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ABSTRACT


This study examined relationships between work ethic and welfare dependency. The 65-item Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP) (Miller, Woehr, & Hudspeth, 2002) and the 28-item MWEP (Meriac, Woehr, Gorman, & Thomas, 2013) with attached socioeconomic surveys were administered to n=338 and n=247 adult subjects, respectively. A negative correlation between the two variables was anticipated, so that as levels of agreement with work ethic increase, reported use of welfare benefits decrease. After running correlation matrices to examine Pearson’s r, hierarchical regressions were conducted, culminating in a model which partially predicts the connection between the variables. Bivariate analyses for the 65-item MWEP data indicated that marital status, age, sex, centrality of work, waste time, delayed gratification, self-reliance, morality/ethics, hard work, and leisure were statistically significantly correlated. Bivariate analyses for the 28-item MWEP data indicated that centrality of work and hard work were statistically significantly correlated. These findings could be used in the design of a comprehensive assessment tool to be utilized at the point of entry into the welfare system.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## I. INTRODUCTION
- Purpose and Rationale ......................................................... 1
- The War on Poverty .............................................................. 2
- Definition of Terms .............................................................. 8

## II. BACKGROUND
- Labor Force Participation .................................................... 12
- Causes of Labor Force Decline ................................................ 16
- Work Ethic ........................................................................... 24
- Welfare Dependence .............................................................. 26

## III. MEASURES AND PROCEDURES
- The Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile .................................. 35
- Demographics ........................................................................ 36
- Benefits Usage ....................................................................... 36

## IV. RESULTS
- Bivariate Analysis Long-Form ................................................. 37
- Multivariate Analysis Long-Form ............................................. 38
- Bivariate Analysis Short-Form ................................................ 38
- Multivariate Analysis Short-Form ............................................ 39
V. CONCLUSIONS...........................................................................40
Recommendations...........................................................................42
Limitations......................................................................................44

VI. APPENDICES...........................................................................47
Appendix A: MWEP-LF Scale..........................................................47
Appendix B: Long Form Demographic Survey.................................51
Appendix C: MWEP-SF Scale...........................................................57
Appendix D: Short Form Demographic Survey.................................60
Appendix E: Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate 55+ Years........63
Appendix F: Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate 25-54 Years........64
Appendix G: Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate No Disability 65+..65
Appendix H: Cumulative Workers Added by Age Group..................66
Appendix I: Active USA Population Aged 25-54...............................67
Appendix J: Employment Population Ration Age 16-19 and 16-24.........68
Appendix K: Civilian Noninstitutional Population Age 16-19 and 16-24..69
Appendix L: Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate..........................70
Appendix M: Table 1......................................................................71
Appendix N: Table 2......................................................................72
Appendix O: Table 3......................................................................73
Appendix P: Table 4......................................................................74
Appendix Q: Additional Descriptive Analyses – Long and Short Form......75

Descriptive Analysis Long-Form Demographics...............................75
Descriptive MWEP Analysis Long-Form........................................78
Descriptive MWEP Analysis Long-Form Recodes.............................89
Descriptive Long Form Benefits Recodes......................................97
Descriptive Analysis Long-Form MWEP Index Recodes......................98
Descriptive Analysis Long-Form Benefits Index Recodes...............100
Descriptive Analysis Short-Form Demographics............................101
Descriptive MWEP Analysis Short-Form........................................104
Descriptive MWEP Analysis Short-Form Recodes.............................111
Descriptive Short Form Benefits Recodes.....................................115
Descriptive Analysis Short-Form MWEP Index Recodes.....................115
Descriptive Analysis Short-Form Benefits Index Recodes...............117

VII. REFERENCES..............................................................................118
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Figure 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Figure 2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Table 1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Table 2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Table 3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Table 4</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost I give thanks to Lord God Almighty, for only by His grace was completion of this study possible. My appreciation and gratitude I extend to the following persons: Jonathan C. Varhola, M.A., steadfast advisor and tutor, for his guidance, encouragement, and staying the course with me throughout this long endeavor. Gary N. Burns, Ph.D., Psychology Department, for contributing his valuable time, expertise, critique and recommendations in his capacity as Thesis Director. Dr. Burns was also instrumental in recruiting additional participants for this study. Jacqueline A. Bergdahl, Ph.D., Department of Sociology and Anthropology, for her valuable suggestions and guidance. Lafleur Small, Ph.D., Department of Sociology and Anthropology; Director, Applied Behavioral Science Program, for her time and efforts to ensure deadlines were met, and paperwork organized and submitted on time. Finally, I thank my husband Roderick for his unwavering support and confidence in me to carry out and successfully complete this research study.
I. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE AND RATIONALE

The purpose of this study is to determine what if any relationships exist between the work ethic construct and welfare benefits usage. For this purpose, the work ethic is defined and measured as the multidimensional construct developed by Miller, Woehr, & Hudspeth (2002), which is comprised of seven dimensions or subscales: Centrality of Work, Self-Reliance, Hard Work, Leisure, Morality/Ethics, Delay of Gratification, and Wasted Time.

The conceptual framework for this inquiry draws primarily from the social learning theory of behaviorism (Bandura, 1985), and absent any formal theories of poverty, is based on the concept of the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960), the widely accepted pattern of social exchange. Because people respond to incentives (rewards and punishments) and learn vicariously and internally within social contexts, the social learning theory/behaviorism paradigm is central to the argument that welfare dependency diminishes work ethic. Moreover, the social learning/behavioral framework provides for hypotheses to be formulated and variables to be tested relative to the work ethic construct and how it may or may not affect welfare dependency.
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The paper is organized in the following manner. The remainder of this first section provides an overview of the period leading up to the anti-poverty programs that were created as part of the 1964 Great Society domestic initiatives. Additionally, the first section culminates with a review of the implementation of programs, the original intent of said programs, actual program outcomes, and a glossary of terms used throughout the paper. Section II includes a review of the literature, which focuses on the decline in workforce participation, causes and effects of the decline on work behavior, use of benefits, and a brief history of work ethic and welfare dependence in the American context. Sections III and IV cover sampling, methods, and results of the two data collection efforts employed in this study. Section V contains the author’s conclusions and recommendations for future research and policy. References and appendices are found in sections VI and VII, respectively.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Unofficially known as the War on Poverty, the 1964 social welfare legislation introduced by the Lyndon B. Johnson administration vastly expanded the role of the federal government in the economy and in the social welfare. The anti-poverty programs were part of the broader legislative agenda known as the Great Society and were the central feature of the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964. Before the War on Poverty, there was the New Deal domestic agenda instituted by the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration in the early 1930s in response to the Great Depression. While the New Deal changed the federal government’s relationship to the citizens by taking responsibility for the social welfare, it was nevertheless a temporary response to a
temporary crisis and its relief programs were ended once the country came out of the Depression several years later. President Roosevelt’s New Deal consisted of a few programs to secure the nation’s banks, provide for old age pensions through the Social Security Act, establish unemployment insurance for the jobless and implement programs designed to get people back to work. In contrast, the War on Poverty initiatives served as the impetus to the modern welfare state, despite the fact that work, self-sufficiency and alleviation of poverty were the defining features of the legislation. Ironically, in 1964 there was little demonstrable need for the federal government to involve itself in the social welfare, as the vast majority of people had found work to sufficiently sustain themselves and their families. Private charities served as the safety net for those who temporarily struggled, for widows with young children, orphans, and those unable to work due to chronic physical and/or mental impairments. Nevertheless, the Johnson administration was concerned that not enough had been done to help the segment of the population that remained impoverished and without work. The administration was also concerned about racial disparities, as unemployment among black youth increased from eight percent in 1944 to almost 25 percent by 1964 (Handler, 1987). President Johnson acknowledged in his State of the Union Address in May 1964 that although job creation, wages, profits and family income were at their highest levels in history, there were still 4 million people out of work and living in poverty that should not be ignored, and therefore warranted major legislative intervention.

Marking a shift in the generally accepted notion that poverty was the result of personal failings, President Johnson declared that it was more a structural failure of
society that was to blame for poverty rather than lack of personal responsibility or moral failings of the poor themselves. He said “…the cause [of poverty] may lie deeper in our failure to give our fellow citizens a fair chance to develop their own capacities, in a lack of education and training, in a lack of medical care and housing, in a lack of decent communities in which to live and bring up their children”, following which he promised “…to give every citizen an escape from the crushing weight of poverty” (Johnson, 1964).

At the time anti-poverty efforts were underway in 1964, the official poverty rate was approximately 19 percent, and had been in sharp decline since the late 1940s as the economy took off in the post-war boom. The poverty rate dropped from 32.2 percent in 1950 to 17.3 percent by 1965 (Sheffield & Rector, 2014). In 1967, after the programs had been set into operation, the poverty rate had dropped to 14.5 percent. Today it stands at 13.5 percent, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2016). The lowest poverty rate recorded between 1967 and 2016 was 11.1 percent in 1973 and the highest poverty rate recorded during that same time period was 14.8 percent in 2014 (Federal Safety Net, 2016). While there has been little change in the poverty rate since 1967, the U.S. has nonetheless spent more than 16 times as much on social welfare than it did in the 1960s; over $1 trillion each year on means-tested programs alone (Sheffield & Rector, 2016). Aside from a brief respite after the 1996 welfare reform legislation, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA), the welfare state has continued to grow. As of March 2017, over 43 million people were officially living in poverty, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2017) and over 94 million had dropped out of the labor force (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). When Lyndon B. Johnson declared in his
1964 State of the Union address that “our aim is not only to relieve the symptoms of poverty, but to cure it, and, above all, to prevent it”, he was unambiguous as to the purpose and intent of the new social welfare policies. It is in keeping with this mission statement that the question is posed, have social welfare programs succeeded in lifting people out of poverty or have they created an ever-growing culture of dependency?

Figure 1 shows the poverty rate falling, beginning in the late 1940s, to 19 percent in 1964, just prior to the beginning of the War on Poverty, to 14.5 percent in 1967, after the implementation of anti-poverty programs. From that point on the poverty rate has remained relatively static. When the rate hit its record high of 14.8 percent in 2014 it was roughly the same as in 1967, and then dropped to 13.5 percent in 2015. A poverty rate of 13.5 percent breaks down into 1 out of every 7 individuals relying on one or more safety net program to make ends meet, and 1 out of every 5 households relying on one or more safety net programs.

Figure 2 depicts the poverty rate trend line from 1947 to 2012 in relation to total federal spending on means-tested welfare programs. Despite increasing levels of spending, the poverty rate from 1967 forward has, on average, remained flat. In the decades since the War on
Poverty, the U.S. government has spent over $22 trillion dollars on medical care, food stamps, cash assistance, child care, education, housing subsidies, and utility assistance for the poor, with little to no effect on reducing poverty (Rector, 2012).

The Medicaid healthcare program for the poor is a good illustration of how a social welfare program can balloon in size and cost, yet fail to adequately provide for those who rely on it. Signed into law by President Johnson in 1965, Medicaid has grown from a small program to the single largest means-tested state-federal welfare program, and under the Affordable Care Act’s (ACA) Medicaid expansion, it has grown even more since 2010. In 1966, 4 million people were enrolled in Medicaid; by 1990 the number had grown to 22.9 million; by 2009 it had 50.9 million enrollees and by 2016 the program had 70.5 million enrollees, or 1 in 5 Americans (Sparer, 2015). Of the 70.5 million Medicaid enrollees, approximately 12 million are new enrollees under the ACA, which vastly expanded Medicaid eligibility in those states choosing to participate. The subsidies for the millions of new Medicaid enrollees are primarily paid for through higher premiums, deductibles and co-pays for those who have employer-based and private health insurance (Congressional Research Service, 2012). The Medicaid program has proven to be no more effective in providing medical care to the poor than it is cost effective to the taxpayers, as less than half of U.S. doctors and other health care providers will accept Medicaid patients due to low reimbursement rates (Blasé, & Gray, 2011; Dayaratna, 2012), and Medicaid patients are sicker longer, have less access to medical care and have worse outcomes than people with private health insurance or no health insurance at all (Dayaratna, 2012).
Second to Medicaid in size and cost is the food stamp program, otherwise known as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Enrollment in SNAP hit a record high of 47.6 million in 2013 (USDA, 2014). Food stamp use remains well over what it was in 2004 with 24 million enrollees; in 2000 there were 17.2 million enrollees (Rector, Sheffield, & Dayaratna, 2016). As of January 2017, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) reported the enrollment total at 43.2 million, or 1 in 7 persons. Though the record high 2013 food stamp statistics coincide with the fallout from the Great Recession of 2007-2008, participation as of 2015 was still higher than pre-recession levels, with the most rapid growth occurring among working-age, able-bodied adults with no dependents or ABAWDs (Rector, Sheffield, & Dayaratna, 2016). Another factor in the rise of food stamp enrollment was the suspension of the work requirement for ABAWDs as part of the 2009 economic stimulus legislation. Notably, from 2007 to 2010 overall food stamp participation jumped by 53.7 percent and in that same period the ABAWD food stamp participant population jumped by 126.9 percent (USDA, 2016). Many states have since re-instated the work requirements and have seen their food stamp enrollment numbers drop significantly, such as in the state of Maine (Billies, 2016). The 1996 welfare reform law included a separate rule for the food stamp (SNAP) program giving states the option of imposing time limits on the benefit use of able-bodied adults without dependents (ABAWDs), but until recently, it had rarely been used. Of all welfare recipients, healthy adults without dependents would be the most likely to successfully work their way off of the system, and so it is reasonable to set expectations higher and eligibility criteria tighter for this group than for others.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Civilian Labor Force:** A percentage of the civilian non-institutional population; a subset of the population who are working or looking for work, 16 years of age or older and who are not institutionalized or serving in the military.

**Civilian Non-Institutional Population:** persons 16 years of age and older residing in the 50 States and the District of Columbia who are not inmates of institutions (penal and mental facilities, homes for the aged, etc.), and who are not on active duty in the Armed Forces.

**Employed:** Persons 16 years and over in the civilian non-institutional population who, during the reference week, did at least one hour of work as paid employees; worked in their own business, profession, or on their own farm; worked 15 hours or more as workers in a family business; and all those who were not working but were temporarily absent from jobs or businesses due to vacation, illness, etc. Excludes persons whose only activity consisted of work around their own house (home repair or housework) or volunteer work for religious, charitable, and other organizations.

**Labor Force Drop-Outs:** Refers to persons who have been jobless for 12 months and longer, are not looking for work and have given up looking for work. This population is excluded from the Bureau of Labor Statistics unemployment rate calculations.

**Labor Force Participation Rate:** The labor force participation rate is a ratio of the population age 16 years and older who are not in jails, hospitals, nursing homes, or the military, and are participating in the labor force by either working or looking for work
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(civilian labor force). It is computed by dividing the civilian labor force by the civilian non-institutional population.

**Long-Term Unemployed:** Persons who are out of work and looking for work for 27 weeks or more, and were not actively seeking work in the 4 weeks prior to survey. Also includes the long-term unemployed who have given up looking for work and are not interested in finding work. The long-term unemployed population is not counted in the official unemployment rate since they are not considered part of the labor force.

**Means-Tested:** Government social welfare programs that are only available to those who meet certain household income and assets criteria. Eligibility verification is typically done through a review of an applicant’s tax returns, paycheck stubs, bank statements, etc.

**Poverty:** For this study, poverty is defined as both material poverty and to a greater extent, behavioral poverty, which is reflected in a diminished work ethic, a weakened family structure, and related social problems.

**Poverty Rate:** The official poverty rate is the ratio of the population living below the poverty line and the population as a whole. The poverty line or threshold is the minimum level of income considered adequate for basic necessities of life, and is based on a 1955 formula that assumes an individual or family will use at least one-third of their income for food. It is calculated by the Census Bureau depending on family size, age, and income before taxes. In this context, income is defined as earnings, retirement income, social security, child support, alimony, interest, dividends, etc., and excludes all forms of noncash social benefits such as food stamps, Medicaid, housing and daycare subsidies;
capital gains or losses, and income from any non-relative living in same household.

Because the official measure of poverty excludes noncash social welfare benefits, for purposes of this study it is considered more a measure of self-sufficiency than it is a measure of material poverty (much as the labor force participation rate is a more accurate measure of unemployment than the official unemployment rate).

**Unemployed:** Persons aged 16 years and older who are jobless, actively looked for work in the 4 weeks prior to the survey, and who are available for work. The unemployment rate calculation excludes people who have been unemployed for 27 weeks or more and not looking for work in the 4 weeks prior to the survey and who have given up looking for work. It also excludes those who receive federal disability income, whether or not they are looking for work and are available for work.

**Unemployment Rate:** The unemployment rate, as a percentage of the total labor force, accounts for those who are jobless, looking for work and available to work but cannot find a job. It excludes those who have given up looking for work and have dropped out of the labor force altogether, and so is not a true measure of unemployment.

**Welfare Dependence:** For purposes of this study, welfare dependence is defined as use of one or more means-tested and/or federal disability social welfare programs for six months or more. It also describes a condition in which individuals or families can become so chronically dependent on social welfare that without the benefits, they are unable to meet the expenses of basic daily living.
Work Ethic: For purposes of this study, work ethic is defined as it is conceptualized by Miller et al (2002):

“….“work ethic” reflects a constellation of attitudes and beliefs pertaining to work behavior. Characteristics of the work ethic construct are that it (a) is multidimensional; (b) pertains to work and work-related activity in general, not specific to any particular job (yet may generalize to domains other than work school, hobbies, etc.); (c) is learned; (d) refers to attitudes and beliefs (not necessarily behavior); (e) is a motivational construct reflected in behavior; and (e) is secular, not necessarily tied to any one set of religious beliefs” (page 5).
II. BACKGROUND

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION

The civilian labor force is comprised of those persons aged 16 and older who are either working or actively looking for work and are not in the military or an institution, also referred to as “members of the labor force”. The labor force participation rate is calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as the percentage of the civilian population relative to the population as a whole, while the unemployment rate is calculated as the percentage of people in the civilian labor force without a job and actively seeking a job. The total population of persons eligible to participate in the labor force is the civilian labor force population plus those persons unemployed and not looking for work or who have given up looking for work altogether. In other words, all of the people who are able though not necessarily willing to work. Currently, the labor force participation rate is 62.9 percent of the total workforce-eligible population, which equals over 94 million people who are out of the labor force. Fujita (2014) examined the reasons given for nonparticipation in the available Current Population Survey (CPS) data from 2000 to 2013. Eighty-one percent of respondents were over the age of 65, of whom 5 percent reported being disabled and 73 percent reported being retired; 36 percent were aged 55-64, of whom 13 percent claimed to be disabled and 17 percent claimed to be retired; 19
percent were aged 25-54, of whom less than 2 percent were in school, and 45 percent aged 16-24, of whom 67 percent reported not being in school.

It is unknown if the declining participation rate is due to cyclical trends (a direct result of a weak labor market in a contracting economy), or structural factors (a long-lasting or permanent level of unemployment that arises when the skills in demand no longer match the skill sets of the unemployed). It is also unknown if the participation decline is permanent (Aaronson, Cajner, Fallick, Galbis-Reig, Smith, & Wascher, 2014). What is known is that people ages 25 to 54 years are working less today than they were 16 years ago, yet no definitive explanations exist among economists and scholars as to why this is, though various theories abound. Congressional Budget Office director Keith Hall called it puzzling in his recent testimony to Congress, and noted that implicit taxes on work was one reason for the labor participation decline among prime working aged people. Hall used the Affordable Care Act (ACA) to illustrate his point, declaring the “…ACA itself probably reduces labor force participation…” (Hall, 2017). As a massive means-tested initiative, the ACA has all the characteristics of the Medicaid healthcare program for the poor. In order to purchase health insurance on a state exchange or federal exchange, a consumer must first provide their household income and go through a verification process rather than purchase a product at a set market price. If a consumer meets a low enough income threshold, they qualify for taxpayer subsidies or benefits but if they earn too much income they don’t receive any subsidies. It follows then that the majority of people who gained health care coverage through the ACA are actually new Medicaid enrollees in those states that opted to expand Medicaid through the ACA
Medicaid expansion (Congressional Budget Office, 2017). Of the roughly 14 million newly insured under the ACA, 84 percent or 11.8 million are Medicaid enrollees, mostly able-bodied working age people. States are incentivized with additional federal funding to enroll young, healthy and able-bodied persons in Medicaid. Casey Mulligan (2014), professor of economics at the University of Chicago, refers to the ACA exchanges and the employer mandate as “tax distortions” or behavioral changes that businesses and households make in order to either decrease their tax liabilities or increase their tax subsidies, and that such behaviors would not be present were it not for the tax code. In the case of the exchanges, Mulligan notes that people working full-time for employers who provide health coverage are ineligible for the marketplace tax subsidies, but that subsidies are awarded to those who work part-time or not at all. In this way, the ACA law is similar to means-tested social welfare programs because it discourages full-time employment; when full-time employment is disincentivized, it weakens the labor market, the overall economy and the work ethic of recipients. Tax penalties on employers who fail to provide health coverage for full-time employees, tax subsidies for those working part-time or not at all, and the implicit tax on earnings all taken together add up to a tax on full-time employment (Mulligan, 2014). A full-time employee may have to work an extra 20 to 30 hours per week to replace the value of the government subsidy they would have received if they worked part-time or not at all. In line with Dr. Mulligan’s conclusions is the Congressional Budget Office’s (CBO) February 2014 report of revised estimates of the ACA’s impact on the labor force. The CBO initially projected a loss of 800,000 full time workers by 2021 due to the ACA; their revised report projects a loss of 2.3 million instead, and by 2024 the CBO projects a loss of 2.5 million full-time workers
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(Labor Market Effects of the Affordable Care Act: Updated Estimates, 2014). The CBO report states:

“The ACA’s largest impact on labor markets will probably occur after 2016, once its major provisions have taken full effect and overall economic output nears its maximum sustainable level. CBO estimates that the ACA will reduce the total number of hours worked, on net, by about 1.5 percent to 2.0 percent during the period from 2017 to 2024, almost entirely because workers will choose to supply less labor—given the new taxes and other incentives they will face and the financial benefits some will receive [Italics added].” (Labor Market Effects of the Affordable Care Act: Updated Estimates, 2014).

A declining labor force participation rate combined with a social welfare benefit system (including health care and federal disability) that discourages work and self-sufficiency does not bode well for the people trapped within that system who otherwise could be working, prospering and contributing to the collective support. The longer a person is out of the labor force the less likely it is they will return, because job skills and work-related behaviors atrophy in place. Moreover, employers are less interested in job seekers who have been unemployed for more than six months and whose work skills are not up to date, so that even improving labor market conditions would likely not help to alleviate the long-term unemployed situation (Krueger, Cramer, & Cho, 2014).

Employers consider a strong work ethic as the most desired trait in new employees (Hill & Fouts, 2005), even more so than intelligence, enthusiasm or education (Flynn, 1994). Therefore, employers will discriminate between those job applicants who are either employed or have been unemployed a very short period of time, and those who have been unemployed for six months or longer.

The poor job prospects of the long-term unemployed is a phenomenon often referred to in labor economics as hysteresis (Frantz, 1990), meaning the delayed effects
of unemployment on the unemployed. Sustained high levels of unemployment result in more categories of the long-term unemployed; the longer people are unemployed, the more their work skills and work-related norms and behaviors atrophy, and the more they will adapt to and accept a lower standard of living. The more a lowered standard of living and being unemployed becomes acceptable within the growing population of labor force dropouts, the more socially acceptable being unemployed becomes. Consequently, once the economy rebounds and the labor market returns to normal, many or most of the long-term unemployed will not be interested in returning to work. Hysteresis in this context represents a structural unemployment problem wherein a recovering economy with increased labor market demand will have little to no impact on long-term unemployment. Further complicating the situation is the likelihood that many of the long-term unemployed will turn to social safety-net programs and become welfare dependent, possibly for decades. Because safety-net programs do not have the same social stigma associated with them as in the past due to changes like transitioning to electronic debit cards for cash assistance and food stamp programs, it is becoming more acceptable for people to use them. Reduced social stigma combined with the lack of work incentives only increases the odds that more of the long-term unemployed will adapt to and become dependent upon social welfare programs instead of returning to the workforce.

CAUSES OF LABOR FORCE DECLINE

A common explanation for the decline in labor force participation is that more people are retiring from the workforce, in particular the baby boom generation. While many of the baby boomers are indeed retiring, the available data does not support that explanation as being the primary cause. The participation rate among those aged 55 and
over has been increasing since the mid-1990s, while the participation rates of people age 25 to 54 years have been decreasing since 2000. Those aged 65+ have also seen their participation rates increase since 2003, to a high of 24.5 percent in March 2016. The hiring of prime working age people sharply decreased after 2007, while hiring of those age 55 and over increased. The older population can be accounted for if a calculation is done by age bracket in the same way the participation rate is calculated, by dividing the civilian labor force by the civilian non-institutionalized population. This would show that the population aged 25 to 54 primarily accounts for the steep decline in the participation rate and that the increased labor participation rate of the 55 and older population keep the aggregate participation rate from falling even further.

The labor force participation rate for 25 to 54 year olds fell from 84.4 percent in January 2000 to 81.4 percent in March 2016, with the pace of decline accelerating rapidly after 2007/2008. It is notable that during 2000 to 2008 the population of this group increased by more than 3 million, from 101,393,583 in 2000 to 104,396,000 in 2008.

In the 16 to 24 yr. old age group, the participation rate was 66.1 percent in 1992; from 1992 to 2002 it fell another 2.9 percent, to 63.3 percent, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. From 2002, it fell from 63.3 percent to 54.9 percent in 2012, and ticked up to 55.4 percent in March 2016. The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts a further

---

1 See chart in Appendix E
2 See chart in Appendix F
3 See chart in Appendix G
4 See chart in Appendix K
5 See chart in Appendix H
6 See chart in Appendix I
decline of 5.0 percent to 5.5 percent through to 2022\textsuperscript{7}. Although the population growth for this youth group has declined, the rate of labor force participation was greater than the rate of decline in population.

Economic and trade policies impact workforce participation, such as the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), often cited as the cause of massive losses of U.S. manufacturing jobs. The workforce participation rate hit its peak in 2000 of 67.1 percent before starting its steady decline, and then the decline accelerated with the start of the recession in 2008\textsuperscript{8}. The first wave of baby boomers also turned age 62 at the start of the 2008 recession, which exerted expected downward pressure on labor force participation, although as noted earlier, not all baby boomers and workers over age 55 are retiring, and their participation rates are increasing. The data on the direct effects NAFTA has had on the U.S. job market is inconclusive at best because so many other events were happening around the same time. It is possible that more jobs may have been lost to automation and globalization, particularly China’s entrance into the world market, than as a direct result of the 1994 trade policy. Rather than being the direct cause of massive job losses, NAFTA may have instead permanently changed the makeup of U.S. occupations. For example, many low-skilled manual labor occupations that do not require a college degree were lost due to NAFTA while many other types of job gains were made, such as in the financial, information / technology sectors, service and retail industries. Whatever the exact cause, millions of American workers, many low-skilled without college educations, have been dropping out of the workforce since 2000, especially prime age

\textsuperscript{7} See chart in Appendix J
\textsuperscript{8} See chart in Appendix L
workers in the 25 to 54 age range. Labor force participation has been on the decline for “every cohort in the United States,” not just retirees, according to the Congressional Budget Office Director Keith Hall in his testimony before Congress (Hall, 2017). Regards to gender, the participation rate for women has been decreasing since reaching its peak in 1999, while the participation rate for prime working age men 25 to 54 continues the decline that began in the mid-1950s, when their workforce participation hit a high of 98 percent. It remained relatively high at 96 percent in 1970, but has been falling steadily since. By 2016, male participation had fallen to 88.4 percent (Bunker, 2016). While the overall decline among the prime aged men and women is indeed a concern, it is the decline in the workforce participation of men aged 25 to 54 that is even more troubling. Female participation, especially for married women, increased rapidly since the 1950s, hit its peak in 1999 and has been declining since, though not as drastically as that of men. It is easy to surmise some of the reasons prime age women may drop out of the labor force, such as for child bearing, child care and other family responsibilities, but it is more difficult to explain why prime age men continue to drop out of the workforce. According to data from the Current Population Survey (CPS), the main reason given by this population of men who were neither working nor looking for work was that they were not interested in employment. Unfortunately, after the redesign of the CPS survey in 1994, those particular types of questions are no longer asked of the long term unemployed as to why they are not seeking work, and excludes those who have not looked for work in over a year.
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If the population of men who are not interested in finding work for reasons other than dependence on social safety-net programs, there would not be as much cause for concern. However, indications are that welfare dependence is a likely cause, especially with men’s growing dependence on the social security disability insurance (SSDI) program. Political economist Nicholas Eberstadt (2016) states that for every unemployed prime-age man today, three more are neither working nor looking for work, and one in four is receiving social security disability, a program that he describes as having taken on the characteristics of a social safety-net program. Eberstadt paints a dire picture for working-age men, calling their declining labor force participation a “quiet catastrophe”. He points out the percentage of men who are voluntarily detached from paid work has more than doubled since 1948 and that more prime aged men were engaged in work near the end of the Great Depression in 1940 than are working today. Moreover, in 1948, 14 percent of men aged 20 to 54 had dropped out of the workforce and by 2015, 32 percent had dropped out. The decreasing workforce participation cannot be attributed solely to demographic factors like an aging and retiring population if prime age people are working less today than their counterparts of 16 years ago. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that overall labor force participation will continue to fall for the next ten years while the participation rate of workers aged 55 and older will slowly increase (BLS, 2017). The Congressional Budget Office (2017) projects the rate will fall from 62.8 percent in 2017 to 61.0 percent in 2027 to 59.2 percent by 2047 (CBO, 2017), attributing most of the decrease to the baby boomers aging out of the job market but also due to prime age workers dropping out. In some cases, the labor force participation rate is a more accurate gauge of the strength of the labor market than the official unemployment
rate. However, it is not as accurate a gauge of economic strength because the long-term unemployed do not necessarily benefit from an improving economy and job market.

The social security disability insurance program has been drawing more attention recently as a driver of declining labor force participation. According to Office of the Inspector General, Social Security Administration (2013), as unemployment rose during the last three recessions, first in the early 1990s then the early 2000s and finally in 2007-2008, the number of applications for disability also rose. The number of disabled worker-only beneficiaries rose from 2.5 million in 1991 to 7.4 million in 2009 to 10.9 million in November 2015. The rising enrollment in the disability insurance program accounts for one of the biggest shifts of Americans leaving the workforce, among all age groups but particularly among men (Winship, 2015). Moreover, the Congressional Budget Office projects the disability rolls will continue to increase over the next 30 years, which is not a surprising prediction given that less than one percent of recipients ever return to the workforce (CBO, 2017; Hall, R., 2015; Joffe-Walt, C., 2013). Once enrolled in disability, the recipients are no longer counted as unemployed, which further distorts the unemployment rate, since many on disability would be capable of some kind of work. After the Reagan administration relaxed the medical and mental health eligibility criteria for disability in the early 1980s (Social Security Disability Benefits Reform Act, 1984), the enrollments soon increased and continue to increase. Eligibility determination was revised to rely more on an applicant’s perception of their mental or medical conditions rather than an actual diagnosis by a physician. Today, mental disorders top the list as the most cited reason for disability with musculoskeletal conditions coming in second place,
two conditions which should be generally amenable to treatment with a substantial degree of recovery, aside from the most severe cases.

Automation has impacted the labor force, for better or for worse, since the start of the Industrial Revolution in the late 18th century. Today, automation is often portrayed in terms of sophisticated industrial robots welding car bodies together in a high tech factory somewhere. However, it is a much broader and much older process: the gradual elimination of mostly low-skilled, manual human labor through technological means or artificial intelligence (AI). Over the last century or so, machines have reached such a high state of sophistication that they not only increase the productivity of human beings but have replaced many occupations altogether. Gone forever are the typing pools, manual telephone switchboard operators, film projectionists, bowling alley pinsetters and numerous other low to medium skilled occupations. Machines now threaten to replace humans in high-end cognitive occupations that would have once been thought entirely beyond the reach of automation, such as music composition, legal work, or medical diagnosis and treatment (Danaher, 2016).

Frey & Osborne (2017) examined the susceptibility of 702 current occupations to automation. Based on their methodology, the occupations were determined to be either at high, medium or low risk of automation in the near future. The researchers estimate that 47 percent of occupations in the U.S. are at high risk of being replaced by automation within the next 10 to 20 years, primarily low-skill, low-wage occupations such as office and administrative support jobs, transportation and logistics, retail and food service. Fundamentally, the current potential of automation voids the age-old contract between
the worker and whatever person employs or otherwise governs him. If work can be done more efficiently and more profitably by a machine, human labor becomes less sought after by employers. This should be of concern to both social policymakers and private capitalists, for if a nation can produce an abundance of material wealth with only a minimal amount of human effort, the function of a large populace is necessarily called into question. It is readily apparent that unemployed workers do not magically pursue "higher callings" and move on to become great writers, artists or musicians, even if supported entirely on the largess of the state. Instead, their work skills atrophy in place and work ethic diminishes. As already noted, the longer people stay out of the workforce the less likely it is that employers will be interested in hiring them, and the less likely it is they will return to the work force (Hill & Fouts, 2005; Krueger, Cramer & Cho, 2014).

Unrestrained immigration exerts downward pressure on the wages and job opportunities of native born workers, especially the poorest and low-educated. Despite what immigration advocates claim, the U.S. does not need more working age people coming into the labor force to make up for an aging society, because there already exist adequate numbers of people in their working prime who are able to do the jobs. While it is difficult to determine the exact harm done to native Americans as a result of immigration, the fact that big business lobbies have advocated relentlessly over the past few decades for more skilled and unskilled immigration is indicative of the productivity gains by employers at the expense of lower wages and lost jobs for Americans. Research shows that legal and illegal immigration not only lowers wages for American workers (Borjas, 2013) but also displaces native workers, including teenagers, from the labor
force (McCarthy & Vernez, 1997; Smith, 2012). Since 2000, all job gains in the U.S.
have gone to foreigners (Camarota & Zeigler, 2014) while 100 percent of all female
employment gains have gone to foreigners since 2007 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015).
The claim of big business lobbyists, immigration activists and the U.S. Chamber of
Commerce that the country has a shortage of labor when millions of people aged 16 to 59
are sitting on the sidelines of the labor force is simply not supported by the data. The
problem appears to be that too few of those out of the labor force are attached to paid
employment.

WORK ETHIC

Hard work and the benefits it affords in providing for oneself is a classic
American value, the origins of which are found in the 16th century European movement
known as the Protestant Reformation. Initially led by Augustinian monk Martin Luther
and later by John Calvin, the religious revolution helped to transform the U.S. into the
wealthiest and most prosperous nation in the history of the world (Weber, M., Tawney,
R. H., & Parsons, T., 1930). According to German sociologist Max Weber’s 1904 thesis,
it was the Protestant Ethic of work that facilitated the rise of capitalism and the Industrial
Revolution. The fundamentals of the Protestant ethic were hard work, diligence,
promptness, delay of gratification, centrality of work, integrity and fairness in dealings
with others. Weber emphasized the role of Protestantism and the combined work of
Martin Luther and John Calvin during the Reformation as a major catalyst for social
change. The Lutheran and Calvinist work ethic maintained that ordinary human work and
business was as equally glorifying to God as the monastic and contemplative life of the
clergy (North, 1975). The reformers followed Martin Luther’s lead in returning to a biblical doctrine of work, such as is expressed in Proverbs 20:13, Proverbs 20:4, 1 Thessalonians 4:9-12, or 1 Corinthians 15:58, wherein work is seen as having its own intrinsic value, as was first established by God prior to the Fall of man. Genesis 2:15 (ESV) states “The LORD God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and keep it.” It was only after sin had infected man that he was condemned to death and to a more arduous work life on earth: “By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread, till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for you are dust, and to dust you shall return.” (Genesis 3:19, ESV). While Martin Luther saw ordinary work as a way for people to serve God through their particular calling, he held a more rigid view than Calvin; he opposed finance and trade or any profit-oriented enterprise and believed that people should remain in the occupation into which they were born under the feudal system of the time. In contrast, Calvin believed people should serve God within the vocation of their own choosing, whatever they deemed to be the most profitable to them, and that their economic success was an outward sign they were one of God’s Elect. Through work, people were to serve God with diligence, frugality, good stewardship of resources and by re-investing any profits they made back into their business, indefinitely (Hill, 1996). The Calvinist ethic proved to be a major influence in the growth of capitalism in Northern Europe as people built up their businesses, created wealth and re-invested profits, while living modestly and shunning luxuries and frivolous spending. Eventually, the Protestant ethic helped to transform the feudal system into a capitalist system, with capitalism gradually taking on a life of its own (Hill, 1996; Weber, Tawney & Parsons, 1930). Over time, the Protestant ethic transformed into a secular work ethic,
not necessarily attached to a particular religious doctrine but nonetheless remaining an American cultural norm seen as possessing intrinsic value of its own (Weber, Tawney, & Parsons, 1930; Van Hoorn & Maseland, 2013).

WELFARE DEPENDENCE

For purposes of this study, welfare dependence is defined as a condition in which an individual or a household depends on one or more social benefit programs to meet basic needs for a period of six months or longer. This was the threshold used to measure benefits usage in this study. Beyond the definition used for quantitative purposes, welfare dependency can also be described as a state wherein an individual or household is reliant on the social safety-net for such a long period of time (e.g. 12 months or longer) that were it not for the benefits, they would be unable to meet their basic daily living expenses. Additionally, welfare dependency is a condition of being reliant on a welfare system that is designed to discourage work and self-sufficiency. It is the position of this author that the current welfare system harms more people than it helps because of its disincentivizing effects on work and marriage. In particular, it harms people who have suffered job loss and displacement due to economic structural factors, and who are otherwise healthy and able to perform some kind of work but have lost interest in returning to the workforce after long spells of unemployment. When a weak labor market is combined with a social welfare system that disincentivizes work, it can result in a growing population that is content to sit on the sidelines of the labor force indefinitely, with little interest in returning, such as appears to be the case today.

Empirical studies confirm that welfare dependency diminishes work ethic (Danziger, Haveman, & Plotnick, 1981; Besley & Coate, 1992; Moffitt, 1992; Card &
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Robins, 1996; Michalopoulos, Robins, & Card, 2005) and document the harmful effects of welfare dependence and chronic unemployment (Vedder, Gallaway & Lawson, 1991; Jakee & Sun, 2005; Lindbeck & Nyberg, 2006; Beaulier & Caplan, 2007; Ayala & Rodriguez, 2010). In 2012, two years after the recession officially ended, approximately 52.2 million Americans were receiving some kind of means-tested monthly benefit, such as Medicaid, food stamps or cash transfer payments, according to a report by the U.S. Census Bureau that examined benefit participation rates from 2009 to 2012 (Irving & Loveless, 2015). Both Medicaid and SNAP eligibility criteria was temporarily relaxed during the Great Recession of 2007-2008, but when the recession officially ended in mid-2009 many of the expanded policy measures remained in place. However, states have been trying out various reform measures since then, many successful, such as in Maine, Mississippi, Kansas and Wisconsin (Healy, 2017; Ingram, 2016; LePage, 2017; Welfare Fraud Policy Brief, 2017). Besides discouraging work, the social safety-net system also discourages marriage. The breakdown of the family is a primary driver of poverty and increases the risk of welfare dependence. Reform efforts should focus on incentives that encourage and preserve marriage, which is one of the most powerful measures to prevent poverty (Amato & Maynard, 2007; Gassman-Pines & Yoshikawa, 2006; Lichter, Graefe & Brown, 2003; Matters, 2005; Thomas & Sawhill, 2002; Edin, England, Shafer, & Reed, 2007; Harper & McLanahan, 2004). In 2008, the poverty rate for children with a single parent was 36.5 percent; for married couples with children the rate was 6.4 percent, and a child being raised in a household headed by married parents reduced their odds of living in poverty by roughly 80 percent (Rector, 2010). Based on ample research confirming the need to design programs that incentivized work and marriage, the 1996
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welfare reform law did just that with the former Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The 1996 law also decreased the odds that welfare dependency would be passed on from generation to generation, although intergenerational dependency continues to persist (Hartley, Lamarche, & Ziliak, 2016).

In the decades following the Johnson administration’s War on Poverty in 1964, means-tested social welfare spending has steadily increased each year, with the expected acceleration occurring during periods of recession and economic contraction (Haskins, 2012). The early federal anti-poverty programs were open-ended cash entitlements that discouraged work and marriage. The rolls for the main cash-assistance program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), had increased dramatically since its implementation in 1935 as part of the Social Security Act, and by the mid-1960s there were over four million people on AFDC. By 1972 the rolls had grown to almost ten million (Moffitt, 1992) and in 1995 approximately one in seven children received AFDC benefits. The length of time a recipient stayed on the program was about 13 years on average, a concerning trend since welfare dependency is likely to be passed on from one generation to the next (Antel, 1992; Rank & Cheng, 1995). In the late 1980s, states had begun experimenting with various types of reforms to their welfare systems in an effort to reverse what they considered to be a disturbing trend towards chronic dependency (Tanner & DeHaven, 2010). In particular, Wisconsin’s welfare-to-work reforms under former Governor Tommy Thompson drew nationwide attention for its successes in reducing welfare caseloads by 22.4 percent between 1986 and 1994 (Wiseman, 1996). Despite ideological differences among the political class at the time, there was broad,
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general agreement between those on the political left who supported more of an institutional type of welfare system and those on the political right who supported the traditional residual welfare system. Both sides agreed that open-ended programs had become a pressing social problem and that major reforms were warranted. In 1996 the federal welfare reform legislation known as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA) passed in both houses of congress with bipartisan support and was signed into law by President Bill Clinton on August 22, 1996. The PRWORA reforms proved to be extremely successful. By 2004, welfare caseloads were significantly reduced by a record 60 percent while employment and household incomes of single mothers rose by 30 percent (Riccucci, Meyers, Lurie & Han, 2004). The observational study done by Riccucci and colleagues found that the role of welfare caseworkers post-reform changed dramatically from directly and/or indirectly encouraging welfare dependence to encouraging work and self-reliance through mandated employment-related activities and monitoring of their clients’ participation and progress. Employment among single mothers who had never been married increased by 50 percent and earnings rose significantly for low-income single mothers regardless of education, race or age (Haskins, 2006). The child poverty rate fell from 20.8 percent in 1995 to 16.3 percent in 2001, and the overall poverty rate dropped from 13.8 percent in 1995 to 11.7 percent in 2001 (Rector & Fagan, 2003). Cheng (2005) examined the effect of welfare reform on recidivism rates among welfare recipients and found that under the reforms, return to welfare use dropped significantly. Transitional employment supports such as child care, transportation, continuing medical coverage to compliment the work requirements, and time limits served to motivate many recipients’ towards employment. Cheng concluded
that self-sufficiency is achieved primarily through full-time employment and is impeded by welfare use.

Despite the successes of the 1996 welfare reform law, today more than half of family assistance recipients in most states are neither working nor engaged in any type of work activity, mainly because the PRWORA reforms established a relatively low mandatory work compliance rate; only 50 percent of able-bodied adult recipients are required to be working or preparing for work, meaning the other 50 percent could be doing no work activity at all and still receive benefits. However, even at a 50 percent compliance rate, the mandated work requirement resulted in recipients’ increased attachment to the labor force. The work requirement may also have been a deterrent to making application in the first place, for as people learn they have to work in exchange for assistance, they are more likely to seek paid employment first and apply for benefits only as a last resort. The mandatory time limits, on the other hand, had far less of an impact than the work requirement because of the numerous exemptions that exist. Marshall & Rector (2013) report that only two percent of family assistance recipients have been dis-enrolled from the program for maxing out the time limits.

The 1996 reforms applied primarily to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, formerly AFDC, and left out more than 80 other federal means-tested programs. There was a very modest work requirement included for able bodied food stamp recipients, but it proved mostly ineffective because states or local jurisdictions were allowed to waive it and it has rarely been enforced. Reform advocates consider this narrow application to be the major flaw in the legislation, and argue reforms
should be applied to most if not all of the means-tested programs (Rector & Marshall, 2013). Because the welfare state has continued to expand since the law was enacted and despite its successes with TANF, recent proposals have been made to attach work requirements to the food stamp program (SNAP) and to increase the mandatory work participation compliance rate from the current 50 percent to a 75 percent compliance rate (Welfare Reform and Upward Mobility Act of 2016). Additionally, some states have proposed mandatory work requirements for able-bodied Medicaid recipients, however such proposals are unlikely to gain political momentum unless work requirements for all cash, food and housing assistance programs are successfully established.

Reforming the social welfare state programs to encourage work and self-sufficiency has taken on a new importance and urgency due to the sustained high rate of long-term unemployment, particularly for those unemployed for 12 months or longer, and particularly for prime working age men. Even if the economy picks up and hiring demand along with it, research shows that it is unlikely to make any difference for those who have been languishing on the sidelines of the labor for long periods of time (see section II on Labor Force Participation). Kreuger, Cramer & Cho (2014) warn that this population of labor force drop-outs, who are mostly able-bodied men without a college education, could potentially collect some kind of social welfare benefit for decades while contributing nothing to the economy and to the collective support. Such a situation would not only be detrimental to economic growth, but would represent a tremendous waste of human potential.
After a thorough review of the existing literature on two relatively separate constructs, work ethic and welfare dependency, this study aims to explore potential connections between them by collecting cross-sectional data from respondents on both work ethic (as measured by the 65-item MWEP and the 28-item MWEP) and welfare benefits usage. As discussed in the introduction, the social learning/behavioral framework provides for hypotheses to be formulated and variables to be tested relative to the work ethic construct and how it may affect welfare dependency. In this study, the following hypotheses will be examined:

- **H₁**: As respondents report more agreement with Centrality of Work MWEP subscale items, reported benefits usage will decrease.
- **H₂**: As respondents report more agreement with Delayed Gratification MWEP subscale items, reported benefits usage will decrease.
- **H₃**: As respondents report more agreement with Hard Work MWEP subscale items, reported benefits usage will decrease.
- **H₄**: As respondents report more agreement with Morality MWEP subscale items, reported benefits usage will decrease.
- **H₅**: As respondents report more agreement with Self-Reliance MWEP subscale items, reported benefits usage will decrease.
- **H₆**: As respondents report more agreement with Waste Time MWEP subscale items, reported benefits usage will decrease.
- **H₇**: As respondents report more agreement with Leisure MWEP subscale items, reported benefits usage will decrease.
- **H₈**: As reported respondent age increases, reported benefits usage will also increase.
- **H₉**: When reported respondent marital status is married/partnered, as compared to single/never married, reported benefits usage will decrease.
• H_{10}: When reported respondent race is non-white, as compared to white, reported benefits usage will increase.

• H_{11}: When reported respondent employment status is employed, as compared to unemployed, reported benefits usage will decrease.

• H_{12}: As reported time unemployed increases, reported benefits usage will also increase.

• H_{13}: As reported religious attendance increases, reported benefits usage will decrease.

• H_{14}: As reported prayer frequency increases, reported benefits usage will decrease.

In this study, a univariate analysis of each relevant variable will be conducted with a discussion on descriptive frequency data. Additionally, bivariate analyses will be conducted through the production of correlation matrices, focusing on Pearson’s r and relevant significance figures. Finally, the data analysis will culminate in a multivariate hierarchical regression model, which may offer insights into how policy makers, program designers, and practitioners on the front lines of social welfare may better assess incoming applicants in order to more efficiently streamline their resource allocation processes, and to better ensure recipients’ successful transition from welfare to work.
III. MEASURES AND PROCEDURES

Two samples were selected for this study. The first pass of data collection consisted of a convenience sample of n=358 adults, mostly undergraduate students in a large Midwestern university, combined with a smaller sample of randomly selected adults from the local and surrounding communities. Student participants volunteered to take an online survey and outside participants volunteered to complete a paper-and-pencil version of the survey. Students were given the opportunity to participate in exchange for extra course credit of 5 percent on top of their final course grade, and outside participants were given the opportunity to participate in exchange for a generic gift card.

In the second pass of data collection a convenience sample of n=247 undergraduate students from the same Midwestern university were invited to participate in an online survey in exchange for 5 percent extra credit on top of their final course grade.

The surveys used in this study were not of a particularly personal or sensitive nature, so we did not anticipate, and did not experience, more than minimal risk to any of the respondents. All participants were informed in a consent letter that they were free to decline to answer certain questions of their choosing and/or terminate their participation at any time without any loss of benefit.
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All participants first completed either the long or short form version of the MWEP questionnaire. A demographic and socioeconomic survey, including benefit usage, was included at the end of both the long and short form versions of the MWEP questionnaire. Qualtrics and SONA software were used to administer and manage the surveys. All survey items can be found in Appendices A through D.

THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL WORK ETHIC PROFILE

The Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile, or MWEP (Miller, M. & Woehr, D., 2001) was used for the first survey data collection, while the MWEP short form (Meriac, Woehr, Gorman, & Thomas, 2013) was used for the second data collection. The 2002 and 2013 MWEP questionnaires were used to measure the various components of the work ethic construct, which includes seven subscales: Centrality of work, self-reliance, delayed gratification, morality, hard work, wasted time, and leisure preferences. The MWEP long form is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 65 items. The MWEP short form is a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 28 items.

Some MWEP items were reverse coded (e.g. all leisure subscale items, and three morality subscale items), both to replicate the standards of the original MWEP creators, and so that attitudinal responses which ranged from strong disagreement to strong agreement logically reflected higher levels of work ethic. In other words, as respondents agreed with MWEP attitudinal items more, it indicated a higher degree of work ethic. Individual MWEP items were then averaged to create mean scores for all seven MWEP subscales. High scores indicate higher levels of work ethic.
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DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographic questions included items on age, race, sex, years of education, employment status, amount of time unemployed, number of dependent children, marital status, and religious preference, and two measures of religiosity – prayer frequency and frequency of religious attendance.

BENEFITS USAGE

Benefits usage was measured with four items asking about respondent use of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), food stamps (SNAP), income from unemployment insurance, and income from federal disability programs (SSI or SSDI). Responses were recoded to indicate the proportion of benefit programs used. For example, a score of 0 indicated that no benefits were used, while a score of 1 indicated that 1 of 4 benefits were used, and a score of 4 indicated that all four benefits were used.
IV. RESULTS

BIVARIATE ANALYSIS LONG FORM

A bivariate correlation was conducted for the Long Form data set, which produced a useful correlation matrix. Descriptive statistics and correlations can be found in Tables 1 and 2. Benefits usage was significantly correlated with Age ($r = .40, p < .05$), Race ($r = -.096, p < .05$), Time Unemployed ($r = .167, p < .05$), Marital Status ($r = -.128, p < .05$), Centrality of Work Mean ($r = -.112, p < .05$), Waste Time Mean ($r = -.152, p < .05$), Delayed Gratification Mean ($r = -.121, p < .05$), Self-Reliance Mean ($r = -.139, p < .05$), Morality Mean ($r = -.247, p < .05$), Hard Work Mean ($r = -.214, p < .05$), and Leisure Mean ($r = -.064, p < .05$).

The original hypothesis $H_1$ appears to be supported because as respondents reported more agreement with MWEP Centrality of work subscale item statements, reported benefits usage goes down. Additionally, the original hypotheses $H_2$-$H_7$ appear to be supported because as respondents reported more agreement with waste time, delayed gratification, self-reliance, morality, hard work, and leisure subscale item statements, reported benefits usage decreased. Regarding demographic variables, the original hypotheses $H_8$-$H_{10}$, and $H_{12}$ appear to be supported; as reported respondent age increased, reported benefits usage increased. When reported respondent marital status is married/partnered/etc., reported benefits usage decreased. When reported respondent race
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is white, reported benefits usage decreased. As reported respondents’ time unemployed increased, reported benefits usage increased.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS LONG FORM

A hierarchical regression was used to examine the impact of demographics and MWEP on benefit usage. Demographics explained 19.3% of the variance in benefits usage ($F(9,310) = 8.26, p < .05$, Adjusted $R^2 = .17$), with age ($\beta = .44, p < .05$) and race ($\beta = -.16, p < .05$) being significant predictors. Time Unemployed was not considered in the multivariate analysis, due to too many missing data points. Adding the MWEP explained an additional 3.3% of variance above and beyond what was explained by demographics ($F_{\text{change}}(7, 303) = 1.86, p = .08$), but this was not significant. In the overall model age ($\beta = .04, p < .05$), race ($\beta = -.23, p < .05$), Centrality of Work ($\beta = .20, p < .05$), and Morality ($\beta = -.14, p < .05$) were all significant predictors.

BIVARIATE ANALYSIS SHORT FORM

A bivariate correlation was conducted for the Short Form data set, which produced a useful correlation matrix. Descriptive statistics and correlations can be found in Tables 3 and 4. Benefits usage was significantly correlated with Centrality of Work Mean ($r = -.26, p < .05$), and Hard Work Mean ($r = -.22, p < .05$). The original hypothesis $H_1$ seems to be supported, because as reported respondent agreement with MWEP Centrality of Work subscale item statements increase, reported benefits usage goes down. The original hypothesis $H_3$ seems to be supported, because as reported respondent
agreement with MWEP Hard Work subscale item statements increase, reported benefits usage goes down.

There appears to have been a limitation in sampling during the Short Form data collection pass, as none of the demographic variables in the Short Form appeared to be significant, even though there were a number of significant demographic variables in the Long Form data collect pass.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS SHORT FORM

A hierarchical regression was used to examine the impact of demographics and MWEP on benefit usage. MWEP means examined 11.0% of the variance in benefits usage \(F(7, 221) = 5.04, p < .05\), with Centrality of Work \(\beta = -.28, p < .05\), and Delayed Gratification \(\beta = .16, p < .05\), Self-Reliance \(\beta = .16, p < .05\), Hard Work \(\beta = -.19, p < .05\), were all significant predictors.
V. CONCLUSIONS

A majority of all respondents identified as middle class, a finding consistent with the perception of most Americans, who still identify as middle class across all socioeconomic levels, though it has been declining in recent years (Newport, 2016). In the first sample, reported religious attendance and prayer frequency was scarce, which could indicate a weak attachment to work, while the second sample reports indicate a moderate attachment to attending religious services and prayer frequency. Weak attachment to religiosity may be related to a diminished work ethic, based on research showing a significant correlation between work ethic and religious orientation (Jones, 2010). A high level of religiosity is also correlated with hardworking behavior (Elei, Sener, & Alpkan, 2010). However, the secularization of the work ethic over time does not necessarily mean it has weakened, but that it has become detached from religious doctrine. The majority of all respondents reported little to no benefit usage, including disability; most were white/Caucasian with a Protestant/Christian religious preference, and a slight majority were female. With regard to employment, most of the first sample reported being out of work and looking for work, while most of the second sample reported being employed for wages. This may reflect the age differences between the groups; the mean age of the first sample (n=340) was 23.4 years, and the mean age of the second sample (n=236) was 36.9 years. Respondents in the younger group may have been
living with parents or receiving support from family while pursuing a degree, while the older group were more likely to be self-supporting simply because they were older. The majority of both samples were college undergraduates with no minor children in the household. Overall political affiliation yielded mixed results; in the first sample a slight majority identified as democrat, but when independent and republican affiliations are combined, the democrat political affiliation becomes a minority. In the second sample republican affiliation was the slight majority but when democrat and independent affiliations are combined, republican affiliation becomes a minority.

Bivariate analyses for the MWEP-Long Form data indicated the following variables were statistically significant when compared to benefits usage: The respondents who reported their marital status as married, partnered, separated, divorced, or widowed were more likely to report using benefits than were respondents who reported being single/never married. Respondents who reported being older than 19 years were more likely to report using benefits than were respondents who reported being 19 years old and younger. Respondents who reported being male were more likely to report using benefits than were respondents who reported being female (at a confidence interval of 90%), an interesting finding since historically women and children have been the primary recipients of social welfare benefits. The demographics of welfare recipients has been changing, however, from primarily women, children and the frail elderly to more able-bodied and low-income workers of both genders, with and without children. Moreover, the workforce participation rate for men aged 25 to 54 has been on a steady decline since the mid-1950s, when it fell from a high of 98 percent to 88.4 percent in 2016 (Bunker,
2016), to 81.7 percent in April 2017. Government data projects the declining workforce participation rate for both men and women will continue to decline at relatively similar rates for at least the next decade (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017).

As reported respondent agreement with Centrality of Work, Waste Time, Delayed Gratification, Self-Reliance, Morality/Ethics, Hard Work, and Leisure measures increased, reported benefits usage declined.

Bivariate analyses for the MWEP-Short Form data indicated that the following variables were statistically significant when compared to benefits usage: As reported respondent agreement with Centrality of Work and Hard work measures increased, reported benefits usage declined.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of these findings, the author recommends the development of a comprehensive assessment tool consisting of either the complete 28-item MWEP questionnaire or a version of it that captures the noted correlates discovered in this study, combined with a work skills assessment to be administered at the point of entry into the welfare system. This type of assessment could help front-line practitioners identify those individuals most likely to find and keep employment, and those who may not be as motivated to find work and support themselves. In other words, if such an instrument could assist in identifying applicants who are more likely to struggle with finding and keeping a job, the resources allocated their way would be different from resources allocated towards applicants whose assessment scores indicate higher levels of motivation. Applicants with low assessment scores may require extended job training,
day care services, classes on personal hygiene and proper dress for the workplace, time management and budgeting, and help with job interviewing, while persons with higher intake assessment scores may require fewer and more targeted resources, such as transportation to and from work, day care subsidies if they have minor children in the home, and/or a continuation of medical care coverage for a period of time after they have found employment. Distinguishing between applicants in this manner and allocating resources accordingly could go a long way towards ensuring a smooth transition from welfare to work for the client population and good stewardship of taxpayer monies.

A comprehensive work ethic and needs assessment tool for incoming applicants would fit best within a reciprocal type of paradigm, if only on a local level (Wax, 2000), wherein people would be entitled to public assistance in times of temporary struggle only once they have exhausted all other avenues to remedy their situation. Under such a system, adults who are able-bodied and of working age would be expected to work for a living and contribute financially to the collective support system. Those individuals who cannot work through no fault of their own, such as the very young, the handicapped and many of the elderly, would be entitled to a minimum of ongoing support. Distinguishing between who meets the criteria for assistance based on an individual’s ability to support themselves would be based on a cultural norm described by Wax (2000) as “conditional reciprocity”, in which able-bodied recipients who refuse to work or who work less than cultural expectations demand are stigmatized as “freeloaders”. As noted earlier, there is strong evidence that welfare use is passed on from generation to generation, so when government handouts are de-stigmatized and encouraged for everyone, it teaches the population as a whole, versus members of a primary family unit, that chronic dependence
on the social welfare is an acceptable option for those who are otherwise able to work.

The residual type of welfare system in place today reflects some of the norms of conditional reciprocity, and there has long been majority public support for such a system (Shaw & Shapiro, 2002). However, such concepts are routinely referred to by politicians in their campaign rhetoric, but rarely do they materialize in actual implementation of policy. The reforms under the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) were a step in the right direction towards a reciprocal system but proved too narrow in scope by focusing on just one of many federal means-tested programs. Recently, there have been proposals to expand the PRWORA work requirements to the food stamp or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and to increase the mandatory work participation from the current 50 percent compliance rate to a 75 percent compliance rate (Welfare Reform and Upward Mobility Act of 2016). Some states have sought approval from the federal government to be able to require able-bodied Medicaid recipients to work for their benefit as part of Section 1115 of states’ Medicaid expansion waiver applications (Medicaid and Work Requirements, 2017).

Any reforms to the social welfare system should also be applied to the federal disability program, as there is no reason to assume that reforms incentivizing work would not be just as effective with the disability recipient population as with other types of benefit programs.

LIMITATIONS

This study has several limitations, the first being the convenience sample used in both data collections. The vast majority of the sample consists of university students within the 23 to 37 year old age range residing in the same geographic area and with
varied work and unemployment status and histories. However, as Miller et al (2002) point out, the work ethic construct is not subject to the confines of specific work contexts but can be applied to an “effort-performance relationship” in any setting where it may exist. Moreover, they suggest that findings in work ethic related studies with participants of varied employment backgrounds and work histories would be more generalizable to the population at large than if participants had been selected from one or two specific types of business establishments.

The use of self-report data has the inherent problems of response bias and honesty, incomplete or missing items, and respondents’ capacity for introspection and/or comprehension of abstract concepts. There are also problems associated with the use of online surveys versus in-person survey takers.

While the validity of the MWEP-Long Form (Miller et al, 2002) and the MWEP-Short Form (Meriac et al, 2013) has been established (Hudspeth, 2004; Woehr, Arciniega, & Lim, 2007), the initial demographic and socioeconomic survey designed by the author had issues with the way some questions were worded, and the way some response choices were ordered. The second pass survey design attempted to correct these limitations.

The current study did not seek to establish any cause and effect relationships between the variables. A cross-sectional data collection was employed to assess possible correlations between demographic / socioeconomic characteristics and attitudes about work ethic. As with all correlational research, interpreting causal relationships is the greatest limitation, and no attempt is made in the current study to draw any causal
conclusions. The stated hypotheses were based on established research studies in the areas of human motivation, social learning, work ethic and welfare dependence.

Suggestions for future research include utilizing either third party observational data or state/county welfare caseload data to measure welfare utilization with proper release of information consent; reporting criterion-related validity evidence for the MWEP-Short Form using supervisor or peer reports of performance data, and measuring additional criteria such as job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and counterproductive behavior. The reduced length of the 28-item MWEP makes it far more convenient for researchers, more palatable for participants, and allows for its inclusion in studies where the longer 65-item version would have been impractical.
APPENDIX A
MWEP-LF SCALE

Instructions
This booklet lists a series of work-related statements. Please circle the alternative that best represents your opinion to the right of each item. For example, if you strongly agree with item number one in the booklet you would circle SA to the left of the item. This booklet contains 65 statements. Please read each statement carefully. For each statement circle the response that best represents your belief or opinion.

Circle SA if you strongly agree with the statement.
Circle A if you agree with the statement.
Circle N if you neither agree nor disagree with the statement.
Circle D if you disagree with the statement.
Circle SD if you strongly disagree with the statement.

1. It is important to stay busy at work and not waste time. SD D N A SA
2. I feel uneasy when there is little work for me to do. SD D N A SA
3. If I want to buy something, I always wait until I can afford it. SD D N A SA
4. I feel content when I have spent the day working. SD D N A SA
5. Life would be more meaningful if we had more leisure time. SD D N A SA
6. To be truly successful, a person should be self-reliant. SD D N A SA
7. One should always take responsibility for one’s actions. SD D N A SA
8. I would prefer a job that allowed me to have more leisure time. SD D N A SA
9. Time should not be wasted, it should be used efficiently. SD D N A SA
10. Even if I were financially able, I would not stop working. 
11. I get more fulfillment from items I had to wait for. 
12. I schedule my day in advance to avoid wasting time. 
13. A hard day’s work is very fulfilling. 
14. The more time I can spend in a leisure activity, the better I feel. 
15. One should always do what is right and just. 
16. I would take items from work if I felt I was not getting paid enough. 
17. Nothing is impossible if you work hard enough. 
18. The less time one spends working and the more leisure time one has, the better. 
19. Things that you have to wait for are the most worthwhile. 
20. Working hard is the key to being successful. 
21. Self-reliance is the key to being successful. 
22. If one works hard enough, one is likely to make a good life for oneself. 
23. I constantly look for ways to productively use my time. 
24. Hard work makes one a better person. 
25. One should not pass judgment until one has heard all of the facts. 
26. People would be better off if they depended on themselves. 
27. Work takes too much of our time, leaving little time to relax. 
28. One should live one’s own life independent of others as much as possible. 
29. A distant reward is usually more satisfying than an immediate one. 
30. It is very important for me to always be able to work. 
31. More leisure time is good for people. 
32. One must avoid dependence on other persons whenever possible.
33. Even if I inherited a great deal of money, I would continue to work somewhere.  
34. I do not like having to depend on other people.  
35. By working hard a person can overcome every obstacle that life presents.  
36. I try to plan out my workday so as not to waste time.  
37. You should never tell lies about other people.  
38. Any problem can be overcome with hard work.  
39. How a person spends their time is as important as how they spend their money.  
40. Even if it were possible for me to retire, I would still continue to work.  
41. Life without work would be very boring.  
42. I prefer to save until I can afford something and not buy it on credit.  
43. The world would be a better place if people spent more time relaxing.  
44. I strive to be self-reliant.  
45. If you work hard you will succeed.  
46. The best things in life are those you have to wait for.  
47. Anyone who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.  
48. Stealing is all right as long as you don’t get caught.  
49. The job that provides the most leisure time is the job for me.  
50. Having a great deal of independence from others is very important to me.  
51. It is important to treat others as you would like to be treated.  
52. I experience a sense of fulfillment from working.  
53. A person should always do the best job possible.  
54. It is never appropriate to take something that does not belong to you.  
55. Only those who depend on themselves get ahead in life.
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56. Wasting time is as bad as wasting money.  
57. There are times when stealing is justified.  
58. People should have more leisure time to spend in relaxation.  
59. It is important to control one’s destiny by not being dependent on others.  
60. By simply working hard enough, one can achieve one’s goals.  
61. People should be fair in their dealings with others.  
62. The only way to get anything worthwhile is to save for it.  
63. Leisure time activities are more interesting than work.  
64. A hard day’s work provides a sense of accomplishment.  
65. A distaste for hard work usually reflects a weakness of character.
APPENDIX B

LONG FORM DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

1) What is your age (in years)? _________

2) What is your marital status?
   _____ 1. Married
   _____ 2. Partnered/Significant other
   _____ 3. Widowed
   _____ 4. Divorced
   _____ 5. Separated
   _____ 6. Never married

3) With which race do you identify? (check one)
   _____ 1. Asian
   _____ 2. Bi / Multi-racial
   _____ 3. White / Caucasian
   _____ 4. Black / African American
   _____ 5. Hispanic

4) What is your sex?
   _____ 1. Male
   _____ 2. Female

5) How many total years of education, including K through 12, have you completed?
   _________
6) What year of college are you in? (check one)
   _____ 1. Freshman
   _____ 2. Sophomore
   _____ 3. Junior
   _____ 4. Senior
   _____ 5. Other
   _____ 6. Not in college

7) Number of dependent children under age 18 in your household: (check one)
   _____ 1. None
   _____ 2. 1-3
   _____ 3. 4-6
   _____ 4. 7 or more

8) What is your religious preference? (check one)
   _____ 1. None
   _____ 2. Protestant / Christian
   _____ 3. Jewish
   _____ 4. Catholic
   _____ 5. Muslim
   _____ 6. Other

9) How often do you attend religious services? (check one)
   _____ 1. Never
   _____ 2. Less than once per year
   _____ 3. Once or twice per year
   _____ 4. Several times per year
   _____ 5. One or more times per month
6. Once per week
7. More than once per week

10) How often do you pray? (check one)
1. Never
2. Once or twice per year
3. Several times per year
4. More than once per month
5. Several times per week
6. Every day

11) Are you currently... (check all that apply)
1. Employed for wages
2. Self-employed
3. Out of work and looking for work
4. Out of work but not currently looking for work
5. A homemaker
6. A student
7. Military
8. Retired
9. Unable to work

12) If unemployed, for how long? (check one)
1. Less than 6 months
2. 6 months to less than a year
3. 1 year to less than 2 years
4. 2 years to less than 3 years
5. 3 years to less than 4 years
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6. 4 years to less than 5 years
7. 5 years or more

13) How long have you received income from Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)? (check one)
   1. Never
   2. Less than 6 months
   3. 6 mths to less than 1 year
   4. 1 year to less than 2 years
   5. 2 years to less than 5 years
   6. 5 years or more

14) How long have you received benefits from the food stamp (SNAP) program? (check one)
   1. Never
   2. Less than 6 months
   3. 6 months to less than 1 year
   4. 1 year to less than 2 years
   5. 2 years to less than 5 years
   6. 5 years or more

15) How long have you received income from unemployment insurance? (check one)
   1. Never
   2. Less than 6 months
   3. 6 months to less than 1 year
   4. 1 year to less than 2 years
   5. 2 years to less than 5 years
   6. 5 years or more

54
16) How long have you received income from a federal disability program (SSI or SSD)? (check one)
   _____ 1. Never
   _____ 2. Less than 6 months
   _____ 3. 6 months to less than 1 year
   _____ 4. 1 year to less than 2 years
   _____ 5. 2 years to less than 5 years
   _____ 6. 5 years or more

16) What is your political affiliation? (check one)
   _____ 1. Democrat
   _____ 2. Republican
   _____ 3. Independent
   _____ 4. Libertarian
   _____ 5. Other

17) What best describes your political views? (check one)
   _____ 1. Very conservative
   _____ 2. Conservative
   _____ 3. Moderate
   _____ 4. Liberal
   _____ 5. Very liberal

18) Which of the following best describes your social class? (check one)
   _____ 1. Lower class
   _____ 2. Working class
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_____ 3. Middle class
_____ 4. Upper-middle class
_____ 5. Upper class
_____ 6. Not sure
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APPENDIX C

MWEP-SF SCALE

After reading each statement, please circle the answer that best describes your views.

1. It is important to stay busy at work and not waste time.
   
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

2. I feel content when I have spent the day working.
   
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

3. One should always take responsibility for one’s actions.
   
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

4. I would prefer a job that allowed me to have more leisure time.
   
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

5. Time should not be wasted, it should be used efficiently.
   
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

6. I get more fulfillment from items I had to wait for.
   
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

7. A hard day’s work is very fulfilling.
   
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

8. Things that you have to wait for are the most worthwhile.
   
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

9. Working hard is the key to being successful.
   
   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
10. Self-reliance is the key to being successful.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

11. If one works hard enough, one is likely to make a good life for oneself.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

12. I constantly look for ways to productively use my time.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

13. One should not pass judgment until one has heard all of the facts.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

14. People would be better off if they depended on themselves.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

15. A distant reward is usually more satisfying than an immediate one.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

16. More leisure time is good for people.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

17. I try to plan out my workday so as not to waste time.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

18. The world would be a better place if people spent more time relaxing.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

19. I strive to be self-reliant.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

20. If you work hard you will succeed.
   - Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

21. The best things in life are those you have to wait for.
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Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

22. Anyone who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

23. It is important to treat others as you would like to be treated.

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

24. I experience a sense of fulfillment from working.

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

25. People should have more leisure time to spend in relaxation.

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

26. It is important to control one’s destiny by not being dependent on others.

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

27. People should be fair in their dealings with others.

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

28. A hard day’s work provides a sense of accomplishment.

   Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
APPENDIX D
SHORT FORM DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1) What is your age (in years)? _________

2) What is your marital status? (check one)
   _____ 1. Married
   _____ 2. Partnered/Significant other
   _____ 3. Widowed
   _____ 4. Divorced
   _____ 5. Separated
   _____ 6. Never married

3) With which race do you identify? (check one)
   _____ 1. Asian
   _____ 2. Bi / Multi-racial
   _____ 3. White / Caucasian
   _____ 4. Black / African American
   _____ 5. Hispanic

4) What is your sex?
   _____ 1. Male
   _____ 2. Female

5) How many total years of education, including Kindergarten through 12, have you completed? _________

6) Are you currently in college?
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No

7) If yes, how many years have you completed? (check one)
   _____ 1. Less than 1 year
   _____ 2. 1 to 2 years
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3. 2 or more years

8) Number of children under age 18 in your household: (check one)
   _____ 1. None
   _____ 2. 1 - 3
   _____ 3. 4 or more

9) What is your religious preference? (check one)
   _____ 1. None
   _____ 2. Protestant / Christian
   _____ 3. Jewish
   _____ 4. Catholic
   _____ 5. Muslim
   _____ 6. Other

10) How often do you attend church? (check one)
    _____ 1. Never
    _____ 2. A few times per year
    _____ 3. Once per week
    _____ 4. More than once per week

11) How often do you pray? (check one)
    _____ 1. Never
    _____ 2. Several times per year
    _____ 4. Every day

12) Are you currently… (check one)
    _____ 1. Employed (or self-employed)
    _____ 2. Unemployed and looking for work
    _____ 3. Unemployed and not looking for work
    _____ 6. Unable to work

13) If unemployed, for how long? (check one)
    _____ 1. Less than 6 months
    _____ 2. 1 to 2 years
    _____ 3. 2 years or more

14) How long have you received income from Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)? (check one)
    _____ 1. Never
    _____ 2. Less than 6 months
    _____ 3. 1 to 3 years
4. 3 years or more

15) Do you receive food stamps (EBT card)?
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No

16) If yes, for how long have you received food stamps? (check one)
   _____ 1. Less than 6 months
   _____ 2. 1 to 2 years
   _____ 3. 2 years or more

17) Do you receive unemployment benefits? (check one)
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No

18) If yes, how long have you received unemployment benefits? (check one)
   _____ 1. Less than 6 months
   _____ 2. 1 to 2 years
   _____ 3. 2 years or more

19) Do you receive disability (SSI or SSD)? (check one)
   _____ 1. Yes
   _____ 2. No

20) If yes, how long?
   _____ 1. Less than 6 months
   _____ 2. 1 to 2 years
   _____ 3. 2 years or more

21) What is your political affiliation? (check one)
   _____ 1. Independent
   _____ 2. Republican
   _____ 3. Libertarian
   _____ 4. Democrat
   _____ 5. None

22) Which best describes your social class? (check one)
   _____ 1. Lower class
   _____ 2. Working class
   _____ 3. Middle class
   _____ 4. Upper class
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CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE: 55+ YEARS
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CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE: 25 TO 54 YEARS
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CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE WITH NO DISABILITY: 65 YEARS AND OVER
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CUMULATIVE WORKERS ADDED BY AGE GROUP
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ACTIVE USA POPULATION AGED 25-54
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EMPLOYMENT POPULATION RATIO AGE 16-19 AND 16-24, 1950-2010

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
www.bls.gov
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CIVILIAN NONINSTITUTIONAL POPULATION AGE 16-19 AND 16-24
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CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Item A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Item B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Item C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Item D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sample Data from Longitudinal Study on Economic Trends and Work Ethic Variables
### APPENDIX N

Table 2
Hierarchical Regression Results for Benefits Use (MWEP Long Form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>β Step 1</th>
<th>β Step 2</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race¹</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex²</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed³</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status⁴</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Preference⁵</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>β Step 2</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality of Work</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Time</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay of Gratification</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality Ethics</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 320. * p < .05, ** p < .01. ¹ White/Caucasian = 1, Other = 0. ² Male = 1, Other = 0. ³ Yes = 1, No = 0. ⁴ Single/Never Married = 1, Married/Partnered/Separated/Divorced/Widowed = 0. ⁵ Judeo-Christian Preference = 1, Other = 0.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample (LPF) Short Form: Descriptive analysis and correlation between study variables.
### APPENDIX P

Table 4: Hierarchical Regression Results for Benefits Use (MWEP Short Form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1/2</th>
<th>β Step 1</th>
<th>β Step 2</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race¹</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex²</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed³</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Status⁴</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality of Work</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Time</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay of Gratification</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morality Ethics</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.21†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 217. *p < .05, **p < .01. 1. White/Caucasian = 1, Other = 0. 2. Male = 1, Other = 0. 3. Yes = 1, No = 0. 4. Single/Never Married = 1, Married/Partnered/Separated/Divorced/Widowed = 0.
APPENDIX Q

ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSES – LONG AND SHORT FORM

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS LONG FORM DEMOGRAPHICS

The average (mean) age of the respondents in this sample (n=340) was 23.4 years. The average (mean) years of education of the respondents in this sample (n=343) was 14.3 years. These averages represent a limitation of our first pass in data collection, which used a convenience sample drawn primarily from a population of undergraduate university students. The center most response (median=2) for the variable year of college (n=344) was sophomore. In this sample, 48.5% of respondents reported 1=freshman, while 18.6% reported 2=sophomore, 9.3% reported 3=junior, 11.6% reported 4=senior, 2.9% reported 5=other, and 9.0% reported not being in college as an undergraduate student. The center most response (median=3) for the variable social class (n=33) was middle class. In this sample, 9.1% of respondents identified as Lower Class, 39.4% as Working Class, 42.4% as Middle Class, and 9.1% reported being a member of the Upper-Middle Class. The center most response (median=1) for the variable number of children in household under age 18 (n=340) was none. In this sample, 68.5% of those surveyed reported having no children under the age of 18 in their household, while 28.8% reported having 1-3 minor children in the household and 2.6% reported having 4 or more minor children at home. The center most response (median=3) for the variable frequency of
religious service attendance (n=342) was once or twice per year. In this sample, 22.5% of respondents reported never attending religious services, while 21.9% report rarely attending, 15.2% reported they sometimes attend, 11.1% report they often attend, while 29.2% of those surveyed reported frequent attendance of religious services. The center most response (median=3) for the variable Prayer Frequency (n=343) was Several Times per year. In this sample, 21.6% of respondents reported never praying, 17.5% report they rarely pray, 11.7% responded they sometimes pray, 13.7% often pray, while 35.6% report they frequently pray. The center most response (median=1) for the variable Length of Unemployment (n=174) was Less Than 6 Months. In this sample, 67.2% of respondents reported being unemployed for less than or equal to 12 months, 8.0% for 13 to 24 months, 5.7% for 25 to 36 months, and 19.0% reported being unemployed for 37 or more months. The center most response (median=1) for the variable Length of TANF Use (n=340) was Never. In this sample, 87.7% of respondents reported they had never used TANF benefits, 2.4% reported TANF use of less than 6 months, 1.5% used TANF for 6 months to 12 months, 1.2% for 13 months to 24 months, and 2.6% used TANF benefits for more than 24 months. The center most response (median=1) for the variable Length of Food Stamp (SNAP) Use (n=339) was Never. In this sample, 86.7% of respondents report they had never used food stamps, 2.7% had used SNAP less than 6 months, 3.2% for 6 months to 12 months, 1.5% for 13 months to 24 months, and 5.9% reported using SNAP benefits for more than 24 months. The center most response (median=1) for the variable Length of Unemployment Income (n=338) was Never. In this sample, 92.9% of respondents reported never having received unemployment income, 3.0% reported
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having received unemployment for less than 6 months, 1.5% for 6 months to 12 months, and 2.7% reported having received unemployment for 13 months to 24 months. The center most response (median=1) for the variable Length of Disability Income (n=340) was Never. In this sample, 95% of respondents reported never having received disability income, 1.5% received disability payments for less than 6 months, .6% for 6 months to 12 months, .3% for 13 months to 24 months, and 2.6% received disability income for more than 24 months. The most frequently occurring response (mode=6) for the variable marital status (n=343) was single/never married. In this sample, 8.5% of respondents reported being married, 13.1% reported being partnered/having a significant other, 1.5% reported being widowed, 2.6% reported being divorced, 1.2% reported being separated, and 73.2% reported being single/never married. For the variable race, (n=340), the most frequently occurring response (mode=3) was White/Caucasian. In this sample, 8.5% of respondents reported identifying as Asian, 4.1% reported identifying as Bi/Multi-racial, 66.8% identified as White/Caucasian, 17.4% identified as Black/African American, and 3.2% identified as Hispanic. Regarding the variable sex, (n=342), the most frequently occurring response (mode=2) was female. In this sample, 48.5% of respondents identified as male, and 51.5% identified as female. For the variable religious preference, (n=342), the most frequently occurring response (mode=2) was Protestant/Christian. In this sample, 23.7% of respondents affiliated with none/Atheist, 39.2% reported Protestant/Christian affiliation, 2.9% reported being Jewish, 12.6% were Catholic, 13.5% identified as Muslim, and 8.2% affiliated as other. For the variable Political Affiliation (n=339), the most frequently occurring response (mode=2) was Democrat. In this sample,
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28.3% of respondents identified as Democrat, 17.4% identified as Republican, 19.5% as Independent, 9.1% as Libertarian, and 25.7% of respondents identified as other. Lastly, the most frequently occurring response (mode=3) for the variable Employment Status (n=344) was Out of Work and Looking for Work. In this sample, 35.2% of respondents reported being employed for wages full or part-time, 2.6% as self-employed full or part-time, 60.2% reported being unemployed and looking for work, while 2.0% reported they were unemployed and not looking for work.

DESCRIPTIVE MWEP ANALYSIS LONG FORM

In the first dimension of the MWEP-LF scale, the “Centrality of Work” statements describe an attitude towards the importance of work in one’s life relative to the work ethic construct. In this sample we found the median measure of central tendency to indicate agreement (median=4) with seven of the nine statements (#4, 10, 30, 33, 41, 52, and 64), and neutrality (median=3) with two of the nine statements (#2 and 40). This reflects moderate agreement on the importance of work in one’s life.

For the statement “I feel content when I have spent the day working”, 3.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 9.6% Disagreed, 20.1% were Neutral, 45.5% Agreed, and 21.3% strongly agreed. For the next statement “Even if I were financially able, I would not stop working”, 5.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 14.2% Disagreed, 16.8% were Neutral, 41.0% Agreed, and 22.3% strongly agreed. Regarding the statement “It is very important for me to always be able to work”, 4.1% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 7.6% Disagreed, 20.2% were Neutral, 51.3% Agreed, and 16.7% strongly agreed. For the statement “Even if I inherited a great deal of money, I would continue to
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work somewhere”, 3.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 12.0% Disagreed, 17.2% were Neutral, 50.1% of respondents Agreed, and 16.9% Strongly agreed. Regarding the statement “Life without work would be very boring”, 4.1% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 15.3% Disagreed, 23.3% were Neutral, 42.5% Agreed, and 14.7% strongly agreed. For the statement “I experience a sense of fulfillment from working”, 5.9% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 5.6% Disagreed, 13.8% were Neutral, 53.4% Agreed, 21.4% strongly agreed. Regarding the statement “A hard day’s work provides a sense of accomplishment”, 4.7% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 6.2% Disagreed, 12.1% were Neutral, 53.4% Agreed, 23.6% strongly agreed. For the statement “I feel uneasy when there is little work for me to do”, 4.3% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 19.3% Disagreed, 28.4% were Neutral, 34.2% Agreed, 13.8% strongly agreed. Regarding the statement “Even if it were possible for me to retire, I would still continue to work”, 4.7% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 19.0% Disagreed, 28.9% were Neutral, 35.0% Agreed, 12.5% Strongly agreed.

In the second dimension of the MWEP-LF scale, the “Self-Reliance” statements describe an attitude towards the importance of self-sufficiency in one’s life relative to the work ethic construct. In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency indicated agreement (median=4) with eight of the ten statements (#6, #21, #26, #32, #34, #44, #50, and #59), and neutrality (median=3) with two of the ten (#28 and #55). This reflects a general consensus that self-reliance is an important feature of one’s work ethic while at the same time acknowledging interdependence as also necessary to achieve one’s goals. While it is generally recognized that cooperative relationships are essential to
success, the concept of interdependence does not preclude individual motivation and effort as the driving force. These results indicate a moderately strong emphasis on self-reliance.

For the statement “To be truly successful, a person should be self-reliant” 3.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 6.4% of respondents Disagreed, 19.1% of respondents were Neutral, 43.5% of respondents Agreed, and 27.2% of respondents Strongly Agreed. In the following statement “Self-reliance is the key to being successful”, 2.3% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 9.1% of respondents Disagreed, 23.4% of respondents were Neutral, 45.9% of respondents Agreed, and 19.3% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “People would be better off if they depended on themselves”, 3.2% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 13.5% of respondents Disagreed, 24.9% of respondents were Neutral, 40.1% of respondents Agreed, and 18.4% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Responding to the statement “One must avoid dependence on other persons whenever possible”, 4.1% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 16.4% of respondents Disagreed, 27.3% of respondents were Neutral, 38.4% of respondents Agreed, and 13.8% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Regarding the statement “I do not like having to depend on other people”, 3.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 9.0% of respondents Disagreed, 14.6% of respondents were Neutral, 41.4% of respondents Agreed, and 31.5% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “I strive to be self-reliant”, 3.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 7.3% of respondents Disagreed, 11.7% of respondents were Neutral, 49.9% of respondents Agreed and 27.6% of respondents Strongly Agreed. The next statement “Having a great deal of independence from others is very important to
me”, 2.3% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 7.0% of respondents Disagreed, 27.5% of respondents were Neutral, 45.6% of respondents Agreed, and 17.5% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Regarding the statement “It is important to control one’s destiny by not being dependent on others”, 2.6% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 9.1% of respondents Disagreed, 31.1% of respondents were Neutral, 44.6% of respondents Agreed and 12.6% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “One should live one’s own life independent of others as much as possible”, 4.1% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 25.1% of respondents Disagreed, 26.8% of respondents were Neutral, 31.5% of respondents Agreed, and 12.5% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Lastly, for the statement “Only those who depend on themselves get ahead in life”, 3.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 23.8% of respondents Disagreed, 32.6% of respondents were Neutral, 30.5% of respondents Agreed, and 9.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed.

In the third dimension of the MWEP-LF scale, the “Hard Work” statements describe an attitude towards the importance of working hard or diligently in one’s life relative to the work ethic construct. In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency to indicate agreement (median=4) with ten of the eleven statements (#, #17, #20, #22, #24, #35, #38, #45, #47, #53, 60), and neutrality (median=3) with one of the eleven. This reflects general agreement on the importance of “working hard” versus doing just enough to get by. Indicating agreement with #17, #35, #38 and #60 may or may not reflect a bias to provide a “socially desirable” response.

For the statement “Nothing is impossible if you work hard enough”, 4.1% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 11.1% of respondents Disagreed, 15.5% of respondents
were Neutral, 40.6% of respondents Agreed and 28.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the following statement, “Working hard is the key to being successful”, 3.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 7.2% of respondents Disagreed, 12.2% of respondents were Neutral, 42.0% of respondents Agreed and 34.8% of respondents Strongly Agreed.

For the statement “If one works hard enough, one is likely to make a good life for oneself”, 3.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 6.4% of respondents Disagreed, 9.9% of respondents were Neutral, 49.7% of respondents Agreed and 30.4% of respondents Strongly Agreed. The next statement “Hard work makes one a better person”, 2.9% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 9.1% of respondents Disagreed, 18.5% of respondents were Neutral, 44.3% of respondents Agreed and 25.2% of respondents Strongly Agreed.

Regarding the statement “By working hard a person can overcome every obstacle that life presents”, 2.9% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 16.4% of respondents Disagreed, 19.6% of respondents were Neutral, 41.3% of respondents Agreed and 19.6% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “Any problem can be overcome with hard work”, 2.9% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 15.3% of respondents Disagreed, 26.8% of respondents were Neutral, 35.9% of respondents Agreed, and 19.1% of respondents Strongly Agreed. The next statement “If you work hard you will succeed”, 2.0% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 7.6% of respondents Disagreed, 14.3% of respondents were Neutral, 48.8% of respondents Agreed and 27.2% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “Anyone who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding”, 2.9% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 7.3% of respondents Disagreed, 12.8% of respondents were Neutral, 47.8% of respondents
WELF
ARE DEPENDENCY AND WORK ETHIC

Agreed and 29.2% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Regarding the statement “A person should always do the best job possible”, 6.4% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 4.9% of respondents Disagreed, 7.0% of respondents were Neutral, 41.9% of respondents Agreed, and 39.8% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the last statement in this set, “By simply working hard enough, one can achieve one’s goals”, 1.7% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 10.5% of respondents Disagreed, 19.2% of respondents were Neutral, 46.6% of respondents Agreed and 21.9% of respondents Strongly Agreed.

In the fourth dimension of the MWEP-LF scale, the “Leisure” statements describe an attitude towards the importance of leisure time in one’s life relative to the work ethic construct. For the statements in this subscale, the original MWEP-LF measures were reversed (e.g. 1=SD became 1=SA). In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency to indicate neutrality (median=3) with nine of the ten statements (#5, #8, #14, #18, #27, #43, #49, #58, #63) and agreement (median=2) with one of the ten (#31). This reflects a general attitude of slight indifference regarding the amount of leisure time in one’s working life, though it can also be interpreted as a preference for spending more time in leisure activities versus working.

For the statement “Life would be more meaningful if we had more leisure time”, 10.5% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 38.5% of respondents Agreed, 35.9% of respondents were Neutral, 11.7% of respondents Disagreed, and 3.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. Regarding the statement “I would prefer a job that allowed me to have more leisure time”, 11.1% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 36.8% of respondents Agreed, 32.7% of respondents were Neutral, 15.5% of respondents Disagreed and 3.8%
of respondents Strongly Disagreed. For the statement “The more time I can spend in leisure activity, the better I feel”, 9.9% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 36.9% of respondents Agreed, 37.8% of respondents were Neutral, 12.8% of respondents Disagreed and 2.6% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. The following statement, “The less time one spends working and the more leisure time one has, the better”, 6.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 18.1% of respondents Agreed, 38.3% of respondents were Neutral, 31.3% of respondents Disagreed, and 5.6% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. For the statement “Work takes too much of our time, leaving little time to relax”, 8.1% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 32.6% of respondents Agreed, 38.4% of respondents were Neutral, 18.3% of respondents Disagreed and 2.6% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. For the statement “The world would be a better place if people spent more time relaxing”, 7.6% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 36.8% of respondents Agreed, 36.0% of respondents were Neutral, 16.1% of respondents Disagreed and 3.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. The next statement “The job that provides the most leisure time is the job for me”, 6.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 21.3% of respondents Agreed, 38.5% of respondents were Neutral, 27.7% of respondents Disagreed and 5.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. For the statement “People should have more leisure time to spend in relaxation”, 6.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 41.3% of respondents Agreed, 39.2% of respondents were Neutral, 11.0% of respondents Disagreed and 1.7% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. Regarding the statement “Leisure time activities are more interesting than work”, 9.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 38.5% of respondents Agreed, 35.9% of respondents were Neutral, 13.5% of respondents
Disagreed and 2.4% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. For the last statement in this set “More leisure time is good for people”, 11.4% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 40.1% of respondents Agreed, 33.6% of respondents were Neutral, 12.6% of respondents Disagreed and 2.3% of respondents Strongly Disagreed.

In this fifth dimension of the MWEP-LF scale, the “Morality/Ethics” statements describe and attitude towards the importance of moral convictions and ethical behavior in one’s life as regards the work ethic construct. For the statements in this subscale, the original MWEP-LF measures #’s 16, 48, and 57 were reversed (e.g. 1=SD became 1=SA). In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency indicates agreement (median=4) with five of the ten statements (#15, #25, #51, #54, #61), neutrality (median=3) with two of the ten (#37, #57), strong agreement (median=1) with one of the ten (#7), disagreement (median=4) with one of the ten (#16), and strong disagreement (median=5) with one of the ten (#48). Overall, these results reflect a general attitude towards morality and ethics as being central to the work ethic construct.

For the statement “One should always do what is right and just”, 6.1% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 8.1% of respondents Disagreed, 10.4% of respondents were Neutral, 44.6% of respondents Agreed and 30.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed. The next statement, “One should not pass judgment until one has heard all of the facts”, 6.1% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 5.8% of respondents Disagreed, 11.0% of respondents were Neutral, 41.3% of respondents Agreed and 35.8% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “It is important to treat others as you would like to be treated”, 7.3% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 2.6% of respondents Disagreed, 7.0%
of respondents were Neutral, 33.3% of respondents Agreed and 49.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “It is never appropriate to take something that does not belong to you”, 9.1% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 5.8% of respondents Disagreed, 10.2% of respondents were Neutral, 31.6% of respondents Agreed and 43.3% of respondents Strongly Agreed. The next statement “People should be fair in their dealings with others”, 6.2% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 6.2% of respondents Disagreed, 8.8% of respondents were Neutral, 46.9% of respondents Agreed and 32.0% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement ”You should never tell lies about other people”, 6.4% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 5.2% of respondents Disagreed, 13.7% of respondents were Neutral, 34.7% of respondents Agreed and 39.9% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “There are times when stealing is justified”, 10.3% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 21.4% of respondents Agreed, 23.8% of respondents were Neutral, 22.3% of respondents Disagreed, and 22.3% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. For the statement “One should always take responsibility for one’s actions”, 6.7% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 4.9% of respondents Disagreed, 7.0% of respondents were Neutral, 31.0% of respondents Agreed and 50.4% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “I would take items from work if I felt I was not getting paid enough”, 9.0% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 13.1% of respondents Agreed, 8.5% of respondents were Neutral, 25.9% of respondents Disagreed and 43.4% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. For the last statement in this set, “Stealing is all right as long as you don’t get caught”, 11.1% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 9.4% of respondents Agreed,
5.8% of respondents were Neutral, 20.5% of respondents Disagreed and 53.2% of respondents Strongly Disagreed.

In the sixth dimension of the MWEP-LF scale, the “Delay of Gratification” statements describe an attitude towards the importance of restraint and delaying gratification in one’s life as it pertains to the work ethic construct. In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency indicates agreement (median=4) with all seven statements (#3, #11, #19, #29, #42, #46, #62), expressing overall agreement that delaying gratification is an important element of the work ethic construct.

For the statement “If I want to buy something, I always wait until I can afford it”, 6.6% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 13.3% of respondents Disagreed, 13.6% of respondents were Neutral, 40.5% of respondents Agreed and 26.0% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Regarding the statement “I get more fulfillment from items I had to wait for”, 3.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 11.3% of respondents Disagreed, 18.3% of respondents were Neutral, 42.7% of respondents Agreed, and 24.1% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “Things that you have to wait for are the most worthwhile”, 2.0% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 12.0% of respondents Disagreed, 20.1% of respondents were Neutral, 44.6% of respondents Agreed, and 21.3% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Regards the statement “A distant reward is usually more satisfying than an immediate one”, 1.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 11.8% of respondents Disagreed, 31.2% of respondents were Neutral, 42.9% of respondents Agreed and 12.4% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “I prefer to save until I can afford something and not buy it on credit”, 3.2% of respondents Strongly
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Disagreed, 9.9% of respondents Disagreed, 16.9% of respondents were Neutral, 37.9% of respondents Agreed and 32.1% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Considering the statement “The best things in life are those you have to wait for”, 1.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 11.6% of respondents Disagreed, 26.7% of respondents were Neutral, 41.3% of respondents Agreed and 18.9% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “The only way to get anything worthwhile is to save for it”, 3.2% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 13.4% of respondents Disagreed, 27.4% of respondents were Neutral, 43.4% of respondents Agreed, and 12.5% of respondents Strongly Agreed.

In the seventh dimension of the MWEP-LF scale, the “Wasted Time” statements describe an attitude towards the importance of using one’s time productively in one’s life, as a component of the work ethic construct. In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency to indicate agreement (median=4) with all seven statements (#1, #9, #12, #23, #36, #39, #56), expressing general agreement that the efficient use of one’s time is a central feature of the work ethic construct.

For the statement “It is important to stay busy at work and not waste time”, 5.2% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 4.3% of respondents Disagreed, 6.1% of respondents were Neutral, 42.9% of respondents Agreed, and 41.5% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Regards the statement “Time should not be wasted, it should be used efficiently”, 3.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 7.2% of respondents Disagreed, 14.2% of respondents were Neutral, 50.6% of respondents Agreed, and 24.6% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “I schedule my day in advance to avoid wasting time”, 3.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 16.7% of respondents Disagreed, 26.6%
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of respondents were Neutral, 38.3% of respondents Agreed, and 14.6% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “I try to plan out my workday so as not to waste time”, 3.2% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 14.9% of respondents Disagreed, 21.1% of respondents were Neutral, 45.6% of respondents Agreed, and 15.2% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Regards the statement “How a person spends their time is as important as how they spend their money”, 2.6% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 7.4% of respondents Disagreed, 18.8% of respondents were Neutral, 47.6% of respondents Agreed, and 23.2% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Lastly, for the statement “Wasting time is as bad as wasting money”, 3.2% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 14.6% of respondents Disagreed, 25.4% of respondents were Neutral, 37.4% of respondents Agreed, and 19.3% of respondents Strongly Agreed.

DESCRIPTIVE MWEP ANALYSIS LONG FORM RECODES

In this sample (n=249), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded CENTRALITY dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 32.9% respondents reported disagreement, whereas 67.1% reported agreement. In this sample (n=274), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECENTRALITY1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 16.4% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 83.6% reported agreement. In this sample (n=288), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECENTRAL2 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 24.0% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 76.0% reported agreement. In this sample (n=295), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECENTRAL2A dummy
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variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.9% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.1% reported agreement. In this sample (n=272), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECCENTRAL3 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 14.7% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 85.3% reported agreement. In this sample (n=284), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECCENTRAL4 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 19.0% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 81.0% reported agreement. In this sample (n=244), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECCENTRAL5 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 33.2% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 66.8% reported agreement. In this sample (n=260), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECCENTRAL6 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 25.4% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 74.6% reported agreement. In this sample (n=294), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECCENTRAL7 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 13.3% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 86.7% reported agreement. In this sample (n=298), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECCENTRAL8 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.4% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.6% reported agreement.

In this sample (n=326), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded WASTETIME dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 10.1% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 89.9% reported agreement. In this sample (n=297), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECWASTE1
dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=251), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECWASTE2 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 27.9% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 72.1% reported agreement. In this sample (n=260), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECWASTE3 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 18.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 81.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=270), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECWASTE4 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 23.0% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 77.0% reported agreement. In this sample (n=275), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECWASTE5 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.4% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.6% reported agreement. In this sample (n=255), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECWASTE6 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 23.9% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 76.1% reported agreement. In this sample (n=243), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECWASTE7 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 34.6% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 65.4% reported agreement.

In this sample (n=299), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECDELAYGRAT dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 23.1% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 76.9% reported agreement. In this sample
WELFARE DEPENDENCY AND WORK ETHIC

(n=281), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECDELAY1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 18.1% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 81.9% reported agreement. In this sample (n=274), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECDELAY2 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 17.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 82.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=234), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECDELAY3 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 19.7% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 80.3% reported agreement. In this sample (n=285), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECDELAY4 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 15.8% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 84.2% reported agreement. In this sample (n=252), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECDELAY5 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 17.9% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 82.1% reported agreement. In this sample (n=279), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRELIA dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=262), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 14.9% of respondents reported disagreement.
reported disagreement, whereas 85.1% reported agreement. In this sample (n=257), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE2 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 22.2% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 77.8% reported agreement. In this sample (n=251), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE3 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 39.8% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 60.2% reported agreement. In this sample (n=248), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE4 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 28.2% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 71.8% reported agreement. In this sample (n=293), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE5 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 14.7% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 85.3% reported agreement. In this sample (n=301), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE6 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.3% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.7% reported agreement. In this sample (n=248), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE7 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.9% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.1% reported agreement. In this sample (n=230), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE8 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 40.4% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 59.6% reported agreement. In this sample (n=235), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded
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RECSSELFRE9 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 17.0% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 83.0% reported agreement.

In this sample (n=321), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORALITY dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=309), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORAL1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 15.9% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 84.1% reported agreement. In this sample (n=314), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded RECMORAL2 dummy variable was “disagreement”. For this item, 75.8% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 24.2% reported agreement. In this sample (n=306), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORAL3 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 13.4% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 86.6% reported agreement. In this sample (n=296), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORAL4 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 13.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 86.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=322), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded RECMORAL5 dummy variable was “disagreement”. For this item, 78.3% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 21.7% reported agreement. In this sample (n=318), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORAL6 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 10.7% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 89.3% reported agreement. In this sample (n=307), the most frequently
occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORAL8 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 16.6% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 83.4% reported agreement. In this sample (n=260), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded RECMORAL9 dummy variable was “disagreement”. For this item, 58.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 41.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=311), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORAL10 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 13.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 86.5% reported agreement.

In this sample (n=320), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWORK dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.2% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.8% reported agreement. In this sample (n=289), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 18.0% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 82.0% reported agreement. In this sample (n=303), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK2 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=308), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK3 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 11.0% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 89.0% reported agreement. In this sample (n=278), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK4 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 14.7% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 85.3% reported agreement.
In this sample (n=274), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK5 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 24.1% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 75.9% reported agreement. In this sample (n=249), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK6 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 24.9% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 75.1% reported agreement. In this sample (n=293), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK7 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 11.3% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 88.7% reported agreement. In this sample (n=277), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK8 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 11.7% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 88.3% reported agreement.

In this sample (n=277), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECLEISURE dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 23.6% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 76.4% reported agreement. In this sample (n=230), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECLEISURE1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 87.8% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 12.2% reported agreement. In this sample (n=214), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECLEISURE2 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 24.8% of respondents reported disagreement,
whereas 75.2% reported agreement. In this sample (n=211), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded RECLEISURE3 dummy variable was “disagreement”. For this item, 59.7% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 40.3% reported agreement. In this sample (n=212), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECLEISURE4 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 34.0% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 66.0% reported agreement. In this sample (n=227), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECLEISURE5 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 22.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 77.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=219), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECLEISURE6 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 30.6% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 69.4% reported agreement. In this sample (n=211), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded RECLEISURE7 dummy variable was “disagreement”. For this item, 54.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 45.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=209), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECLEISURE8 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 21.1% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 78.9% reported agreement. In this sample (n=218), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECLEISURE9 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 24.8% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 75.2% reported agreement.
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In this sample (n=340), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded TANF dummy variable was “never used benefits”. For this item, 92.4% of respondents reported using no benefits, whereas 7.6% reported using benefits. In this sample (n=340), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded SNAP dummy variable was “never used benefits”. For this item, 86.7% of respondents reported using no benefits, whereas 13.3% reported using benefits. In response (mode=0) for the recoded UNEMPINS dummy this sample (n=340), the most frequently occurring variable was “never used benefits”. For this item, 92.9% of respondents reported using no benefits, whereas 7.1% reported using benefits. In this sample (n=340), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded DISABILITY dummy variable was “never used benefits”. For this item, 95.0% of respondents reported using no benefits, whereas 5.0% reported using benefits.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS LONG FORM MWEP INDEX RECODES

In the Centrality of Work Index sample, 74.5% of respondents disagreed with all 10 centrality of work measures, whereas 11.2% agreed with 1 of 10, 3.1% agreed with 2 of 10, 2.0% agreed with 4 of 10, 2.0% agreed with 5 of 10, 2.0% agreed with 6 of 10, 1.0% agreed with 7 of 10, 3.1% agreed with 8 of 10, and 1.0% agreed with 9 of 10. The centermost value in this sample (n=98) for the Centrality of Work Index was median=0, or disagreed with all 10 centrality of work measures.

In the Waste Time Index sample 7.9% of respondents disagreed with all 8 waste time measures, whereas 4.0% agreed with 1 of 8, 1.0% agreed with 2 of 8, 2.0% agreed with 3 of 8, 4.0% agreed with 4 of 8, 1.0% agreed with 5 of 8, 5.0% agreed with 6 of 8, 98
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22.8% agreed with 7 of 8, and 52.5% agreed with all 8 waste time measures. The centermost value in this sample (n=101) for the Waste Time Index was median=8, or agreed with all 8 waste time measures.

In the Delayed Gratification Index sample, 12.4% of respondents disagreed with all 7 delayed gratification measures, whereas .8% agreed with 1 of 7, 3.3% agreed with 2 of 7, .8% agreed with 3 of 7, 1.7% agreed with 4 of 7, 4.1% agreed with 5 of 7, 12.4% agreed with 6 of 7, and 64.5% agreed with all 7 delayed gratification measures. The centermost value in this sample (n=121) for the Delayed Gratification Index was median=7, or agreed with all 7 delayed gratification measures.

In the Self-Reliance Index sample, 2.5% of respondents disagreed with all 10 self-reliance measures, whereas 3.7% agreed with 2 of 10, 1.2% agreed with 3 of 10, 2.5% agreed with 4 of 10, 3.7% agreed with 6 of 10, 3.7% agreed with 7 of 10, 11.1% agreed with 8 of 10, 17.3% agreed with 9 of 10, and 54.3% agreed with all 10 self-reliance measures. The centermost value in this sample (n=81) for the Self Reliance Index was median=10, or agreed with all 10 self-reliance measures.

In the Morality Index sample, 9.7% of respondents disagreed with all 10 morality measures, whereas 2.3% agreed with 1 of 10, 1.1% agreed with 2 of 10, 1.1% agreed with 6 of 10, 5.1% agreed with 7 of 10, 7.4% agreed with 8 of 10, 17.6% agreed with 9 of 10, and 55.7% agreed with all 10 morality measures. The centermost value in this sample (n=176) for the Morality Index was median=10, or agreed with all 10 morality measures.
In the Hard Work Index sample, 6.8% of respondents disagreed with all 10 hard work measures, whereas 1.4% agreed with 2 of 10, 2.1% agreed with 3 of 10, .7% agreed with 4 of 10, 1.4% agreed with 6 of 10, 1.4% agreed with 7 of 10, 3.4% agreed with 8 of 10, 7.5% agreed with 9 of 10, and 75.3% agreed with all 10 hard work measures. The centermost value in this sample (n=146) for the Hard Work Index was median=10, or agreed with all 10 hard work measures.

In the Leisure Index sample, 32.5% of respondents agreed with all 10 leisure measures, whereas 10.0% agreed with 1 of 10, 7.5% agreed with 2 of 10, 10.0% agreed with 3 of 10, 15.0% agreed with 4 of 10, 2.5% agreed with 5 of 10, 2.5% agreed with 7 of 10, 2.5% agreed with 8 of 10, 5.0% agreed with 9 of 10, and 12.5% of all 10 leisure measures. The centermost value in this sample (n=40) for the Leisure Index was median=2.5, or disagreed with 2.5 of 10 leisure measures.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS LONG FORM BENEFITS INDEX RECODES

In the Benefits Index sample, 81.0% of respondents used no benefits, whereas 10.6% used 1 of 4 benefits, 5.4% used 2 of 4 benefits, 1.5% used 3 of 4 benefits, and 1.5% used all 4 benefits. The centermost value in this sample (n=331) for the Benefits Index, was median=0, or used no benefits.

In the Recoded Benefits Index sample, 81.0% of respondents reported using no benefits, whereas 19.0% reported benefit use. The centermost value in this sample (n=331) for the recoded Benefits Index dummy variable was median=0, or used no benefits.
DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS SHORT FORM DEMOGRAPHICS

The average (mean) age of the respondents in this sample (n=236) was 36.9 years. The average (mean) years of education of the respondents in this sample (n=234) was 13.0 years.

The center most response (median=1) for the variable year of college (n=237) was freshman. In this sample, 53.2% of respondents reported 1=freshman, while 25.3% reported 2=sophomore, 13.5% reported 3=junior, 6.3% reported 4=senior, 1.7% reported 5=not in college at the undergraduate level. The center most response (median=3) for the variable social class (n=239) was middle class. In this sample, 4.6% of respondents identified as Lower Class, 27.2% as Working Class, 57.3 as Middle Class, 2.9% reported being a member of the Upper-Middle Class, and 7.9% reported being not sure. The center most response (median=1) for the variable number of children in household under age 18 (n=237) was none. In this sample, 72.2% of those surveyed reported having no children under the age of 18 in their household, while 26.6% reported having 1-3 minor children in the household and 1.3% reported having 4 or more minor children at home. The center most response (median=2) for the variable frequency of religious service attendance (n=238) was rarely. In this sample, 26.9% of respondents reported never attending religious services, while 27.7% report rarely attending, 17.2% reported they sometimes attend, 13.9% report they often attend, while 14.3% of those surveyed reported frequent attendance of religious services. The center most response (median=3) for the variable Prayer Frequency (n=236) was sometimes. In this sample, 21.6% of respondents reported never praying, 17.4% report they rarely pray, 28.4% responded they sometimes pray,
16.5% often pray, while 16.1% report they frequently pray. The center most response (median=1) for the variable Length of Unemployment (n=124) was less than or equal to 12 months. In this sample, 79.0% of respondents reported being unemployed for less than or equal to 12 months, 8.1% for 13 to 24 months, 12.9% for 37 months or more. The center most response (median=1) for the variable length of TANF use (n=238) was never. In this sample, 97.5% of respondents reported they had never used TANF benefits, 0.8% reported TANF use of less than 6 months, 1.3% used TANF for 6 months to 12 months, 0.4% for 13 months to 24 months, and 0.0% used TANF benefits for more than 24 months. The center most response (median=1) for the variable length of food stamp (SNAP) use (n=236) was never. In this sample, 94.5% of respondents report they had never used food stamps, 1.7% had used SNAP less than 6 months, 2.5% for 6 months to 12 months, 0.4% for 13 months to 24 months, and 0.8% reported using SNAP benefits for more than 24 months. The center most response (median=1) for the variable length of unemployment insurance (n=232) was never. In this sample, 96.1% of respondents reported never having received unemployment income, 1.7% reported having received unemployment for less than 6 months, 0.9% for 6 months to 12 months, 1.3% reported having received unemployment for 13 months to 24 months, and 0.0% reported having received unemployment for more than 24 months. The center most response (median=1) for the variable length of disability income (n=239) was never. In this sample, 95.0% of respondents reported never having received disability income, 0.4% received disability payments for less than 6 months, 1.3% for 6 months to 12 months, 1.3% for 13 months to 24 months, and 2.1% received disability income for more than 24 months.
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The most frequently occurring response (mode=6) for the variable marital status (n=239) was single/never married. In this sample, 5.4% of respondents reported being married, 13.4% reported being partnered/having a significant other, 0.4% reported being widowed, 0.4% reported being divorced, 0.8% reported being separated, and 79.5% reported being single/never married. For the variable race, (n=238), the most frequently occurring response (mode=3) was White/Caucasian. In this sample, 5.0% of respondents reported identifying as Asian, 5.9% reported identifying as Bi/Multi-racial, 70.2% identified as White/Caucasian, 12.6% identified as Black/African American, 2.9% identified as Hispanic, and 3.4% identified as other. Regarding the variable sex, (n=238), the most frequently occurring response (mode=2) was female. In this sample, 41.6% of respondents identified as male, and 58.4% identified as female. For the variable religious preference, (n=238), the most frequently occurring response (mode=2) was Protestant/Christian. In this sample, 19.7% of respondents affiliated with none/Atheist, 48.3% reported Protestant/Christian affiliation, 0.0% reported being Jewish, 15.1% were Catholic, 5.0% identified as Muslim, and 11.8% affiliated as other. For the variable political affiliation (n=234), the most frequently occurring response (mode=4) was Republican. In this sample, 29.5% of respondents identified as Democrat, 29.9% identified as Republican, 22.6% as Independent, 6.4% as Libertarian, and 11.5% of respondents identified as other. Lastly, the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the variable employment status (n=238) was employed for wages full or part time. In this sample, 54.2% of respondents reported being employed for wages full or part-time,
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3.4% as self-employed full or part-time, 18.1% reported being unemployed and looking for work, while 24.4% reported they were unemployed and not looking for work.

DESCRIPTIVE MWEP ANALYSIS SHORT FORM

The following MWEP-SF statements and participant responses describe an attitude towards the importance of work in one’s life which is expressed as the “Centrality of Work” dimension of the work ethic construct. In this data set we found the median (median = 4.0) measure of central tendency to indicate AGREEMENT with all four statements (#2, 7, 24, and 28). This reflects an overall general agreement on the importance of the centrality of work in one’s life, which may be a partial indicator of a strong work ethic.

For the statement “I feel content when I have spent the day working”, 0.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 4.9% Disagreed, 14.2% were Neutral, 56.9% agreed, and 23.2% strongly agreed. Regarding the statement “A hard day’s work provides a sense of accomplishment”, 1.2% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 2.9% Disagreed, 11.1% were Neutral, 58.8% Agreed, 25.9% strongly agreed. For the statement “I experience a sense of fulfillment from working”, 1.2% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 2.1% Disagreed, 12.9% were Neutral, 60.6% Agreed, 23.2% strongly agreed. Regarding the statement “A hard day’s work is very fulfilling”, 0.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 4.9% Disagreed, 13.8% were Neutral, 51.6% Agreed, 28.9% strongly agreed.

In the second dimension of the MWEP-SF scale, the “Self-Reliance” statements and participant responses describe an attitude towards the importance of independence self-reliance in one’s life which is expressed as the “Self-Reliance” dimension of the as a
component of the work ethic construct. In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency indicated agreement (median=4) with three of the four statements (#10, 19, and #26), and neutrality (median=3) with one of the four statements (#14). This reflects a general consensus that self-reliance is an important feature of one’s work ethic while at the same time acknowledging interdependence as also necessary to achieve one’s goals. While it is generally recognized that cooperative relationships are essential to success, the concept of interdependence does not preclude individual motivation and effort as the driving force. These results indicate a moderate emphasis on self-reliance and individual responsibility.

For the statement “Self-reliance is the key to being successful” 2.0% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 15.1% of respondents Disagreed, 21.6% of respondents were Neutral, 41.6% of respondents Agreed, and 19.6% of respondents Strongly Agreed. In the following statement “I strive to be self-reliant”, 0.4% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 3.7% of respondents Disagreed, 14.4% of respondents were Neutral, 48.1% of respondents Agreed, and 33.3% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “It is important to control one’s destiny by not being dependent on others”, 2.1% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 12.1% of respondents Disagreed, 20.8% of respondents were Neutral, 48.3% of respondents Agreed, and 16.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Responding to the statement “People would be better off if they depended on themselves”, 4.1% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 25.6% of respondents Disagreed, 27.2% of respondents were Neutral, 32.5% of respondents Agreed, and 10.6% of respondents Strongly Agreed.
In the third dimension of the MWEP-SF scale, the “Hard Work” statements describe an attitude towards the importance of working hard or diligently in one’s life relative to the work ethic construct. In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency to indicate agreement (median=4) with all four statements (#9, #11, #20, and #22). This reflects general agreement on the importance of “working hard” versus doing just enough to get by. Indicating agreement with these four statements may or may not reflect a bias to provide socially desirable responses, rather than well-reasoned responses.

For the statement “Working hard is the key to being successful”, 2.0% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 6.1% of respondents Disagreed, 11.4% of respondents were Neutral, 42.7% of respondents Agreed and 37.8% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the following statement, “If one works hard enough, one is likely to make a good life for oneself”, 2.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 7.3% of respondents Disagreed, 15.0% of respondents were Neutral, 48.8% of respondents Agreed and 26.0% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “If you work hard, you will succeed”, 2.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 8.7% of respondents Disagreed, 19.0% of respondents were Neutral, 44.2% of respondents Agreed and 25.6% of respondents Strongly Agreed. The next statement “Anyone who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of success”, 0.4% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 8.3% of respondents Disagreed, 10.0% of respondents were Neutral, 55.0% of respondents Agreed and 26.3% of respondents Strongly Agreed.
In the fourth dimension of the MWEP-SF scale, the “Leisure” statements describe an attitude towards the importance of leisure time in one’s life relative to the work ethic construct. For the statements in this subscale, the original MWEP-SF measures were reversed (e.g. 1=SD became 1=SA). In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency to indicate agreement (median=2) with three of the four statements (#4, #16, #25) and neutrality (median=3) with one of the four statements (#18).

For the statement “I would prefer a job that had more leisure time”, 14.3% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 39.8% of respondents Agreed, 33.2% of respondents were Neutral, 11.1% of respondents Disagreed, and 1.6% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. Regarding the statement “More leisure time is good for people”, 13.1% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 48.4% of respondents Agreed, 29.5% of respondents were Neutral, 9.0% of respondents Disagreed and 0.0% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. For the statement “People should have more leisure time to spend in relaxation”, 11.1% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 43.6% of respondents Agreed, 38.3% of respondents were Neutral, 6.6% of respondents Disagreed and 0.4% of respondents Strongly Disagreed. The following statement, “The world would be a better place if people spent more time relaxing”, 10.2% of respondents Strongly Agreed, 37.7% of respondents Agreed, 34.0% of respondents were Neutral, 15.6% of respondents Disagreed, and 2.5% of respondents Strongly Disagreed.

These results of the leisure dimension descriptives indicating a strong preference for more leisure time in one’s work life may be reflective of the steady decline in labor force participation rates for this younger of the prime working age population. Consider
that the mean age for the MWEP-LF sample was 23.6 years while the mean age for the MWEP-SF sample was 36.9 years. As noted earlier, the labor force participation rate (LFPR) for people aged 25 to 54 was 84.4% in January 2000 and began its steady decline from there, to 81.4% in March 2016, with the pace accelerating after the 2007-2008 recession. During this same period, the population of this group increased by more than 3 million, from 101,393,583 in 2000 to 104,396,000 in 2008. In the 16 to 24 yr. old age group, the participation rate was 66.1% in 1992; from 1992 to 2002 it fell another 2.9%, to 63.3%, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). From 2002, it fell from 63.3% to 54.9% in 2012, a decline of 8.4%. The workforce participation rate for this group was 55.4% as of March 2016, and the BLS projects further decline of 5.0% to 5.5% by 2022.

In this fifth dimension of the MWEP-SF scale, the “Morality/Ethics” statements describe and attitude towards the importance of moral convictions and ethical behavior in one’s life as regards the work ethic construct. In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency indicates strong agreement (median=5) with two of the four statements (#3, #23), and agreement (median=4) with two of the four statements (#13, #27). Overall, these results reflect a general attitude towards morality and ethics as being central to the work ethic construct.

For the statement “One should always take responsibility for one’s actions”, 0.0% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 1.2% of respondents Disagreed, 3.3% of respondents were Neutral, 33.5% of respondents Agreed and 62.0% of respondents Strongly Agreed. The next statement, “It is important to treat others as you would like to be treated”, 0.0%
of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 0.4% of respondents Disagreed, 3.7% of respondents were Neutral, 31.7% of respondents Agreed and 64.2% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “One should not pass judgment until one has heard all of the facts”, 0.4% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 2.0% of respondents Disagreed, 6.1% of respondents were Neutral, 45.7% of respondents Agreed and 45.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “People should be fair in their dealings with others”, 0.0% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 1.2% of respondents Disagreed, 6.6% of respondents were Neutral, 56.0% of respondents Agreed and 36.2% of respondents Strongly Agreed.

In the sixth dimension of the MWEP-SF scale, the “Delay of Gratification” statements describe an attitude towards the importance of restraint and delaying gratification in one’s life as it pertains to the work ethic construct. In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency indicates agreement (median=4) with three of four statements (#6, #8, #21), and indication of neutrality (median=3) with one of four statements (#15), which expresses an overall agreement that delaying gratification is an important element of the work ethic construct.

For the statement “I get more fulfillment from items I had to wait for”, 1.2% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 12.2% of respondents Disagreed, 30.1% of respondents were Neutral, 40.7% of respondents Agreed and 15.9% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Regarding the statement “Things that you have to wait for are the most worthwhile”, 0.0% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 9.5% of respondents Disagreed, 32.9% of respondents were Neutral, 39.1% of respondents Agreed, and 18.5% of respondents
Strongly Agreed. For the statement “The best things in life are those you have to wait for”, 0.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 14.0% of respondents Disagreed, 34.6% of respondents were Neutral, 38.3% of respondents Agreed, and 12.3% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Regards the statement “A distant reward is usually more satisfying than an immediate one”, 0.0% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 14.8% of respondents Disagreed, 37.3% of respondents were Neutral, 35.2% of respondents Agreed and 12.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed.

In the seventh dimension of the MWEP-SF scale, the “Wasted Time” statements describe an attitude towards the importance of using one’s time productively in one’s life, as a component of the work ethic construct. In this sample, we found the median measure of central tendency to indicate agreement (median=4) with all four statements (#1, #5, #12, #17), expressing general and overall agreement that the efficient use of one’s time is a central feature of the work ethic construct.

For the statement “It is important to stay busy at work and not waste time”, 0.8% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 1.6% of respondents Disagreed, 5.7% of respondents were Neutral, 55.1% of respondents Agreed, and 36.7% of respondents Strongly Agreed. Regarding the statement “Time should not be wasted, it should be used efficiently”, 0.4% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 2.4% of respondents Disagreed, 15.5% of respondents were Neutral, 54.7% of respondents Agreed, and 26.9% of respondents Strongly Agreed. For the statement “I constantly look for ways to productively use my time”, 1.6% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 12.2% of respondents Disagreed, 21.6% of respondents were Neutral, 49.8% of respondents Agreed, and 14.7% of respondents
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Strongly Agreed. For the statement “I try to plan out my workday so as not to waste time”, 1.6% of respondents Strongly Disagreed, 12.8% of respondents Disagreed, 17.3% of respondents were Neutral, 54.7% of respondents Agreed, and 13.6% of respondents Strongly Agreed.

DESCRIPTIVE MWEP ANALYSIS SHORT FORM RECODES

In this sample (n=221), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded CENTRALITY dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 6.6% respondents reported disagreement, whereas 93.4% reported agreement. In this sample (n=212), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECENTRALITY1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 6.6% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 93.4% reported agreement. In this sample (n=210), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECCENTRAL7 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 3.8% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 96.2% reported agreement. In this sample (n=216), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECCENTRAL8 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 4.6% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 95.4% reported agreement.

In this sample (n=231), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded WASTETIME dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 2.6% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 97.4% reported agreement. In this sample (n=207), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECWASTE1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 3.4% of respondents reported
disagreement, whereas 96.6% reported agreement. In this sample (n=192), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECWASTE3 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 17.7% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 82.3% reported agreement. In this sample (n=201), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECWASTE4 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 17.4% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 82.6% reported agreement.

In this sample (n=172), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECDELAY1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 19.2% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 80.8% reported agreement. In this sample (n=163), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECDELAY2 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 14.1% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 85.9% reported agreement. In this sample (n=153), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECDELAY3 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 23.5% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 76.5% reported agreement. In this sample (n=159), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECDELAY5 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 22.6% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 77.4% reported agreement.

In this sample (n=192), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 21.9% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 78.1% reported agreement. In this sample
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(n=179), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE2 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 40.8% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 59.2% reported agreement. In this sample (n=208), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE6 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 4.8% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 95.2% reported agreement. In this sample (n=190), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECSELFRE9 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 17.9% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 82.1% reported agreement.

In this sample (n=237), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORALITY dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 1.3% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 98.7% reported agreement. In this sample (n=230), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORAL3 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 2.6% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 97.4% reported agreement. In this sample (n=234), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORAL6 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 0.4% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 99.6% reported agreement. In this sample (n=227), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECMORAL10 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 1.3% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 98.7% reported agreement.
In this sample (n=218), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK2 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 9.2% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 90.8% reported agreement. In this sample (n=209), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK3 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.0% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 88.0% reported agreement. In this sample (n=196), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK7 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 13.8% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 86.2% reported agreement. In this sample (n=216), the most frequently occurring response (mode=1) for the recoded RECHARDWK8 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 9.7% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 90.3% reported agreement.

In this sample (n=163), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded RECLEISURE1 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 19.0% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 81.0% reported agreement. In this sample (n=172), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded RECLEISURE5 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 12.8% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 87.2% reported agreement. In this sample (n=161), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded RECLEISURE6 dummy variable was “agreement”. For this item, 27.3% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 72.7% reported agreement. In this sample (n=150), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded RECLEISURE8 dummy variable was
“agreement”. For this item, 11.3% of respondents reported disagreement, whereas 88.7% reported agreement.

DESCRIPTIVE SHORT FORM BENEFITS RECODES

In this sample (n=238), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded TANF dummy variable was “never used benefits”. For this item, 97.5% of respondents reported using no benefits, whereas 2.5% reported using benefits. In this sample (n=236), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded SNAP dummy variable was “never used benefits”. For this item, 94.5% of respondents reported using no benefits, whereas 5.5% reported using benefits. In response (mode=0) for the recoded UNEMPINS dummy this sample (n=232), the most frequently occurring variable was “never used benefits”. For this item, 96.1% of respondents reported using no benefits, whereas 3.9% reported using benefits. In this sample (n=239), the most frequently occurring response (mode=0) for the recoded DISABILITY dummy variable was “never used benefits”. For this item, 95.0% of respondents reported using no benefits, whereas 5.0% reported using benefits.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS SHORT FORM MWEP INDEX RECODES

In the Centrality of Work Index sample, 1.2% of respondents disagreed with all four centrality of work measures, whereas 1.2% agreed with one of four statements, 1.8% agreed with two of four statements, 1.2% agreed with three of four statements, 94.6% agreed with all four statements. The centermost value in this sample (n=166) for the
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Centrality of Work Index was median=4, or agreed with all four centrality of work measures.

In the Waste Time Index sample 2.2% of respondents disagreed with all four waste time measures, whereas 0.7% agreed with one of four statements, 3.6% agreed with two of four statements, 11.5% agreed with three of four statements, and 82.0% agreed with all four statements. The centermost value in this sample (n=139) for the Waste Time Index was median=4, or agreed with all four waste time measures.

In Morality Index sample 0.0% of respondents disagreed with all four morality measures, whereas 0.0% agreed with one of four statements, 0.0% agreed with two of four statements, 3.9% agreed with three of four statements, and 96.1% agreed with all four statements. The centermost value in this sample (n=203) for the Morality Index was median=4, or agreed with all four morality measures.

In the Delayed Gratification Index sample 6.1% of respondents disagreed with all four delayed gratification measures, whereas 6.1% agreed with one of four statements, 2.0% agreed with two of four statements, 15.3% agreed with three of four statements, and 70.4% agreed with all four statements. The centermost value in this sample (n=98) for the Delayed Gratification Index was median=4, or agreed with all four delayed gratification measures.

In the Hard Work Index sample 5.1% of respondents disagreed with all four hard work measures, whereas 2.5% agreed with one of four statements, 3.8% agreed with two of four statements, 2.5% agreed with three of four statements, and 86.0% agreed with all
four statements. The centermost value in this sample (n=157) for the Hard Work Index was median=4, or agreed with all four hard work measures.

In the Self Reliance Index sample 2.6% of respondents disagreed with all four self-reliance measures, whereas 11.1% agreed with one of four statements, 7.7% agreed with two of four statements, 12.0% agreed with three of four statements, and 66.7% agreed with all four statements. The centermost value in this sample (n=117) for the Self Reliance Index was median=4, or agreed with all four self-reliance measures.

In the Leisure Index sample 76.6% of respondents disagreed with none of the leisure measures, whereas 11.7% disagreed with one of four statements, 3.2% disagreed with two of four statements, 3.2% disagreed with three of four statements, and 5.3% disagreed with all four statements. The centermost value in this sample (n=94) for the Leisure Index was median=0, or agreement with all four leisure measures.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS SHORT FORM BENEFITS INDEX RECODES

In the Benefits Index sample, 88.2% of respondents used no benefits, whereas 9.6% used 1 of 4 benefits, 0.9% used 2 of 4 benefits, 0.0% used 3 of 4 benefits, and 1.3% used all 4 benefits. The centermost value in this sample (n=229) for the Benefits Index, was median=0, or used no benefits.

In the Recoded Benefits Index sample, 88.2% of respondents reported using no benefits, whereas 11.8% reported benefit use. The centermost value in this sample (n=229) for the recoded Benefits Index dummy variable was median=0, or used no benefits.
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