



ETHICS RESOURCE CENTER'S
NATIONAL BUSINESS ETHICS SURVEY[®]

METHODOLOGY AND DEMOGRAPHICS

2007

Fifth in a longitudinal study of U.S. workplaces

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

ISBN 978-0-916152-11-6

This report is published by the Ethics Resource Center (ERC). All content contained in this report is for informational purposes only. The Ethics Resource Center cannot accept responsibility for any errors or omissions or any liability resulting from the use or misuse of any information presented in this report.

©2007 Ethics Resource Center. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in whole or in part, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission from the Ethics Resource Center, 2345 Crystal Drive, Suite 201, Arlington, VA 22202 USA.

Additional copies of this report and more information about permission and licensing may be obtained by calling 703-647-2185, or by visiting www.ethics.org.



ETHICS
RESOURCE
CENTER

Founded in 1922, the Ethics Resource Center (ERC) is America's oldest nonprofit organization devoted to the advancement of high ethical standards and practices in public and private institutions. For more than 85 years, ERC has been a resource for public and private institutions committed to a strong ethical culture. ERC's expertise also informs the public dialogue on ethics and ethical behavior. ERC researchers analyze current and emerging issues and produce new ideas and benchmarks that matter — for the public trust.

For more information about ERC, please visit our website at www.ethics.org.

Visit our website and sign up to receive additional reports in the National Workplace Ethics Study research series, including:

National Government Ethics Survey

National Nonprofit Ethics Survey

You can also sign up to receive *Ethics Today*, ERC's online newsletter.



METHODOLOGY

Detailed Survey Methodology and Technical Information for the 2007 National Workplace Ethics Study

Overview

The 2007 National Workplace Ethics Study is the fifth such survey conducted by the Ethics Resource Center (ERC). In previous years, the National Business Ethics Survey (NBES) presented data from the business, government, and nonprofit sectors. In 2007, analysis for each sector was conducted separately and will be reported in three distinct reports: the National Business Ethics Survey, the National Government Ethics Survey, and the National Nonprofit Ethics Survey. Throughout these survey reports we compare data from 2007 with that from the 2005, 2003, 2000, and 1994 NBES to identify trends.

The survey methodologies employed in the 2007, 2005, 2003, and 2000 surveys were essentially identical and all four are addressed in the same section of this appendix. Rather than providing redundant details about the 2000, 2003, and 2005 NBES methodologies, we only include information about these surveys where they differ slightly from 2007. Because the survey methodology and sample from 1994 did differ from the three later surveys, we describe this survey separately. A limitations section is also included.

The 2007, 2005, 2003, and 2000 National Business Ethics Surveys

All aspects of data collection for the 2007 survey were managed by Opinion Research Corporation using a questionnaire developed by ERC, and all surveys since 2000 have been conducted over the telephone. There are four minor differences in the nature of the four surveys.

First, the sample size in 2007 and 2005 was twice as large as in 2003 and 2000. Whereas in 2007 and 2005 ERC expanded the sample size to 3452 and 3015 usable interviews, respectively, the 2003 survey contained 1503 interviews, and the 2000 survey contained 1500¹.

Second, the length of time needed to conduct the interviews varied. In 2007, the interviews were completed over an eight-week period. The survey was launched on June 25th, revised slightly on July 25th, and concluded on August 15, 2007. In 2005, the interviews were completed over 16 weeks, whereas in 2003 the survey was conducted over a seven-week period, and the 2000 survey was conducted over a three month period.

Third, the average length of the telephone interviews has varied over time, depending on the length of the question set. In 2007, the average interview lasted eighteen minutes. In 2005, the average interview lasted eleven minutes, in 2003 the average was twelve minutes, and, in 2000, when there were more survey questions, the average was twenty minutes.

Fourth, in 2000 and 2003, respondents were not explicitly given the option to say “neither agree nor disagree” in the strongly agree/strongly disagree scaled questions, or “I don’t know” to any of the questions. Those who gave these answers without being prompted were recorded as having done so, and, not surprisingly, small percentages in both surveys volunteered those answers. In 2005, respondents were explicitly told in the beginning of the survey, “If I ask you any questions you do not know the answer to, just tell me and I will move on.” Additionally, in both 2005 and 2007, the “neither” option was read aloud in each of the strongly agree/strongly disagree scaled questions. Slightly higher percentages tended to say “neither” and “don’t know” in the 2005 and 2007 surveys.

¹ Although the 2003 and 2000 NBES reports treated nine respondents in the 2000 survey as “missing data” because they worked for temporary agencies, in the 2007 and 2005 analysis we decided to include respondents working temporarily. After reconsidering how we treat temporary employee respondents, we now feel that learning about the organizational culture where an employee works for a short time is valuable information that we prefer not to eliminate.

METHODOLOGY

Throughout the report, when comparisons are made across years of the NBES, “don’t know” and “refused” responses are omitted from the calculation of percentages. The “neither agree nor disagree,” and “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” responses have been included only in calculations involving measurement of ethical culture. As a result of these omissions, percentages presented in the 2007 and 2005 reports regarding previous NBES differ from those presented in previous reports, in which these answer choices were included in calculations in various ways.

Sample Selection

In 2007, calls were made to a randomly selected sample of residential households within the contiguous 48 states². These calls were based on a purchased sample listing of randomly generated telephone numbers³. The list that was ordered was a representative sampling of the nation by time zone. Figure A.1 displays the proportion of households across the four time zones included in the 2007 survey and the proportion of respondents surveyed in each time zone.

Figure A.1 Survey Distribution by Region in 2007 NBES

Region	% of U.S. Household Population*	NBES
Northeast	18.2%	18.8%
Midwest	21.7%	22.4%
South	38.4%	36.4%
West	21.7%	22.4%

* According to U.S. Census data

The goal in fielding each NBES sample was to attain a representative regional distribution matching the entire sample we received. As shown in Figure A.1, in 2007 a sample was interviewed that was within two percent of the total percentage of households for any given region. As a result, we achieved a random national sample of the population (that has a land-line telephone). The sampling error of a survey conducted under these circumstances is +1.7% at the 95% confidence level.

Sample Eligibility

Screening procedures in 2007 replicated those used in the 2000, 2003, and 2007 NBES surveys. To be eligible for participation, survey respondents had to be:

- Eighteen years of age or older;
- Currently employed;
- Working for an organization that employs at least two people; and
- Working at least 20 hours per week for their primary employer.

The screening criteria were used primarily to ensure that employees selected for the NBES would have a reasonable basis for answering the survey questions. For example, we screened out employees who worked in one-person organizations because many of the survey questions would not have been relevant to these employees.

² If the person first contacted within a given household was eligible, they were interviewed. If they were ineligible, they were asked whether there was another household member who met the eligibility criteria. Telephone respondents were not asked to list all eligible household members so that one might be randomly selected among them.

³ The sample listing was generated using a random-digit dialing (RDD) procedure.

Confidentiality

Employees were assured that their individual responses to all survey questions would be held in confidence.

Response Rate

Response rate calculations are given below. These are based on a disposition of all telephone survey calls, presented in Figure A.2. The classification of each disposition is in the first column and the number of cases within that disposition is presented in the second column; each case represents a discrete telephone number and the outcome for it.

The first calculation, found in the third column, represents the completion rate (25%). The completion rate is defined as the proportion of households that were reached which resulted in a successful interview. For this purpose, a 'successful interview' includes the brief interview that determined whether or not a household met the eligibility requirements of the study. This figure was derived by adding the total number of completed interviews (3,452) to the total number of screenouts (6,882) and dividing this total by the sum of completions (3,452), screenouts (6,882), partial interviews (61), refusals (18,025), and callbacks and appointments that were not reached (13,626)⁴.

The definition of response rate is the proportion of completions to eligibles. Differences in reported response rates reflect different assumptions regarding which dispositions belong in the denominator of that calculation. The most liberal definition of response rate is to take the number of completions and divide it by the sum of completions, partials, eligible refusals and eligible callbacks. Determining the number of eligible refusals and eligible callbacks requires an intermediate calculation.

In order to determine the number of refusals and callbacks that are likely to have been eligible for inclusion in the survey (and thus should be included in the denominator of the response rate calculation), we need an intermediate calculation of the eligibility ratio within working households (ERWH). Conceptually, this ratio is the proportion of working household numbers that would qualify for the survey. It is obtained by summing together the number of known eligible households (completions and partials) and dividing the figure by the number of known households for which eligibility has been determined (the sum of completions, partials and screenouts). This ratio $((A+B)/(A+B+G))$ is calculated to be 0.338⁵.

This ratio (0.338) is then multiplied by the number of refusals and callbacks respectively to produce the number of refusals and callbacks that are imputed to be eligible for survey participation. Using an ERWH of .338, the number of refusals to be included in 'Response Rate 1' is found to be 6,092.45⁶. And, likewise, the number of callbacks and appointments not reached that are to be included is found to be 4,605.59⁷. Response Rate 1 can then be calculated by dividing the number of completed interviews by the sum of completed calls, partial interviews, and the 6,092.45 refusals and 4,605.59 callbacks calculated using the ERWH. Following this formula, 'Response Rate 1' is found to be 24.3%⁸.

Response Rate 1 does not, however, account for the possibility that some of the numbers that were never answered may have been eligible households. The fact that they were called as many times as they were suggests a reasonable probability that these numbers are, in fact, not working households, but we cannot know this with certainty. For this reason, we calculate a more conser-

⁴ $[(3,452+6,882)/(3,452+6,882+61+18,025+13,626)]=.25$

⁵ $[(3,452+61)/(3,452+61+6882)]=.338$

⁶ $(.338)(18,025)=6,092.45$

⁷ $(.338)(13,626)=4,605.59$

⁸ $[3,452/(3,452+61+6092.45+4,605.59)]=.243$

METHODOLOGY

vative estimate of the response rate apportioning a fraction of these numbers. In order to derive this estimate, we need to estimate the number of unanswered calls that would have both been working and eligible households. To determine this, we first need to derive the probability that a given unanswered number is a working household (PWH). This will then be multiplied by the eligibility ratio (ERWH) just calculated. This product is an estimate of the overall probability that a given unanswered number is both a working household and that that household is eligible for participation.

The probability that a given number is of a working household is best estimated by dividing the number of all known households by the number of total sample for which household status has been determined. The numerator is calculated by adding together completed interviews, partial interviews, refusals, callbacks and appointments not reached, and screenouts (A+B+C+D+G) and dividing the resultant figure by the sum of completed interviews, partial interviews, refusals, callbacks and appointments not reached, screenouts, and non-residential and non-working numbers (A+B+C+D+G+F). Using this formula, the probability that a given number is a working household is calculated to be 0.373.⁹

The proportion of telephone numbers imputed to be working households thus derived is then multiplied by the ERWH calculated above (0.338) to produce an overall probability of working eligible households of .126. In other words 12.6% of the unreached numbers are imputed to be both working households and eligible for this particular survey. This is then multiplied by the 35,599 numbers that were never answered to impute that 4,485.47 of these numbers would have been households that would have been eligible for participation in the survey. When this number is added into the denominator of Response Rate 1, the response rate drops from 24.29% to 18.46%¹⁰.

Figure A.2 Disposition of Survey Telephone Calls

Result	Final	Completion Disposition	Rsp Rate 1	Rsp Rate 2
A. Completed Calls	3452	3452	3452	3452
B. Partial Interviews	61	61	61	61
C. Refusals	18025	18025	6092.45	6092.45
D. Callbacks and Appointments Not Reached	13626	13626	4605.59	4605.59
E. No Answer	35599	--	--	4485.47
F. Non-Residential or Non-Working	35453	--	--	--
G. Screened Out (Ineligible)	6882	6882	--	--
	113098	42046	14211.04	18696.51
Total		24.57%	24.29%	18.46%

⁹ $[(3,452+61+6,092.45+4,605.59+6,882)/(3,452+61+6,092.45+4,605.59+6,882+35,453)]=0.373$

¹⁰ $(3,452)/(3,452+61+6,092.45+4,605.52+4,485.47)=.1846$

Weighting of Data

The 2005, 2003, 2000, and 1994 surveys were not weighted for analysis. In order to make the analysis more closely reflect the working population in the U.S., ERC decided to weight the 2007 survey and all previous years for this year's analysis. The retroactive application of the weighting to prior year data means that some of our published results will differ from the numbers previously published.

NBES Standard Weighting: the weighting across all five years is based on gender, education, and age, with the exception of 1994 which is weighted by gender and age only since education data are not in the dataset. The objective of the weighting is to accurately reflect the U.S. labor force.

- For gender and education we used the data for the month of August 2007 from the U.S. Current Population Survey (CPS) as the benchmark. This survey is a joint product of the U.S. Census Bureau and Bureau of Labor Statistics which tracks the working population in the U.S.
- For age, we used the National Population Estimates for July 2006 from the U.S. Census Bureau. The labor force age breakdown in the CPS does not match the survey categories, so we used the Census figures. The principal difference between these two sources is that the Census gives higher figures for the population between 15 and 21 years of age. This is because some people in this age bracket are still studying and because unemployment is higher in this bracket than any other.
- For ethnicity, we were not able to weight the survey population. After the 2000 Census, the Census Bureau changed the way ethnicity is treated to take into account multiple ethnicities. Specifically, whereas in 2000 people were either 'white' or 'Hispanic,' now they can be 'white' and 'Hispanic.' Similarly, the NBES changed the way 'Hispanicity' is treated, making it impossible to compare the data across years.

Impact of the Weighting on NBES Results

We compared the weighted and unweighted results of the 2007 NBES, as well as prior year surveys. In the 2007 NBES, with the exception of satisfaction and reporting, the weighted and unweighted results are within +/- 0/5%. The weight impact on reporting and satisfaction is as follows:

Survey Variable	Weighted Result (%)	Unweighted Result (%)
Satisfaction with employer	82.9	84.3
Reporting of Misconduct	57.6	61.3

Because of this impact, we applied weight factors to prior year results in order to maintain comparability across years. For NBES 2000, 2003, 2005, and 2007 we used the same weight factor since there has been very little change in the gender, age, and educational demographics in the labor force in this period.

METHODOLOGY

Reliability of Scales

In conducting analyses for the 2007 survey report, we developed scales for ethical culture as well as its several components: the embedded values of an organization, the ethical actions of top management, those of supervisors, and those of coworkers. We also developed scales for indicators of accountability of top management and non-management employees, a scale on the existence of ethics program elements, a scale measuring how well an ethics program has been implemented, and a scale to measure the negativity of the workplace. All scales exceeded a Chronbach's alpha value of .75, indicating high reliability.

1994 Survey of Ethics in American Business

The Survey

The 1994 EAB survey was conducted by NFO Research, Inc., using a questionnaire developed by ERC. The survey was self-administered¹¹ and was mailed out to respondents in December 1993. A total of 4,544 were returned, of which 4,035 were usable.

Sample Selection

A sample of 7,600 households was randomly selected from an existing NFO panel¹² of approximately 550,000 households.

Sample Eligibility

The sample was selected based on the following screening criteria: To be eligible for the 1994 survey, respondents had to be employed but could not be members of any of the following groups: teachers, health professionals, local, state or federal government employees, members of the armed forces, students, or self-employed individuals.

Confidentiality

Employees were assured that their individual responses to all survey questions would be held in confidence.

Response Rate

Of the total 7,600 surveys mailed out to respondents, 4,544 surveys were returned, representing a 60% response rate. Of those returned, 4,035 were found to be usable, resulting in a usable response rate of 53%.

“Don't Know” Response Option

Some questions included a “don't know” response option, and others did not. To maintain comparability across years, when we present data from 1994 in this report we do not include the “don't know” response in the calculations. There were no scaled strongly agree/strongly disagree questions in 1994.

¹¹ Because the 1994 survey was self-administered via paper survey, as opposed to the 2000, 2003, and 2005 surveys which were conducted by telephone, we cannot rule out the potential for differences in findings due to differences in survey format.

¹² Because the 1994 survey was conducted with a volunteer panel, we cannot rule out the potential for differences in findings between 1994 and 2000, 2003, 2005, and 2007 due to differences in the populations surveyed. See also the Limitations section which follows.

Data Analysis

Data reported in the 2005, 2003, 2000 NBES, and 1994 EAB were unweighted for analysis. Given the survey sampling methods used, we believed that our best estimate of the actual population statistics were the unweighted statistics derived from the survey samples. As noted previously, for the 2007 analysis, we weighted the results using the U.S. Current Population Survey and U.S. Census Bureau estimates from August 2007 as the benchmark.

Many of the analyses we present in the NBES 2007 are cross-tabulations of these weighted data. We examined significance using the chi-square and ANOVA statistics. The threshold for reporting relationships as statistically significant was set as $p < .05$.

Limitations of this Report

Methodological differences between the 1994 EAB survey and the four later NBES surveys (2000, 2003, 2005, and 2007) may account for some of the ethics trends we report.

As noted previously, the 1994 report was a written survey of employees who were randomly selected from an existing panel. In contrast, the 2007, 2005, 2003, and 2000 surveys were nationally representative telephone surveys of employees who were selected using a random-digit dialing procedure. It is possible that these differences impacted the comparative findings that we report involving the 1994 data.¹³

However, such comparisons represent only a fraction of the analyses contained in this report. The methodological differences between 1994 and the later surveys above would have no bearing on (1) the majority of internal analyses using only 2007 survey data; (2) comparisons between 2007, 2005, 2003, and 2000 survey data; or (3) any of the relationships between key ethics indicators and outcomes reported.

Fear of retaliation may have led some employees responding to the NBES to over-report positive ethics perceptions and under-report negative ones.

When talking to an unknown interviewer, we can speculate that employees risk more by candidly stating negative versus positive views on ethics in their organizations. If dissatisfied employees systematically under-reported negative perceptions — particularly on sensitive ethics questions, such as observed misconduct and pressure to compromise ethics standards — these 2007, 2005, 2003, and 2000 survey data may be biased in a positive direction. To reduce this possibility, interviewers assured employees of the confidentiality of their responses.

¹³ We should be clear that the methodology employed in the 2007, 2005, 2003 and 2000 surveys represents a substantial increase in rigor over the 1994 survey.

PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

Ethic Resource Center's 2007 National Business Ethics Survey

The following presents characteristics of respondents and their organizations from the 2007 National Business Ethics Survey (NBES). For purposes of comparison, similar data are also presented for the Ethic Resource Center's four previous national ethics surveys: the 2005 National Business Ethics Survey, the 2003 National Business Ethics Survey, the 2000 National Business Ethics Survey, and the 1994 Ethics in American Business Survey (EAB).¹⁴ In order to make data from all years as comparable as possible, we have excluded "don't know" responses and refusals to answer questions from the calculation of percentages.

Employment Sector	Employment Sector ¹⁵			
	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
For-profit	61%	69%	67%	67%
Government	22%	17%	16%	18%
Nonprofit	17%	14%	17%	14%

* $N(2000) = 1,058$; $N(2003) = 1,563$; $N(2005) = 3,020$; $N(2007) = 4,215$. Respondents who said "don't know" or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (4% in 2000; 3% in 2003; 8% in 2005; 6% in 2007).

¹⁴ Only a small number of comparable variables describing respondents' characteristics were collected in the 1994 EAB. These include: tenure, age, level of responsibility, and gender. However, the 1994 EAB categories for level of responsibility were so distinct as to make it incomparable to other years.

¹⁵ This question was not included in the 1994 EAB.

Number of Employees in Entire Organization Across Locations¹⁶

Entire survey

Number of employees in organization	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
2 to 24	17%	20%	23%	18%
25 to 99	14%	15%	16%	15%
100 to 499	19%	18%	15%	18%
500 to 1,999	17%	14%	10%	13%
2,000 to 9,999	14%	13%	13%	15%
10,000 or over				
(10,000 to 100,000 for 2007)	12%	20%	23%	21%
100,000 and over	8%	--	--	--

*N(2000) = 1,517; N(2003) = 1,490; N(2005)=3,246; N(2007) = 4459. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (7% in 2000; 8% in 2003; 1% in 2005; 0% in 2007).

Business Only

Number of employees in organization	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
2 to 24	21%	24%	28%	22%
25 to 99	15%	16%	17%	16%
100 to 499	16%	16%	12%	16%
500 to 1,999	13%	12%	8%	11%
2,000 to 9,999	12%	11%	12%	13%
10,000 or over				
(10,000 to 100,000 for 2007)	14%	21%	23%	22%
100,000 and over	9%	--	--	--

*N(2000) = 996; N(2003) = 963; N(2005)=2,064; N(2007)=2,569. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (6% in 2000; 8% in 2003; 1% in 2005; 0.1% in 2007).

¹⁶ This question was not included in the 1994 EAB.

**Organization Has Experienced Merger, Acquisition, or Restructuring
During Last Two Years¹⁷**

Entire survey

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Yes	29%	25%	27%	39%
No	71%	75%	73%	61%

**N(2000) = 1,561; N(2003) = 1,532; N(2005)=3,122; N(2007) = 4462. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (4% in 2000; 5% in 2003; 5% in 2005; 4% in 2007).*

Business only

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Yes	34%	29%	30%	45%
No	66%	71%	70%	55%

**N(2000) = 1,020; N(2003) = 997; N(2005)=2,005; N(2007)=2,571. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (4% in 2000; 5% in 2003; 4% in 2005, 4% in 2007).*

¹⁷ This question was not included in the 1994 EAB.

Number of Years Employed in Current Organization

Entire survey

Tenure in Years	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey	1994 Survey
Less than a year	8%	10%	15%	13%	--
1 to 2 years	20%	20%	20%	20%	--
3 to 5 years	18%	23%	25%	22%	--
Less than 5 years ¹⁸	--	--	--	--	41%
6 to 10 years	19%	19%	15%	17%	27%
11 or more years	34%	28%	26%	28%	32%

*N(1994) = 3,884; N(2000) = 1,624; N(2003) = 1,583; N(2005) = 3,240; N(2007) = 4,413. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (0.2% in 1994; .3% in 2000; 2% in 2003; 2% in 2005; 1% in 2007).

Business only

Tenure in Years	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey	1994 Survey ¹⁹
Less than a year	9%	11%	17%	14%	--
1 to 2 years	23%	22%	21%	24%	--
3 to 5 years	20%	24%	25%	22%	--
Less than 5 years	--	--	--	--	41%
6 to 10 years	18%	18%	14%	16%	27%
11 or more years	30%	24%	23%	24%	32%

*N (1994) = 3,884; N (2000) = 1,058; N (2003) = 1,040; N (2005) = 2,071; N(2007)=2,548. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (0.2% in 1994; 0% in 2000; 1% in 2003; 1% in 2005; 1% in 2007).

¹⁸ The tenure response categories for the 1994 survey differed slightly from those in 2007, 2005, 2003, and 2000.

¹⁹ The 1994 EAB focused solely on business, omitting responses from teachers; health professionals; local, state, and federal government employees; individuals in the armed forces; students; and self-employed individuals. As a result, the 1994 “Entire survey” and “Business only” breakdowns are identical.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Employee Supervises or Manages Other People at Work²⁰

Entire survey

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Yes	48%	41%	44%	46%
No	52%	59%	56%	54%

**N(2000) = 1,627; N(2003) = 1,580; N(2005) = 3,242; N(2007) = 4,435 Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (.1% in 2000; 2% in 2003; 2% in 2005; 1% in 2007).*

Business only

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Yes	47%	42%	46%	46%
No	53%	58%	54%	54%

**N(2000) = 1,058; N(2003) = 1,038; N(2005) = 2,074; N(2007) = 2,555. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (0% in 2000; 1% in 2003; 1% in 2005; 1% in 2007).*

²⁰ This question was not included in the 1994 EAB.

Level of Responsibility²¹

Entire survey

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Senior Management	10%	8%	12%	8%
Middle Management	17%	13%	14%	15%
First Line Supervisor	15%	19%	17%	21%
Non-management	56%	61%	57%	55%
Other	2%	--	--	--

**N (2000) = 1,590; N (2003) = 1,543; N (2005) = 3,136; N (2007) = 4,378. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question about the level of management they occupy are not included in the calculation of percentages (2% in 2000; 2% in 2003; 5% in 2005; 2% in 2007).*

Business only

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Senior Management	10%	9%	14%	10%
Middle Management	17%	13%	14%	15%
First Line Supervisor	15%	18%	16%	19%
Non-management	56%	59%	56%	55%
Other	2%	--	--	--

**N (2000) = 1038; N (2003) = 1,008; N (2005) = 2,017; N (2007) = 2,525. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question about the level of management they occupy are not included in the calculation of percentages (2% in 2000; 4% in 2003; 3% in 2005; 2% in 2007).*

²¹ Columns do not add up to 100% because some respondents who said that they do supervise or manage people in the initial question about management level said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question when subsequently asked which management level they occupy. However, the 1994 EAB categories for level of responsibility were so distinct as to make it incomparable to other years.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Job Function²²

Entire survey

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Professional/Technical	49%	50%	48%	51%
Administrative/Clerical	14%	17%	17%	18%
Manual Labor	7%	18%	--	--
Skilled Labor	12%	--	--	--
Other	19%	15%	34%	31%

*N(2000) = 874; N(2003) = 872; N(2005)=3,188; N(2007) = 4,414. Respondents who said "don't know" or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (1% in 2000; 3% in 2003; 3% in 2005; 1% in 2007).

Business only

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Professional/Technical	44%	47%	46%	50%
Administrative/Clerical	13%	17%	16%	17%
Manual Labor	8%	21%	--	--
Skilled laborer	14%	--	--	--
Other	22%	15%	38%	33%

*N(2000) = 571; N(2003) = 560; N(2005) =2,033; N(2007) =2,539. Respondents who said "don't know" or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (0.3% in 2000; 1% in 2003; 3% in 2005; 1% in 2007).

²² This question was not included in the 1994 EAB. In 2000, only non-managers were asked about their job function whereas, in 2003, 2005, and 2007, every respondent was asked to identify his/her job function.

Ethnicity²³

Entire survey

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey
White	70%	80%
African American/Black	11%	10%
Hispanic/Latino	13%	5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2%	2%
All other ethnic groups	3%	4%

**N(2005) = 3,166; N(2007) = 4,374 Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (4% in 2005; 2% in 2007).*

Business only

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey
White	73%	81%
African American/Black	9%	9%
Hispanic/Latino	13%	5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3%	2%
All other ethnic groups	2%	4%

**N(2005) = 2,029; N(2007) = 2,514. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (3% in 2005; 2% in 2007).*

²³ This question was not included in the 1994 EAB. The ethnicity question was asked in different ways in 2007, 2005, 2003, and 2000, so we have chosen to present only responses for 2005 and 2007. In 2007, two ethnicity questions were asked. The first choice was an option to select between being Hispanic or not, and the second question asked to choose a specific ethnicity group from the list. Whoever reported Hispanic was recorded as Hispanic regardless of their second choice of ethnicity. In 2005 we had only one ethnicity question.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Highest Level of Education Completed²⁴

Entire survey

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Less than high school graduate	3%	11%	10%	10%
High school graduate	20%	30%	30%	30%
At least two full years of college	26%	28%	28%	28%
Technical school degree or certificate	9%	--	--	--
Bachelor's degree	25%	19%	20%	19%
Postgraduate degree	17%	13%	11%	12%

*N(2000) = 1,620; N(2003) = 1,572; N(2005) = 3,210; N(2007) = 4,427. Respondents who said "don't know" or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (1% in 2000; 3% in 2003; 3% in 2005; 1% in 2007).

Business only

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Less than high school graduate	3%	12%	12%	10%
High school graduate	23%	33%	32%	35%
At least two full years of college	27%	30%	31%	29%
Technical school degree or certificate	10%	--	--	--
Bachelor's degree	25%	18%	19%	19%
Postgraduate degree	12%	8%	7%	7%

*N(2000) = 1,054; N(2003) = 1,035; N(2005) = 2,056; N(2007) = 2,549. Respondents who said "don't know" or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (0.4% in 2000; 1% in 2003; 2% in 2005, 1% in 2007).

²⁴ This question was not included in the 1994 EAB.

Membership in Union, Guild, or Collective Bargaining Agreement²⁵

Entire survey

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Yes	20%	15%	15%	19%
No	80%	85%	85%	81%

**N(2000) = 1,604; N(2003) = 1,614; N(2005) = 3,190 N(2007) = 4387. Respondents who said "don't know" or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (2% in 2000; 3% in 2003; 3% in 2005; 2% in 2007).*

Business only

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey
Yes	12%	10%	9%	12%
No	88%	90%	91%	88%

**N(2000) = 1,040; N(2003) = 1,047; N(2005) = 2,043 N(2007) = 2,528. Respondents who said "don't know" or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (2% in 2000; 1% in 2003; 2% in 2005; 2% in 2007).*

²⁵ This question was not included in the 1994 EAB.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Age²⁶

Entire survey

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey	1994 Survey
18 to 30 years old	22%	28%	29%	28%	29%
31 to 45 years old	31%	31%	31%	30%	33%
46 to 64 years old	41%	36%	37%	38%	39%
65 years or older	6%	4%	3%	3%	--

*N(1994) = 3,904; N(2000) = 1,620; N(2003) = 1,571; N(2005) = 3,155 N(2007) = 4,305. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (0% in 1994; 1% in 2000; 3% in 2003; 4% in 2005; 4% in 2007).

Business only

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey	1994 Survey ²⁷
18 to 30 years old	24%	31%	32%	30%	29%
31 to 45 years old	32%	33%	30%	32%	33%
46 to 64 years old	38%	33%	35%	34%	39%
65 years or older	6%	4%	3%	4%	--

*N(1994) = 3,904; N(2000) = 1,053; N(2003) = 1,036; N(2005) = 2,022; N(2007)=2,482. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (0% in 1994; 1% in 2000; 1% in 2003; 3% in 2005; 4% in 2007).

²⁶ In the 1994 EAB, the age categories were “less than 30” and “30 to 45,” not “31 to 45.” Also, the highest category was “46 and older,” so there is no “65 years or older” category.

²⁷ The 1994 EAB focused solely on business, omitting responses from teachers; health professionals; local, state, and federal government employees; individuals in the armed forces; students; and self-employed individuals. As a result, the 1994 “Entire survey” and “Business only” breakdowns are identical. Also, in this survey, the age categories were “less than 30” and “30 to 45,” not “31 to 45.” Also, the highest category was “46 and older,” so there is no “65 years or older” category.

Gender

Entire survey

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey	1994 Survey
Male	54%	57%	45%	44%	41%
Female	46%	43%	55%	56%	59%

**N(1994) = 3,904; N(2000) = 1,629; N(2003) = 1,614; N(2005) = 3,284; N(2007) = 4,462. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (0% in 1994; 0% in 2000; 0% in 2003; .2% in 2005; 0% in 2007).*

Business only

Response	2007 Survey	2005 Survey	2003 Survey	2000 Survey	1994 Survey ²⁸
Male	62%	50%	48%	50%	41%
Female	38%	50%	52%	50%	59%

**N(1994) = 3,904; N(2000) = 1,058; N(2003) = 1,047; N(2005) = 1,869; N(2007) = 2,571. Respondents who said “don’t know” or refused to answer the question are not included in the calculation of percentages (0% in 1994; 0% in 2000; 0% in 2003; 0% in 2005; 0% in 2007).*

²⁸ The 1994 EAB focused solely on business, omitting responses from teachers; health professionals; local, state, and federal government employees; individuals in the armed forces; students; and self-employed individuals. As a result, the 1994 “Entire survey” and “Business only” breakdowns are identical.



ETHICS
RESOURCE
CENTER

For more information, please contact:

Ethics Resource Center
2345 Crystal Drive, Suite 201
Arlington, VA 22202
USA

Telephone: 800.777.1285
703.647.2185

FAX: 703.647.2180

Website: <http://www.ethics.org>

Email: ethics@ethics.org