (not yours) with an armload of packages.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- acept- ceptable able
6.	Using the telephone for personal business.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- acept- ceptable able
7.	Talking to friends during work hours while customers are waiting.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- acept- ceptable able
8.	Replacing an item that a customer accidentally dropped on the floor in another department.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- acept- ceptable able

9.	Taking returned (but not defective) products for home use.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
10.	Taking extra time on house calls for personal business.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
11.	Using company stamps for personal mail.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
12.	Calling a janitor to remove chewing gum stuck on the floor near the door.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
13.	Giving employee discounts to friends.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
14.	Using a store secretary to type a personal letter.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
15.	Refunding full purchase price to a customer who returns an item that does not appear defective.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
16.	Marking down prices on items for friends or immediate family.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
17.	Taking credit for sale previously made by another sales person.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
18.	Misrepresenting inventory in order to balance books.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
19.	Having the store increase prices above guidelines established for inflationary control.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
20.	Covering a blemish in a product by placing a tag, a decal, or polish over the defect.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able

21. Claiming extra mileage on company trips.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

22. Taking work-related training classes, not sponsored by your store, that will improve your salesmanship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

23. Using a boat or color television on home demonstration for personal use.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

24. Leaving work early and have another employee clock out time card.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

25. Switching the current season's merchandise ticket for an old ticket that will allow the merchandise to be purchased at a reduced price.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

26. Helping another division straighten their merchandise before the store opens. Assume your merchandise is satisfactory.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

27. Using receipt tickets that customers leave in order to claim merchandise.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

28. Notifying a customer that he left his parking lights burning. Assume that he will not buy any item from your department.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

29. Taking extra candy from the Candy Shop or free coffee from the snack shop.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

30. Using store phonograph records to produce stereo tapes for personal use.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

31. Recommending to friends that they check for items they might need in a department having a sale.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

32. Putting merchandise back from display so that it may be purchased during a later sale.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
unac- accept-
ceptable able

33.	Telling a friend to wait until an item is on sale before buying it.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
34.	Suggesting to the Store Manager ways to improve another department's display.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
35.	Cutting short a lunch break in order to wait on customers during a big sale. Assume you receive no commission.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
36.	Reporting out-of-town expenses usually five or ten dollars over the actual expenses.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able
37.	Taking home badly worn but still usable office supplies scheduled for discard.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 unac- accept- ceptable able

Please mark only one answer for each of the following questions:

1. Age: 20-25____, 25-30____, 30-35____, 35-40____.
   40-45____, 45-50____, over 50____.

2. Sex: Male____ Female____

3. Marital Status: Single____ Married (no children)____
   Married (One or More Children)____
   Divorced or Separated____

4. In what religion were you reared:
   (a) Protestant (please specify)_____
   (b) Catholic_____
   (c) Jewish_____
   (d) Mormon_____
   (e) Other_____

5. How many jobs have you held in the last three years? (Include summer and part-time jobs).
   (a) one____ (d) four____
   (b) two____ (e) five____
   (c) three____ (f) over five____

6. What is the longest period you have worked on one job?_____

7. Do you feel that your salary and benefits are equal to, less than, or greater than your contribution in your job?
   (a) equal____ (b) less____ (c) greater____

8. In reference to your future work, what do you expect to be doing five years from now?

   _____

   _____

9. Do you attend church now? Yes____ No____

10. In what department are you now employed? (Remember, these answers will be kept strictly confidential.)

    _____

11. What is the highest level of your formal education?
    (a) did not complete high school_____
    (b) high school graduate_____
    (c) some college_____
    (d) college degree_____
    (e) graduate degree_____

12. Do you feel that your supervisor is understanding of your problems?
    Yes____ No____

13. In what section of the country were you born?
    South____ East____ North____ West____

14. What was your father's chief occupation?
    (a) Unskilled work____
    (b) Semi-skilled or skilled work____
    (c) Sales work____
    (d) Office work____
    (e) Farmer____
    (f) Supervisory work____
    (g) Sub-professional (bookkeeper, draftsman, surveyor, etc.)____
    (g) Scientist (geologist, chemist, engineer, etc.)____
    (i) Professional (doctor, lawyer, etc.)____
    (j) Businessman____
    (k) Executive of business or industry____

15. What was your father's level of formal education?
    (a) did not complete high school____
    (b) high school graduate____

15. (continued)
    (c) some college____
    (d) college degree____
    (e) graduate degree____

16. Do the people you work with make your job more or less satisfying?
    more____ less____

17. If you saw someone shoplifting in some other department, what action would you take?
    (a) ignore it____
    (b) notify a staff member____
    (c) ask the person if he wanted to buy the item____
    (d) tell someone in that department____

18. The place in which you spent the most time during your early life was a:
    (a) farm____
    (b) town of less than 2,000____
    (c) town of 2,000 or more, but less than 10,000____
    (d) city of 10,000 to 100,000____
    (e) city larger than 100,000____

19. How old were you when you were married?
    (a) not married____ (d) 21 to 25 years old____
    (b) less than 18 years old____ (e) 26 to 30 years old____
    (c) 18 to 20 years old____ (f) over 31 years old____

20. How many times have you been married?
    (a) none____
    (b) once____
    (c) two or more times____

21. In your previous job, which best describes your experience?
    (a) had no previous jobs____
    (b) worked independently with no supervision____
    (c) worked under supervision but did not supervise others____
    (d) supervised one or two____
    (e) supervised three or more____

22. What kind of upbringing did you have?
    (a) strict and fair____
    (b) strict and unfair____
    (c) inconsistent--sometimes strict, sometimes unstrict____
    (d) not very strict____
    (e) almost no discipline____

23. How did your parents feel on the subject of your career?
    (a) had very strong feelings and outlined what they wanted you to do____
    (b) were interested and helped you outline what you wanted to do____
    (c) were interested, but did not give you any guidance____
    (e) showed little or no interest____
    (e) actively opposed what you wanted to do____

24. How many close friends do you have?
    (a) very few close friends____
    (b) a little less than average____
    (c) a little more than average____
    (d) many close friends____

25. For what reason did you choose your particular occupation?
    (a) interest in the area____
    (b) influence of parent(s)____
    (c) influence of friends or relatives other than parents____
    (d) opportunities available in the field____
    (e) other, some combination of above, etc.____

26. Have you observed other employees taking merchandise without paying for it?
    Yes____ No____

27. If you have observed another employee taking merchandise without paying for it, what did you do?
    (a) ignored it____
    (b) notified a staff member____
    (c) asked the employee if he wanted to buy the item____
    (d) notified the department manager____

28. Which of the following strikes you as the most important feature about a job?
    (a) the kind of work you actually do____
    (b) the amount of money you make____
    (c) what others think of people who do this job____
    (d) the security the job can give you____
    (e) the ways in which you can use the job to eventually get a better one____

29. Do you think your store's policy toward shoplifting is:
    (a) too strict____
    (b) about right____
    (c) too easy____

30. Do you think that your store's attitude toward inventory losses as compared with shoplifting is:
    (a) too strict____
    (b) about right____
    (c) too easy____

31. Ask yourself, How satisfied are you with this aspect of your present job?
    VS - means your are very satisfied with this aspect of your present job.
    S - means you are satisfied with this aspect of your present job.
    N - means you can't decide whether you are satisfied with this aspect of your present job.
    DS - means you are dissatisfied with this aspect of your present job.
    VDS - means you are very dissatisfied with this aspect of your present job.

	On my present job, this is how I feel about:	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1.	Being able to keep busy all the time----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
2.	The chance to work along on the job----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
3.	The chance to do different things from time to time----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
4.	The chance to be "somebody" in the community--	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
5.	The way my boss handles his employees---------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
6.	The competence of my supervisor in making decisions----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
7.	Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
8.	The way my job provides for steady employment-	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
9.	The chance to do things for other people------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
10.	The chance to tell people what to do----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
11.	The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
12.	The way company policies are put into practice----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
13.	My pay and the amount of work I do----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
14.	My chances for advancement----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
15.	My freedom to use my own judgment----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
16.	The chance to try my own methods of doing the job----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
17.	The working conditions----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
18.	The way my co-workers get along with each other----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
19.	The praise I get for doing a good job---------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS
20.	The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job----------	VDS	DS	N	S	VS

32. Do you think that this questionnaire accurately reveals employee attitudes toward work?
Yes____ No____

* * *

Which questions do you think should be added or removed from the questionnaire in order to improve the questionnaire?

_____

_____

Thank you very much.

APPENDIX C

TABLE X

INTERCORRELATION OF THEFT ATTITUDE ITEMS, 001-013

Variable	001	002	003	004	005	006	007	008	009	010	011	012	013
001	1.00	0.57	0.43	0.64	0.08	0.43	0.34	-0.16	0.61	0.43	0.43	-0.13	0.77
002	0.52	1.00	0.30	0.34	0.18	0.34	0.34	0.17	0.37	0.37	0.42	0.12	0.45
003	0.43	0.30	1.00	0.30	0.08	0.29	0.50	0.11	0.36	0.33	0.32	0.05	0.50
004	0.64	0.34	0.30	1.00	0.08	0.10	0.50	-0.12	0.81	0.34	0.52	0.09	0.77
005	0.08	0.18	0.82	0.08	1.00	0.18	0.11	-0.06	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.29	0.11
006	0.43	0.34	0.30	0.10	0.19	1.00	0.17	-0.09	0.10	0.23	0.17	-0.03	0.16
007	0.34	0.34	0.50	0.50	0.11	0.17	1.00	-0.04	0.51	0.58	0.71	-0.01	0.44
008	-0.16	0.17	0.11	-0.12	-0.06	-0.10	-0.04	1.00	-0.03	-0.08	0.01	0.30	-0.10
009	0.61	0.37	0.36	0.81	0.09	0.11	0.51	-0.03	1.00	0.32	0.45	0.06	0.79
010	0.43	0.37	0.33	0.34	0.09	0.23	0.58	-0.08	0.31	1.00	0.52	-0.04	0.39
011	0.43	0.42	0.32	0.52	0.09	0.17	0.71	0.01	0.44	0.52	1.00	0.16	0.52
012	-0.13	0.12	0.05	0.09	0.29	-0.03	-0.01	0.30	0.06	-0.04	0.16	1.00	-0.00
013	0.77	0.45	0.50	0.77	0.11	0.16	0.44	-0.10	0.79	0.39	0.52	-0.00	1.00
014	0.44	0.29	0.36	0.46	0.11	0.45	0.44	-0.04	0.56	0.35	0.09	-0.17	0.45
015	-0.10	-0.07	-0.11	-0.32	-0.06	0.17	-0.16	0.05	-0.38	-0.06	0.00	0.07	-0.26
016	0.83	0.43	0.46	0.78	0.06	0.29	0.45	-0.08	0.76	0.51	0.49	-0.04	0.87
017	0.40	0.14	0.08	0.42	0.07	0.24	0.23	-0.06	0.38	0.22	0.60	0.03	0.42
018	0.71	0.41	0.39	0.56	-0.07	0.21	0.33	0.00	0.50	0.44	0.43	-0.08	0.74
019	0.69	0.42	0.45	0.79	0.12	0.29	0.64	-0.24	0.74	0.48	0.57	-0.11	0.67
020	0.55	0.19	0.22	0.66	0.09	0.20	0.42	-0.27	0.56	0.50	0.26	-0.15	0.47
021	0.77	0.41	0.28	0.84	0.04	0.19	0.45	-0.20	0.78	0.44	0.55	-0.02	0.74
022	0.16	-0.19	0.02	0.11	0.13	-0.19	0.12	0.08	0.11	0.02	0.18	-0.04	0.16
023	0.61	0.22	0.18	0.38	-0.11	0.29	0.09	-0.25	0.32	0.37	0.32	-0.02	0.52
024	0.54	0.30	0.35	0.77	0.07	0.10	0.58	-0.20	0.77	0.48	0.54	-0.04	0.77
025	0.58	0.43	0.22	0.63	0.01	0.10	0.35	-0.13	0.56	0.38	0.55	0.02	0.65

TABLE X (continued)

Variable	001	002	003	004	005	006	007	008	009	010	011	012	013
026	0.01	0.13	0.07	0.06	0.13	0.15	0.05	0.45	0.07	0.08	0.11	0.20	0.01
027	0.61	0.48	0.33	0.61	0.07	0.06	0.50	-0.15	0.64	0.44	0.40	-0.14	0.57
028	0.12	-0.08	0.23	0.10	0.12	-0.01	0.11	0.20	0.11	-0.05	0.12	0.26	0.14
029	0.64	0.32	0.25	0.52	0.14	0.36	0.18	-0.32	0.44	0.30	0.36	0.04	0.60
030	0.52	0.12	0.30	0.51	-0.20	0.12	0.22	-0.08	0.45	0.25	0.26	-0.37	0.50
031	0.03	0.19	0.17	0.09	0.09	0.21	0.02	0.53	0.06	-0.04	0.17	0.24	0.13
032	0.32	0.15	0.11	0.49	-0.01	0.04	0.12	-0.13	0.54	0.06	0.10	0.02	0.46
033	0.48	0.50	0.24	0.30	0.18	0.57	-0.03	0.07	0.21	0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.30
034	-0.04	-0.15	-0.51	-0.03	0.13	-0.22	-0.32	-0.05	-0.01	-0.13	-0.11	0.04	-0.04
035	-0.00	-0.08	-0.06	0.13	0.22	-0.02	0.20	-0.05	0.13	0.07	0.15	0.01	-0.01
036	0.70	0.37	0.18	0.71	0.01	0.19	0.38	-0.23	0.66	0.34	0.44	-0.09	0.68
037	0.48	0.32	0.26	0.48	-0.00	0.01	0.29	0.12	0.38	0.37	0.43	-0.06	0.43

TABLE XI

INTERCORRELATION OF THEFT ATTITUDE ITEMS, 014-026

Variable	014	015	016	017	018	019	020	021	022	023	024	025	026
001	0.44	-0.10	0.83	0.39	0.71	0.69	0.55	0.77	0.16	0.61	0.54	0.58	0.01
002	0.30	-0.07	0.43	0.14	0.42	0.42	0.19	0.41	-0.19	0.22	0.30	0.43	0.13
003	0.36	-0.11	0.46	0.08	0.39	0.45	0.22	0.28	0.02	0.18	0.35	0.22	0.07
004	0.46	-0.32	0.78	0.42	0.56	0.79	0.66	0.84	0.11	0.38	0.77	0.63	0.06
005	0.11	-0.06	0.06	0.08	-0.07	0.11	0.09	0.04	0.13	-0.11	0.07	0.01	0.13
006	0.45	0.17	0.29	0.24	0.21	0.29	0.20	0.19	-0.19	0.29	0.10	0.10	0.15
007	0.44	-0.16	0.45	0.23	0.33	0.64	0.42	0.45	0.12	0.09	0.58	0.35	0.05
008	-0.04	0.05	-0.08	-0.06	0.00	-0.24	-0.27	-0.20	0.08	-0.25	-0.20	-0.13	0.45
009	0.56	-0.38	0.76	0.38	0.50	0.74	0.56	0.78	0.11	0.32	0.77	0.56	0.07
010	0.35	-0.56	0.51	0.22	0.44	0.48	0.50	0.44	0.02	0.37	0.48	0.38	0.08
011	0.09	0.00	0.49	0.60	0.43	0.57	0.26	0.55	0.18	0.32	0.54	0.55	0.11
012	-0.17	0.07	-0.04	0.03	-0.08	-0.11	-0.15	-0.02	-0.04	-0.02	-0.04	0.02	0.20
013	0.45	-0.26	0.87	0.42	0.74	0.67	0.47	0.74	0.16	0.52	0.77	0.65	0.01
014	1.0	-0.35	0.55	0.05	0.23	0.51	0.63	0.31	-0.14	0.13	0.50	0.12	0.12
015	-0.35	1.0	-0.17	0.04	-0.04	-0.26	-0.23	-0.15	0.09	0.06	-0.30	-0.12	-0.04
016	0.55	-0.17	1.0	0.44	0.78	0.71	0.70	0.81	0.09	0.66	0.78	0.63	0.07
017	0.05	0.04	0.44	1.00	0.45	0.40	0.28	0.52	0.13	0.38	0.54	0.54	0.01
018	0.23	-0.04	0.78	0.45	1.00	0.55	0.34	0.64	0.13	0.67	0.62	0.64	0.05
019	0.51	-0.26	0.71	0.40	0.55	1.00	0.58	0.83	0.02	0.29	0.74	0.63	-0.20
020	0.63	-0.23	0.70	0.28	0.34	0.58	1.00	0.58	0.08	0.40	0.65	0.43	-0.03
021	0.31	-0.15	0.81	0.52	0.64	0.83	0.58	1.00	0.04	0.51	0.75	0.77	-0.11
022	-0.14	0.09	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.02	0.08	0.04	1.00	-0.06	-0.02	-0.17	0.26
023	0.13	0.06	0.66	0.38	0.67	0.29	0.40	0.51	-0.06	1.00	0.54	0.47	0.17
024	0.50	-0.30	0.78	0.54	0.62	0.74	0.65	0.75	-0.02	0.54	1.00	0.72	0.01
025	0.12	-0.12	0.63	0.54	0.64	0.63	0.43	0.77	-0.17	0.47	0.72	1.00	0.15
026	0.12	-0.04	-0.07	0.01	0.05	-0.20	-0.03	-0.11	0.26	0.17	0.01	-0.15	1.00
027	0.44	-0.41	0.63	0.40	0.47	0.69	0.66	0.70	0.04	0.35	0.76	0.58	-0.07
028	-0.11	-0.17	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.36	0.13	0.09	0.07	0.22
029	0.23	-0.08	0.67	0.29	0.55	0.56	0.40	0.60	-0.26	0.74	0.58	0.65	-0.06
030	0.41	-0.45	0.60	0.30	0.48	0.48	0.51	0.45	0.13	0.48	0.49	0.35	0.15

TABLE XI (continued)

Variable	014	015	016	017	018	019	020	021	022	023	024	025	026
031	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.11	-0.04	-0.04	-0.06	0.13	0.07	0.03	0.01	0.53
032	0.34	-0.23	0.41	0.27	0.26	0.40	0.45	0.34	0.07	0.14	0.33	0.22	-0.21
033	0.42	-0.28	0.26	0.15	0.15	0.23	0.26	0.18	-0.13	0.19	0.13	0.09	0.14
034	-0.02	-0.18	-0.16	0.09	-0.13	-0.12	-0.03	-0.10	0.21	-0.20	-0.16	-0.11	-0.09
035	-0.04	-0.24	0.03	0.12	-0.08	0.02	0.14	0.01	0.34	-0.00	0.08	-0.09	0.40
036	0.28	-0.12	0.61	0.38	0.61	0.77	0.44	0.82	0.18	0.34	0.59	0.67	-0.24
037	0.24	-0.49	0.44	0.30	0.33	0.36	0.39	0.39	0.12	0.32	0.31	0.25	0.17

TABLE XII

INTERCORRELATION OF THEFT ATTITUDE ITEMS, 027-037

Variable	027	028	029	030	031	032	033	034	035	036	037
001	0.61	0.12	0.64	0.52	0.03	0.32	0.48	-0.04	-0.00	0.70	0.48
002	0.48	-0.08	0.32	0.12	0.19	0.15	0.50	-0.15	-0.08	0.37	0.32
003	0.33	0.23	0.25	0.30	0.17	0.11	0.24	-0.51	-0.06	0.18	0.26
004	0.61	0.10	0.52	0.51	0.09	0.49	0.30	-0.03	0.13	0.71	0.48
005	0.07	0.12	0.14	-0.20	0.09	-0.01	0.18	0.13	0.22	0.01	-0.00
006	0.06	-0.01	0.36	0.12	0.21	0.04	0.57	-0.22	-0.27	0.19	0.01
007	0.50	0.11	0.18	0.22	0.02	0.12	-0.03	-0.32	0.20	0.38	0.29
008	-0.15	0.20	-0.32	-0.08	0.53	-0.13	0.07	-0.05	-0.05	-0.23	0.12
009	0.64	0.11	0.44	0.45	0.06	0.54	0.21	-0.01	0.13	0.66	0.38
010	0.44	-0.05	0.30	0.25	-0.04	0.06	0.01	-0.13	0.07	0.34	0.37
011	0.40	0.12	0.36	0.26	0.17	0.10	0.05	-0.11	0.15	0.44	0.43
012	-0.14	0.26	0.04	-0.37	0.24	0.02	-0.02	0.04	0.01	-0.10	-0.06
013	0.57	0.14	0.60	0.50	0.50	0.13	0.46	0.30	-0.04	-0.01	0.68
014	0.44	-0.11	0.23	0.41	0.10	0.34	0.42	-0.02	-0.04	0.28	0.24
015	-0.41	-0.17	-0.08	-0.45	0.08	-0.23	-0.28	-0.18	-0.24	-0.12	-0.49
016	0.63	0.10	0.67	0.60	0.10	0.41	0.26	-0.15	0.03	0.61	0.44
017	0.40	0.08	0.29	0.30	0.10	0.27	0.15	0.09	0.12	0.38	0.30
018	0.47	0.09	0.55	0.48	0.11	0.26	0.15	-0.13	-0.08	0.61	0.33
019	0.69	0.08	0.56	0.48	-0.04	0.40	0.23	-0.12	0.02	0.77	0.36
020	0.66	0.04	0.40	0.51	-0.04	0.45	0.26	-0.03	0.14	0.44	0.39
021	0.70	0.02	0.61	0.45	-0.06	0.34	0.18	-0.10	0.01	0.82	0.39
022	0.04	0.36	-0.26	0.13	0.13	0.07	-0.13	0.21	0.34	0.18	0.12
023	0.35	0.13	0.74	0.48	0.07	0.14	0.19	-0.20	-0.00	0.34	0.32
024	0.76	0.09	0.58	0.49	0.03	0.33	0.13	-0.16	0.08	0.59	0.31
025	0.58	0.07	0.65	0.35	0.01	0.22	0.09	-0.11	-0.10	0.67	0.25
026	-0.07	0.22	-0.06	0.15	0.53	-0.21	0.14	-0.09	0.40	-0.24	0.17
027	1.00	0.05	0.35	0.45	-0.07	0.24	0.27	-0.07	0.12	0.54	0.46
028	0.05	1.00	0.14	0.20	0.52	0.22	0.03	-0.09	0.29	0.09	0.21
029	0.35	0.14	1.00	0.35	0.18	0.19	0.25	-0.18	0.04	0.49	0.18
030	0.45	0.20	0.35	1.00	0.12	0.27	0.28	-0.07	0.03	0.32	0.55

TABLE XII (continued)

Variable	027	028	029	030	031	032	033	034	035	036	037
031	-0.07	0.52	0.02	0.12	1.00	0.19	0.26	0.08	0.05	-0.01	0.23
032	0.24	0.22	0.19	0.27	0.19	1.00	0.18	0.24	0.07	0.45	0.31
033	0.27	0.03	0.25	0.28	0.26	0.18	1.00	0.02	-0.25	0.18	0.46
034	-0.07	-0.09	-0.18	-0.07	0.08	0.24	0.02	1.00	0.11	0.10	0.14
035	0.12	0.29	0.04	0.03	0.05	0.07	-0.25	0.12	1.00	-0.06	0.17
036	0.54	0.09	0.49	0.32	-0.01	0.45	0.18	0.10	-0.06	1.00	0.32
037	0.46	0.21	0.18	0.55	0.23	0.31	0.46	0.14	0.17	0.32	1.00

VITA

Jack Martin Brickey was born in Kingsport, Tennessee on June 30, 1944. He attended the public school system in Kingsport, and he was graduated from Dobyns-Bennett High School in 1962. He entered East Tennessee State University in 1962. In 1964 he transferred to The University of Tennessee, where he was graduated in 1967 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering.

After graduation, he was employed by Tennessee Eastman Company in Kingsport. He is a licensed Professional Engineer in the State of Tennessee.

He is married to the former Sharon R. Hartley of Pennington Gap, Virginia.