This paper is based on a cross-cultural research study comparing the Protestant work ethic (PWE) values of three groups of university students from post-industrialized Australia, newly industrialized Turkey and relatively under-developed pre-industrial Kyrgyzstan. The outcomes of this research indicate that PWE endorsement is higher in less developed countries such as Kyrgyzstan followed by relatively developed countries like Turkey and then post-industrial Australia. Additionally, this research shows that the influence of leisure oriented-hedonist culture increases in highly developed societies like Australia. At the same time the PWE is increasingly evident in developing countries like Turkey and especially Kyrgyzstan through an extension of modern/industrial civilization as a form of moral justification for their current social-economic conditions.
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INTRODUCTION

'The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism' is one of Max Weber's well-known works. It was published more than a century ago and was construed as an idealist response to Marx's materialist/determinist approach.

According to Tawney (1971), the question that Weber attempts to answer concerns the psychological conditions which made possible the development of capitalist civilization. Similarly, Gerth and Mills (1977) argued that Weber was keen to emphasize the autonomous role of ideas in the origin of modern capitalism. He thought that the development of modern capitalism required a certain type of personality. This personality type was psychologically constructed as a result of certain beliefs and ideas. The Puritan personality (or Protestant ethic) boosted capitalism by creating 'modern' profit-maximizing capitalists and a disciplined and motivated labor-force (Lessnoff, 1994).

According to Bauman (1987), the puritan, 'inner-directed' and self-controlled man, was construed as the central actor of a reason-guided society. In addition Gorz (1995) highlighted the similarities between "the socialist ethic" and Weber's "Protestant ethic thesis".

The Protestant ethic therefore emphasizes characteristics such as hard work, sobriety, frugality, sexual restraint and a constrained way of living life. Daniel Bell (1978) posits that the Protestant ethic, as a social fact, was eroded before the 1960s. He claimed that the Protestant ethic was undermined by capitalism itself and replaced by a reliance on hedonism as a prevailing value of our age. Bell (1978) furthermore claimed that the cultural justification of capitalism had become hedonistic through the pursuit of pleasure and self gratification as a way of life. As a result, the capitalist system lost its transcendental ethic. The hedonist culture of consumer capitalism therefore places pleasure or happiness and the avoidance of pain as the ideal, as opposed to the puritan temper which extols the virtues of ascetism and the delay of gratification.

Other social theorists such as Lasch (1979), Bauman (1987) concur with the central ideas of Bell (1978) that the decline of the Protestant ethic has been instrumental with the rise of hedonist, narcissist, anti-puritan consumer culture or a new personality type in the post-industrial world.

For Bauman (2005), post-industrial contemporary societies are perceived as passing from a 'society of production' to a 'society of consumers', and at the same time from a society guided by the work ethic to one governed by the aesthetic of consumption. In a society of consumers, mass production does not require any additional mass labor. Bauman claimed that
the puritan had passed away and was replaced by the hedonistic consumer as a new personality type.

Weber's theory of the PWE was introduced into psychology by McClelland (1967). He extended micro-sociological research on individual achievement to the macro-societal level (Furnham, 1987a). McClelland attempted to demonstrate how need-for-achievement beliefs were consistently related to numerous economic variables in various societies (Furnham, 1991).

To date most research has concentrated on an analysis of the cultural shift from the PWE to hedonistic consumerism in highly developed westernized countries. This research is significant in that it focuses on the work beliefs of young people attending college in three countries which are predominantly Muslim and secular characterized by post-Soviet, pre-industrial Kyrgyzstan, newly industrialized Turkey and Protestant based post-industrial Australia.

Australia is a young wealthy and highly developed multicultural post-industrial society with a population which is predominantly protestant. Young Australians are strongly influenced by hedonist consumer culture with a strong commitment to the pursuit of leisure. Compared to other countries such as Turkey and Kyrgyzstan, Australian youth have high levels of disposable income due to access to part-time employment while attending school and university. Australians are among the most highly educated people in the world. Over 80 percent of youth complete secondary school while over 70 percent gain entry into either university or technical colleges.

By comparison, Turkey is a newly industrialized society as borne out in the increased share of industrial products in Turkish exports, which rose from 36 per cent in 1980, to over 94 per cent in 2004 (Turkstat, 2004). Turkey is currently negotiating its full membership into the European Union.

The majority of the population is Muslim in both Turkey (almost 99%) and Kyrgyzstan (75%). Nevertheless, both the education and government systems are secular in these countries.

The influence of modernity and global transformation on college students is highly striking, especially for Turkish youth. The value orientation of the Turkish youth in the 1990s underwent major changes towards a more competitive and individualistic orientation (Cileli, 2000).

Kyrgyzstan is a secular (dominantly Muslim) country which is not characterized by forms of religious extremism or fundamentalism. It has an undeveloped economy based on mainly agricultural production (Whitake's Almanac, 2004; World Guide,
2005) with an historically nomadic origin and a limited work ethic. The country was a former Soviet state which emphasized an ethos of hard work. Within post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan society it is possible to observe extremes in relation to lifestyle. For example, some sectors of the society experience high unemployment and depressed living conditions compared to highly educated college students who see education as a way of obtaining increased social mobility and ultimately contributing to the overall standard of living in the country. However, there is little research within the English literature about Kyrgyzstan youth. The authors of this paper could not locate any research specifically about the work ethic values or beliefs pertaining to college students.

To sum up, it can be argued that a strong work ethic is reinforced through government policies which shape the school systems in both Turkey and Kyrgyzstan. By comparison, Australian young people are mainly motivated by opportunities presented in the competitive market economy.

Weber (1971) claimed that the PWE was primarily located within Protestant religious beliefs. However contemporary social theorists such as Bell (1978), Bauman (1987), Lasch (1979) and Sennet (1996) claim that the Protestant work ethic has declined and has been replaced by a reliance on hedonistic values in post-industrial societies. Both Weber and some social theorists viewed PWE as a polar opposite to hedonism. Based on these arguments we proposed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: The PWE is the polar opposite of hedonism generally. However, as the endorsement of the PWE declines there is a subsequent increase in hedonistic values among young college students.

Additionally, some cross-cultural research (Furnham & Rajamanickam, 1992; Furnham et al., 1993) have found that the PWE is higher in less developed countries compared to highly industrialized nations. Based on these research findings and the claims of social theorists which were mentioned above, we posit a further two hypotheses in relation to this research project.

Hypothesis 2: That college students in pre-industrial Kyrgyzstan will have the highest endorsement for the PWE followed by students in newly-industrialized Turkey. By comparison it is hypothesized that young people in post-industrial Australia will exhibit the lowest endorsement of the PWE.

Hedonist culture is most closely associated with societies that are wealthy and possess high levels of social and economic development. Therefore we suggested the following hypothesis as well:
Hypothesis 3: Australia will have the highest endorsement of hedonistic values followed by the developing nation of Turkey and then Kyrgyzstan.

We also considered additional relationships between the demographic variables such as age, sex, family income and personal expenditure in terms of the PWE and hedonistic values.

There is a dearth of empirical literature which focuses on hedonistic values, compared to the much larger body of research which has examined the PWE from an empirical perspective. Some of the major studies on the PWE will be discussed in the following literature review.

LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE PROTESTANT WORK ETHIC

Seven different scales have been developed and used for measuring the Protestant Work Ethic (Goldstein & Eichorn, 1961; Blood, 1969; Mirels & Garrett, 1971; Hammond & Williams, 1976; Buchholz, 1976; Ray, 1982; Ho & Lloyd, 1984). The Protestant Work Scale of Mirels and Garrett was mostly preferred by researchers because it is more reliable than other scales (Dorst et al., 1978; Gonsalves & Bernard, 1983; Furnham, 1984; Furnham, 1991; Furnham et al., 1993; Wentworth & Chell, 1997; Waters & Zakrjsek, 1991; Tang, 1990; Tang & Tzeng, 1992; Tang, 1993; Abdalla, 1997; Stones & Philbrick, 1992; Ali et al., 1995; Ali & Azim, 1995; Furnham, 1987; Arslan, 2000; Arslan, 2001; Hassall et al., 2005).

A number of researchers examined the factor structure of the Protestant Work Ethic scales (Furnham, 1990; Tang, 1993; McHoskey, 1994; Blau & Ryan, 1997; Abdalla, 1997; Wentworth & Chell, 1997; Arslan, 2000; Miller et al., 2002; Hassall et al., 2005). The dimensions of the scales which were found by researchers are: belief in hard work, anti-leisure, religious and moral beliefs, independence from others, asceticism, internal motive, success, work as an end in itself, saving in money and time, internal locus of control, self-reliance, delay of gratification, reward of work and disdain for indolence.

Mirels and Garrett (1971) claimed that the Protestant ethic provided moral justification for the accumulation of wealth and it was positively related to authoritarianism and to the expectancy for internal control (self-discipline).

Different researchers found that the PWE was significantly positively related to individualism and asceticism (Goldstein & Eichhorn, 1961), authoritarianism and internal locus of control (MacDonald, 1972), conservatism (Feather, 1984; Furnham, 1984; Furnham, 1991), religious beliefs (Beit-Hallami, 1979; Sagie, 1993; Jeynes, 1999; Ray, 1982), realistic, enterprising, conventional and artistic types (Furnham & Koritsas, 1990), being obedient, polite, responsible and clean (Furnham, 1987), personal responsibility, greater expected success (Christopher
& Schlenker, 2005), work centrality (Hirschfeld & Feild, 2000), visiting fitness center (Mudrack, 1992); life and job satisfaction (Blood, 1969), sensitivity to criminal behavior (Christopher et al., 2003), academic job involvement (Edwards & Waters, 1980), work loyalty, (Ali & Azim, 1995), the love of money (Luna-Arocas & Tang, 2004), productivity (Firestone et al., 2005).

On the other hand, the PWE was associated negatively with the leisure ethic, Marxist-related beliefs (Furnham, 1984), the welfare ethic (Furnham & Rose, 1987) and being broadminded, courageous, forgiving, imaginative and intellectual (Furnham, 1987). People who strongly approved of the Protestant work ethic stressed negative individualistic explanations for unemployment (Furnham, 1982).

The relationships with the PWE and ethnic identity (Cockley et al., 2007) and number of demographic variables were examined by various researchers (Ghorpade et al., 2006) and according to Beit-Hallami (1979), the PWE scores reflect elements of social and cultural background.

Aldag and Brief (1975) found a positive correlation between the PWE and age. But Wentworth and Chell (1997) found a negative relationship. On the other hand, Furnham (1991) had no clear relationships between age, class position, and urban-rural residence in PWE scores. The results of his research in Barbados showed that girls tended to have higher scores than boys. Also, family size was positively correlated with PWE score.

For Taiwanese students, scores on the Protestant ethic scale were not related to age, sex, rural or urban background, socio-economic status, family power structure, or religious belief or affiliation (Ma, 1986). Tang and Tzeng (1992) in a sample of 689 American subjects found that the PWE related to affiliation with the Republican Party, young age, less education, part-time employment, low income, and single (marital) status.

There are fewer studies about unemployment and the PWE (Furnham, 1982; Shamir, 1986). Hassall et al. (2005) found that no differences existed between the employed and unemployed in their commitment to the values of the PWE.

The PWE has been studied in relation to many different cultures and societies. Furnham et al. (1993) investigated the measurement and comparison of PWE scores in 13 countries. Rich/developed countries tended to have lower scores than the poor/undeveloped countries. For example, the Indians, black South Africans, and people from Zimbabwe had higher PWE scores than the British, Germans, and New Zealanders.

Tang et al. (2003) compared the endorsement of the money ethic, the PWE, and other work-related attitudes among professional employees in Taiwan, the United States and the United Kingdom. They found that Chinese employees in Taiwan had the strongest endorsement of the PWE. In addition,
Indian people endorsed the PWE more than Britons (Furnham and Rajamanickam, 1992) did.

Ali et al. (1995) found that US participants were more committed to the Protestant and contemporary work ethic than Canadians. However, they did not find any difference between Catholic and Protestant participants. In a different study, white English-speaking South Africans endorsed the basic arguments of the Protestant ethic more strongly than did the American respondents (Heaven, 1980).

Niles (1994, 1999) examined the belief in a Protestant work ethic in Australia and Sri Lanka. He found that Sri Lankan university students have as strong a belief in a work ethic as Australian students have; also, Buddhist Sri Lankan and Christian Australian people have similar perceptions about the meaning of work, but Sri Lankans seem to be more strongly committed to hard work.

Baguma and Furnham (1993) found that Ugandans endorsed the PWE more than Britons, while Somers and Birnbaum (2001) indicated that blacks had more positive work attitudes than did whites in the US.

There are limited studies about the PWE in Islamic countries. The PWE scores in Islamic countries, like many relatively less/late developed countries, are higher than Protestants and Catholics, contrary to Weber’s thesis discussed above in the theoretical framework. For example, Furnham and Muhiudeen (1984) found that there were significant differences between the British and Malaysians in PWE scores. Malaysian scores were higher than British.

Similarly, Arslan (2000, 2001) examined the work ethic characteristics of Protestant, Catholic and Muslim managers. He found that there was a considerable difference between Muslim and other groups. The Muslim managers showed the highest PWE endorsement, while the Protestant group was placed second and Catholic group third. In addition, his results (Arslan, 2000) showed that nineteenth-century Weberian criticism of Islam in terms of economic behavior is not valid in the modern/contemporary Turkish case.

We hope that this kind of research may help the understanding of work ethic values in two secular Muslim countries at different development levels as well as one protestant post-industrial country.

**METHODOLOGY**

Three groups took part in this study from Kyrgyzstan, Turkey and Australia. The students who completed the survey were drawn from the schools of Business and Social Science in each of the three countries. The number of participants and the age differentiation within each group are discussed below.
1. Kyrgyzstan: The Kyrgyzstan survey was carried out in a small Business School with approximately 200 students. There were 122 participants of which 72 (59%) were female, 43 (32.2%) male (7 not specified). In all, 88 (72.1%) were between 17 and 20 years old, 28 (23.0%) between 21 and 23, and 4 (3.3%) over 23 (2 not specified). There were 38 (31.1%) first year, 46 (37.7%) second year, 17 (13.9%) third year and 9 students (7.4%) in their fourth year.

2. Turkey: The Turkish survey was conducted among the students of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business Administration. Among 2200 registered students, 317 participated in our study. In our study group 50.2% are males and 49.8% are females. In all, 140 (44.2%) were between 17 and 20 years of age, 169 (53.3%) between 21 and 23 years of age, and the remainder over 23. There were 100 (31.5%) first year, 45 (14.2%) second year, 81 (25.6%) third year and 55 students (17.4%) in their fourth year (36 not specified).

3. Australia: The Australian survey was carried out both among business and some social science students with approximately 2300 registered students. Of the 311 participants in this sample 232 (74.6%) were female and 76 (24.4%) were male (3 not specified). Forty seven students (15.1%) were between 17-20, 198 (63.7%) between 21-23 years of age and the rest were over 23 years of age. For all three countries the students’ annual income and personal expenditure were recorded.

For each country, student expenditure was divided into four categories while family income was split into six classifications. It was also necessary to construct different categories of family income and personal expenditure for each country considering the vastly different levels of economic development within each site.

Questionnaire

All participants completed a two part questionnaire as well as additional questions relating to demographic variables such as age, gender, family income and personal expenditure etc.:

1. The Protestant Work Ethic Scale: The Mirels’ and Garrett’s 19 item Protestant Work Ethic Scale for measuring the work ethic was employed in this study. As highlighted in the previous literature review this scale is recognized as being the most reliable instrument for measuring the PWE.

2. The Hedonism Scale: Due to the limited research on hedonism a five item scale was developed by the researchers to measure hedonistic values among the research cohorts.

Both the Protestant Work Ethic and the Hedonism Scale consisted of a 5 rank response from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).
Procedure

The questionnaire was translated and back-translated to ensure equivalence among the three cohorts. Students from three regional universities in Turkey, Kyrgyzstan and Australia volunteered to take part in the survey. The surveys were administered in university classrooms in Australia and Kyrgyzstan while the Turkish survey was conducted both in classrooms and in other locations across the campus. A small proportion of students in Turkey and Australia failed to respond to the survey.

RESULTS

In this study of three countries the data was analyzed to provide an understanding of the PWE and hedonistic values of young college students. The reliability of both scales was at an acceptable level when referring to Cronbach’s alpha coefficient reliability which was 0.74 for the Mirels and Garrett’s PWE Scale and 0.72 for the Hedonism Scale.

In the factor analysis, we subjected the PWE data to a principal-components factor analysis with the varimax rotation. The items were selected with factor loadings over .30 or greater with criterion of an eigenvalue greater than one.

The five dimensions were yielded in the factor analysis for PWE scale. These five dimensions accounted for 48 percent of the variance. The PWE scale’s items 11, 1, 2, 6, 12 and 18 constituted Factor 1 (F1) which we called Effort and which explained 12.95% of the total variance. Factor 2 (F2) items consist of 17, 19, 16, 13, 10 and 4 which were titled as Hard Work. Factor 3 (F3) consisted of items 3 and 14 which were named Saving and explained 8.21% of the variance. In addition, factor 4 (F4) contained items 8, 7, 5 which were termed Asceticism and Independence from Others and explained 8.14% of the variance. Finally, the items 15 and 9 constituted factor five (F5) which was named Anti-leisure and explained 8% of the variance. The dimensions of this factor analysis are quite similar with other research which was cited in the literature review.

In Table1 we compared the means and standard deviations for each of the three countries. The PWE scores were highest in pre-industrial Kyrgyzstan (M=3.59) followed by Turkey with (M=3.34) and then post-industrial Australia with the lowest score of (M=3.10).

By comparison, the hedonism scores are reversed in that Australia has the highest endorsement with (M=3.60) compared to Turkey with (M=3.46) and with Kyrgyzstan having the lowest score (M=3.42).
### TABLE 1
Means and Standard Deviations of PWE and Hedonism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N=311</th>
<th>N=317</th>
<th>N=122</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWE</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort (F1)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work (F2)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving (F3)</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay of gratification (F4)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-leisure (F5)</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlations

As we hypothesized (H1) the PWE was the polar opposite of hedonism. The data endorsed the significant negative correlations between the PWE and hedonism in merged file (r=-.084, p < .05).

**TABLE 2**
Correlations of PWE and Hedonism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PWE</th>
<th>F1 (Effort)</th>
<th>F2 (Hard Work)</th>
<th>F3 (Saving)</th>
<th>F4 (Delay of gratification)</th>
<th>F5 (Anti-leisure)</th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.823**</td>
<td>.659**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.674**</td>
<td>.266**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU N=311</td>
<td>PWE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.801**</td>
<td>.723**</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.626**</td>
<td>.281**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>.823**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>.138**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>.659**</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.144**</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.144**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>.674**</td>
<td>.425**</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>.136**</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>-.084*</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.326**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU N=317</td>
<td>PWE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.801**</td>
<td>.723**</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.626**</td>
<td>.281**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>.801**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>.192**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>.723**</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>.626**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.393**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>.281**</td>
<td>.192**</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.260**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR N=317</td>
<td>PWE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.819**</td>
<td>.767**</td>
<td>.474**</td>
<td>.627**</td>
<td>.298**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>.819**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.494**</td>
<td>.304**</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>.767**</td>
<td>.494**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>.474**</td>
<td>.304**</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.139*</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>.627**</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>.139*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.294**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG N=122</td>
<td>PWE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.822**</td>
<td>.742**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>.822**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>.742**</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>-.255**</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.195**</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-.457**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**
However, when the data is split according to individual countries, we see that in countries like Turkey and Australia there is no significant correlation between PWE and hedonistic values. By comparison, the less developed country of Kyrgyzstan displays a much stronger negative correlation between PWE and hedonistic values ($r = -0.255, p < .01$).

Only the *Anti-leisure dimension* (F5) of the PWE across the three countries shows a significant negative correlation with hedonism (AU: $r = -0.260, p < .01$; TR: $r = -0.294, p < .01$; KG: $r = -0.457, p < .01$). However, the other dimensions of the PWE do not display any positive or negative correlations except for Kyrgyzstan in the dimension of F3 (*Saving*) ($r = -0.195, p < .05$).

**Analysis of Variance**

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that there is a significant difference between each of the countries. With regards to the PWE, the results confirm hypothesis (H2) that the less developed country of Kyrgyzstan had higher PWE values followed by the developing nation of Turkey and then Australia as a highly developed industrialized country (PWE $F (2; 747) = 65.51, p < .001$).

In Table 3 the analysis clearly shows that there are significant differences between Australia and the two relatively less developed countries of Turkey and Kyrgyzstan with regards to hedonism $F (2; 747) = 3.64, p < .05$ (H3). It is also worth noting that there were no major differences between males and females in Australia with reference to hedonism. There were though quite significant differences between genders within Turkey and Kyrgyzstan societies with females having a higher endorsement of hedonism compared to males $F (1; 738) = 14.85, p < .001$. However, when we split the files according to the countries, there are no considerable differences in both PWE and hedonism among the males and females in Australia. But there are significant differences for gender in Turkey $F (1; 315) = 7.50, p < .05$ and in Kyrgyzstan $F (1; 113) = 14.56, p < .001$. Females endorsed hedonism more than males, but there are no differences for gender in PWE values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>PWE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Post Hoc</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>65.506</td>
<td>2; 747</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>a&lt;b&lt;c</td>
<td>3.644</td>
<td>2; 747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>4.537</td>
<td>1; 738</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>14.848</td>
<td>1; 738</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>13.111</td>
<td>2; 742</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>a&gt;b=c</td>
<td>2.123</td>
<td>3; 696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class/Year</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>2.609</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>2.609</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>3.183</td>
<td>5; 496</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>a=b&gt;c</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>5; 496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are also significant differences when considering the age of the college students with the subjects in the 17-20 year age bracket having a higher endorsement of the PWE than students who are older (F(2;742) = 13.11, p < .001). When considering hedonistic values there is also an important decrease in the oldest age bracket (over 23 years) when compared to the two other cohorts (F(2;742) = 8.19, p < .001).

Finally, in the PWE there are considerable variations according to family income levels (F(5;496) = 4.44, p < .05). For example, young people who come from the poorest families possess the highest PWE endorsement. However, there were no differentiations between young people with regards to their adherence to hedonistic values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>PWE</th>
<th>(Effort)</th>
<th>(Hard Work)</th>
<th>(Saving)</th>
<th>(Delay of gratification)</th>
<th>(Anti-leisure)</th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.424</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>-.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age1</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>-.355</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country1</td>
<td>-.632</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>-.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country2</td>
<td>-.299</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>-.625</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class1</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class2</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class3</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure1</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure2</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>-.266</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure3</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income1</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income2</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income3</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income4</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.318</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income5</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 5.44, R² = .176

TABLE 4
Regression Analysis for PWE and Hedonism
The final part of the analysis is concerned with the predictors of the PWE and Hedonism. Seven different multiple regressions were computed for: PWE (total score), each PWE dimension; hedonism (total score). The independent variables related to the research: respondents country, sex, age, expenditure, class/year and family income were recoded as dummy in multiple regression because all independent variables were categorical in this survey. Country 1 is Australia, Country 2 Turkey and Country 3 Kyrgyzstan. In terms of age categories, the 17-20 year-olds were coded as Age 1, the 21-23 Age 2, and 24 years and over were coded as Age 3. Moreover, expenditure consisted of four and family income consisted of six ranges. Expenditure 1 and Income 1 signified the poorest group in the range of different development levels. The income level of the poorest group was under the national minimum wage of each country. Finally, the development level and the relative purchasing power of money were the most important factors in this classification. As can be seen in Table 4, the country was the most powerful predictor of the PWE and its dimensions.

**DISCUSSION**

While the hedonist consumer culture increases in post-industrial societies like in Australia, the spread of modernity and the production culture of capitalism have led to puritanisation in countries like Turkey and Kyrgyzstan, which are in a period of relatively early economic development and scarcity.

This comparative study among three countries shows that the PWE endorsement is negatively correlated with hedonism in general. This result therefore endorses the first hypothesis which is based on the theory of Weber and more contemporary social theorists such as Bauman, Lasch and Bell. However, when countries are viewed separately, the interpretation of the PWE and hedonistic values differ. For example, Kyrgyz youth highly endorse the PWE and have a negative endorsement of hedonistic values. However, for the college students in developed countries like Australia, and the rapidly developing nation of Turkey, there is no statistically significant differentiation between their adherence to the PWE and hedonistic values. For example, the data shows that over 67% of Australian and over 65% of Turkish youth believe that it is just as important to work hard as it is to engage in hedonistic pursuits. A possible explanation for this is that Australian and Turkish youth want a work-life balance by working hard in order to make enough disposable income available in order to pursue hedonistic leisure based activities. It can therefore be argued that for Australian and Turkish young...
people the PWE in general is not the polar opposite of hedonism. What is interesting is that only the anti-leisure dimension of the PWE has a negatively significant correlation with hedonistic values.

This research also demonstrates that young people in Kyrgyzstan and Turkey had higher PWE endorsement than those in Australia. A possible reason for this may be that all of the research subjects were college students who have been educated in modern schools, which have instilled the values of hard work, achievement, personal sacrifice, self-discipline, secular asceticism, distain from idleness and so on.

Eighty percent of Turkish and ninety-two percent of Kyrgyz young people believe that: “if they work hard, they will succeed”. These youths need more motivation and self-sacrifice to improve the social and economic conditions of their life compared to other young people from the highly developed country of Australia.

While these high PWE endorsements may not be surprising, they may however be exaggerated especially in the case of the relatively higher authoritarian Kyrgyz culture. In this country the questionnaire was supervised by academics who have a higher social status than the college students. To try to win greater social acceptance from authorities, the research subjects may have expressed higher PWE endorsements than the students in the other two countries. Furnham made a similar observation in his cross-cultural researches in authoritarian cultures and less developed countries (Furnham et al., 1993; Furnham & Rajamanickam, 1992; Baguma & Furnham, 1993).

On the other hand, the coming of consumer society boosted hedonistic values in post-industrial countries like Australia. Therefore, higher endorsement of the hedonistic values in Australian youth is not surprising. However, this embrace of hedonism doesn’t mean that Australians necessarily work less than Turkish or Kyrgyz youth.

Low income and expenditure level students had higher scores than the others. These results confirm the findings of Furnham and Muhiudeen’s research (1984) which showed that the working class had higher scores than the middle class. These results may be interpreted as a rationalization/moral justification of their difficult economic and social situations.

When considering the demographic variables like age and gender, there are differing results when the data from the three countries is merged. With regards to the gender variable there were significant differences in both the PWE and hedonistic values in the merged file. This research suggests that females display a greater endorsement of hedonistic values and corresponding decrease in an adherence to the PWE. For males,
however, the outcomes were reversed with relation to PWE and hedonistic values. Surprisingly, when the data for gender was split into individual countries, we found no significant differences in Australia with regards to PWE and hedonistic values. This suggests that gender differences are less apparent in highly developed countries compared to less developed nations such as Turkey and Kyrgyzstan. In the Turkey and Kyrgyzstan samples we observed that females endorse hedonism more than males. A possible explanation for this is that females in traditional cultures are their late participation in the waged work force.

With reference to age, some researchers found positive relations (Aldag & Brief, 1975), some of discovered negative relations (Wentworth & Chell, 1997) while others nothing (Furnham, 1991). In this research, both PWE and hedonistic values had negative relationships with youthfulness.

Finally, this research found significant relationships between the PWE and hedonism with reference to the variable of gender. Females endorsed the PWE more while males endorsed hedonistic values. There was also no homogeneity with the results of studies conducted by Beit-Hallami (1979), Furnham (1982), Furnham (1987), Buchholz (1978), Furnham & Muhideen (1984), Wentworth & Chell (1997).

In closing, some researchers have argued that the Protestant ethic is not yet dead; it is alive and well, but it is no longer Protestant (Ray, 1982; Furnham, 1990). In fact, the PWE has been penetrating into developing countries by the extension of modern/industrial civilization.

APPENDIX

Hedonism Scale

1) People should live their lives in accordance with their feelings and desires
2) You can't take your money with you when you die, so you should live for today
3) People should always pursue pleasure in their lives
4) People should always live for the present moment
5) People shouldn't sacrifice the pleasure of the present for the possibility of something better in the future

Protestant Work Ethic Scale (Mirels, H. & Garrett, J., 1971)

(1) Most people spend too much time in unprofitable amusements.
(2) Our society would have fewer problems if people had less leisure time
(3) Money acquired easily (e.g. through gambling or speculation) is usually spent unwisely
There are few satisfactions equal to the realization that one has done one’s best at a job.

The most difficult college courses usually turn out to be the most rewarding.

Most people who don’t succeed in life are just plain lazy.

The self-made person is likely to be more ethical than the person born to wealthy.

I often feel I would be more successful if I sacrificed certain pleasures.

People should have more leisure time to spend in relaxation.

Any person who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.

People who fail at a job have usually not tried hard enough.

Life would have very little meaning if we never had to suffer.

Hard work offers little guarantee of success.

The credit card is a ticket to careless spending.

Life would be more meaningful if we had more leisure time.

The person who can approach an unpleasant task with enthusiasm is the person who gets ahead.

If one works hard enough one is likely to make a good life for oneself.

I feel uneasy when there is little work to do.

Distaste for hard work usually reflects a weakness of character.
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