



## THE DIFFERENCE IN WORK ETHIC AND PERSONALITY BETWEEN SOVIET AND INDEPENDENCE GENERATIONS IN UZBEKISTAN DURING THE TRANSITION PERIOD\*

Nargiza USMANOVA\*\*

Yasemin BAL\*\*\*

### Abstract

The purpose of this study is to compare the difference in work ethic and personality between the soviet and independence generations in Uzbekistan during the transition period. For the research purposes employees were divided into two groups of generations. The first group was the, so called "USSR generation" or "Soviet generation" or "elder generation", people who were born before 1984, raised, educated, and worked during the post Soviet Union. The second group was the, so called "Independence generation" or "young generation", people who were born after 1984, raised, educated, and working after the collapse of the USSR and the Independence of the Republic of Uzbekistan in September 1991. The research population consists of 240 employees working in the public and private sector of Uzbekistan. Two generations have answered the questionnaire about work ethic, personality and the demographic valuables. The research results were analyzed using SPSS 20.0 statistical program. Frequency analysis, descriptive statistics analysis, normality test, Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis, Spearman's rank correlation analysis, Mann-Whitney U test and Fisher r-to-z transformation were used during the data analysis. The results of the research study revealed there is no statistically significant difference in any of four components of Work Ethic (hard work, non-leisure, independence and asceticism) between generations. However, the results showed that Extraversion and Openness is significantly higher in the younger generation than in the older generation group.

**Keywords:** Work ethic, Personality, Generations, Transition Period, Uzbekistan.

### 1. WORK ETHIC

Work Ethic is one such value which workers hold that guides their actions and performance at the workplace. It is a way of thinking, providing beliefs and goals of life related to work and to other individuals at work (Rogers, 1978). According to Weber, "work is a central facet of life". It is a responsibility that people should work hard. It is also a balanced approach to life that requires good time planning (Weber, 1958). Work ethic one holds is relatively stable over time. Even though different scholars have given different conceptualizations to work value and ethic, most of them do agree that values one holds are developed through the influences of culture, society, and personality and they are relatively stable over time (Beyer, 1981); (Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins., 1989); (Payne, 1980). Value does not correspond to particular objects or situations so it is more consistent across time and circumstances compared to other more specific constructs such as goals or needs (Eagly & Chaiken, 2007). Further, employees do not work just for gaining necessities for life. They value work itself. The work-oriented values employees intrinsically follow are the work ethic that they hold to guide their behavior at work (Arslan, 2001); (Miller, Woehr, & Hudspeth, 2002).

#### 1.1. Dimensions of Work Ethic

There is no clear report on the actual dimensions of the Work Ethic; however, many researchers suggested their own dimensions of work ethic. Work ethic is a seven-dimensional construct in accordance with the formulation offered by Miller, Woehr, and Hudspeth (2002). The first two dimensions consider the significance of work, work for work itself, and the importance of hard work.

\* Bu çalışma, Nargiza USMANOVA'nın Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Yüksek Lisans Programı'nda tamamlamış olduğu yüksek lisans tezinden üretilmiştir.

\*\* Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, nargizausmanova@yahoo.com

\*\*\* Doç. Dr., Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, yaseminmutluay@gmail.com



**Table 1: Dimensions of Work Ethic**

Work Ethic Dimensions	Descriptions of the Dimensions
Centrality of Work	Centrality of work is the extent to which job-related actions are a daily element of individual's everyday life. And it is the one's belief in work for work's sake and the significance of work.
Hard Work	Hard work is the conviction that hard work brings the desired results. Hard work is the only way to gain what they expect from their jobs thus employees work hard to achieve success at work.
Self-Reliance	Self-reliance stresses not depending on other people for your results in life and the pursuit of independence in your everyday work. A worker who has high work ethic may have a preference to work by him/herself and does not ask for help from others at work.
Leisure	Avoiding leisure is the extent to which people are averse to leisure-related / non-working activities. Workers who have a high work ethic waste less time in leisure-related / non-working activity, since these actions do not assist them to succeed on the job.
Morality/Ethics	Living a correct life, believing in a fair and ethical existence is what morality highlights. Employees who have high work morality are to consider the importance of treating others the way they want to be treated and they usually do not do things that are in opposition to their values.
Delay of Gratification	Delay of gratification is the willingness to wait for the potential (sometimes greater) incentive instead of the immediate reward. Often rewards, from employee's point of view, are not something physical but the feeling of appreciation for and success at the workplace.
Wasted Time	Active and efficient use of time is the principles of the avoidance of wasting time. An employee with a high work ethic mainly focuses on work, responsibly spends more time on work-related behaviors than others and uses time wisely to achieve success at workplace.

Source: Miller, M. J., Woehr, D. J., & Hudspeth, N. (2002). **The meaning and measurement of work ethic: Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional inventory**, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* # 60. , 3:451-89.

Also, Blau and Ryan (1997) suggested four dimensions, including hard work, nonleisure, independence, and asceticism. In this research work, these four dimensions will be used in order to identify the level of work ethic in both generations in Uzbekistan.

### 1.2. Soviet Work Ethic

In the Soviet Union, it has been assumed that there is an informal agreement between the employer and the employee: "They pretend to pay us, we pretend to work". A market system and differentiated reward are necessary conditions for efficient work and economic development and it is a consensus which was developed in the West and East, among many socialists and communists as well as capitalists. Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and other Communist states were characterized as a people with low work ethic, ineffective work, absenteeism, and alcoholism. It is generally accepted that a basic cause for the lack of efficiency is low payment and lack of motivation. The peoples of the Soviet Union have gone through 70 years of a discouragement system, of developing responses to avoid the demands of their rulers. A work-avoidance tradition is really hard to change (Lipset M. , 1992). Certainly, Soviet work attitudes had deep and difficult cultural base prior the twentieth century. "Rabota", the word "work" itself, has close etymological bonds to slavery. Labor was seen as a needful evil, of instrumental value at best, to be escaped and postponed, and then finished as fast as possible. "Work is not a wolf; it will not run away into the forest" is an old Soviet/Russian saying. While unfazed by a task's difficulty, hazards, or hardships, the Russian worker was given to neither accuracy nor promptness. Soviet workers suffered a low standard of living that is why it was commonly accepted that in return they obtained the right to have sloppy work "khaltura" (Pereira & Pereira, 2003). It was believed that the whole problem is financial, that you need only change the system, situation and people will begin to work enthusiastically and properly. The rise of communism in the 20th century has led to the standardization and introduction of limitations on the liberty of thought, labor incentive, national cultures, traditions and religions.

### 1.3. Work Ethic in Uzbekistan

The people of Uzbekistan can be considered hard working. Psychologists and sociologists have found that Uzbeks are good to perform their professional duties, tolerate the hardships and privations of life, are very sensitive to colleagues estimated, and are afraid of rumors about their low diligence or lack of



professional competence. Uzbekistan is a former Soviet Union country therefore the western work ethic is still being learned after decades of an authority and planned economy (Doing Business in Uzbekistan). The majority of work ethic studies have been conducted in developed market economies, where, socio-economic institutions and environments are fairly stable, thus the effect of time (an additional year) would be small. This is not surprising. Regarding to that feature, this study will be a unique opportunity to study work ethic between generations, where the socio-economic situation changed dramatically and impacted on people's lives radically. The change was very extreme, and it influenced many aspects of people's lives and their way of thinking.

## 2. GENERATIONS

Term "generation" means has various definitions according to the researchers and linguists. Many defines generation as a group of people born within the same time and who share same values, attitudes shaped by their cultural environment, as well as important historical events that occurred during that time (Leiter, Jackson, & Shaughnessy, 2009). In case of Uzbekistan, two different generations were formed due to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the disappearance of the whole country from the world map, change of regimes and economic situation. People's lives were divided into before and after the Independence Day. During the Soviet period, the parents of today's youth were brought up in an environment that shaped them according to the so-called "Moral Code of Communism" (Ziyaeva, 2006). The author believes that there is nothing wrong with the very idea of communism. On the contrary, communism is a concern about each and every member of society, their prosperity, equality and unity. But as we know the world is not perfect and people are not as well. Society cannot be fitted in a frame, prohibited to live in grand style, forced to help the needy and work hard. Personality is a complex concept, as a life itself. In this sense and at the moment, democracy and capitalism are more suited to the human nature, rather than socialism or communism. People are different, have different needs, different ideas of a good life, beauty and happiness. Ideally the society should come to communism and socialism, but it should be a natural process of the development of society, but not something that should be forced. One cannot force people for income equality, sameness of the goals, dreams and needs. Some developed countries in Europe, are already undergone the significant evolution, rejected Marxism as the only ideological basis and developed a modern social democracy. Also, we have a quite successful sample of Communist China, this country have mixed communism with capitalism. So, the 'devil' is not as terrible as he is painted. Often 'how' is more important than 'what'. But in those years propaganda of Soviet principles was dynamic everywhere – in secondary schools and universities, on television programs, and in the most books, magazines and periodicals. Even though an education was connected to the national ideas, the quality of education was much higher than that of the education which is currently provided to the youth of Uzbekistan (Ziyaeva, 2006).

The post-soviet generation, whose experience took place after the collapse of the Soviet Union, has now started professional life. Many of them are the kids of Soviet generation. In general western countries fail to understand this new generation, but they are very much like many of their peers around the world. They are interested in global trends and use the Internet nearly as frequently as their western friends (Rojansky, 2011). According to Keldiyarova et al. modern Uzbekistan today is one of the youngest sovereign states among the former Soviet Union countries, since the youth is 64% of the representatives of the total population. There are distinctive features of the young generation of Uzbekistan; they have become more mobile, focused on themselves and their interests. They enjoy more freedoms and have more choices available to them than their predecessors (Ziyaeva, 2006), but that does not mean that they are free from a new propaganda, unwritten codes and rules. Sociological surveys were carried out by the "Ijtimoiy Fikr" center: "Youth of Uzbekistan at the beginning of the XXI century: social orientations and vision for the future". Survey population consisted of 50% of boys and 49.3% of girls. The study found that there are problems among young people, mostly related to education (contract form), advance training (43.0%) as well as mastery of specific professions (17.5%) and achievement of civic position (Keldiyarova, Temirova, Temirov, & Temirova, 2014). There is also an obvious apathy among those who is going to apply for the higher education, studying at one of the universities or has graduated, has to face the "real world" and find a job. Pervasive corruption is not very appealing to the most of young generation, especially to those who has an experience of studying abroad (Ziyaeva, 2006). At the same time, according to another survey carried by the same center in 2015, the faith in the great future among population of Uzbekistan has reached as high as 98,2% (Keldiyarova, Temirova, Temirov, & Temirova, 2014).

The paradox of the current generation is that, despite the many difficulties and hardships, people stubbornly believe in a brighter future. Even if the situation is not easy now, people believe that everything will change for the better in the near future, they just need to wait. Looks like people get used to live in the



future, not at the present. The young generation is actively inspired that they are the most free and prosperous generation over the last century. Because the goal of this research is to compare whether employees from the 'old' and 'new' economic regimes have the same or different work ethic, two age categories (generations) were created. The older generation with employees born before 1984 (until 31, December, 1983) who had received training and worked in the former socialist economy and continue to work in the 'new' economic environment. The younger generation with employees born on and after 1984 (from 1, January, 1984), who received training and worked in the emerging market-oriented economy. This is one of the first studies to provide the evidence of generational differences in the work ethic in Uzbekistan. In addition, this is the first study to evaluate the measurement equivalence of a work ethic inventory or any other work related individual difference construct across generation.

### 3. PERSONALITY

#### 3.1. The Concept of Personality

The term "personality" comes from the Latin word "person," which means (1) a mask used by theater players to represent their character and personality in the play; (2) genuine identity, which consist of its inner aims, feelings, behavior and dreams (Chan, 1996). Origins of the trait model of personality can be linked to Gordon Allport (1937). According to Allport, possible traits that might be used to explain a person's personality are almost an unlimited quantity. He believed personality is something true within a person that leads to trait behavior and thought. The trait approach emphasizes on empirical rather than medical examinations, at times referred to as a dispositional approach and explains behaviors as actual aspects of personality in explanatory terms (e.g., "impulsive", "assertive"). He states that personality is "a dynamic organization within the individual of those psychological systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment". The next trait theorists reviewed personality differences adequately reliable to facilitate recognition of a comparatively little number of broadly applicable descriptive traits (Cattell, 1943). This ultimately led to the evolution of personality trait models such as the "Big Five".

#### 3.2. Big Five (The Five-Factor Model)

The Big Five model of personality is currently one of the most widely used frameworks for studying the human personality construct (Goldberg L. R., 1993); (Parks & Guay, 2009). This framework describes personality as comprising of five global trait domains: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness (McCrae & John, 1992).

Table 2: Big Five Traits

Trait Name	Description
<i>Extraversion</i>	Extraversion describes the extent to which individuals are outgoing, socially confident, and energetic.
<i>Agreeableness</i>	Agreeableness relates to one's levels of passivity, empathy, and consideration for others.
<i>Conscientiousness</i>	Conscientiousness includes traits such as responsibility, self-discipline, and orderliness.
<i>Neuroticism</i>	Neuroticism covers the extent to which an individual is vulnerable, suspicious, and emotionally unstable.
<i>Openness</i>	Openness describes one's levels of abstract thinking, creativity, and openness to ideas.

Source: Hamman, C. M. (2011). *An Exploration of New Zealand Work Value Orientations, Gender, and Personality Traits*. Manawatu, New Zealand: Psychology at Massey University

### 4. METHOD

#### 4.1. Population and Sample

The participants of this study were both the administrative personnel working in Uzbekistan's public and private organizations and their direct supervisors. All participants were white-collar employees who worked in the office. To achieve the purposes of the study, the questionnaires were distributed to a total of 360 employees and 240 of them completed it.

#### 4.2. Instrumentation

Due to employer concerns regarding privacy and confidentiality, the identification of workers was not disclosed. The questions and sections were combined into a single questionnaire. The first part of the survey gathered demographic information: (a) gender, (b) year of birth, (c) education, (d) marital status, (e)



years of work experience, (f) position. Three additional parts of the survey measured the participants score on (a) the work ethic, (b) personality. A 44-item personality scale was measured using John, Naumann and Soto's (2008) The Big Five Inventory and its five factors (dimensions): Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness. An 18-work ethic items were measured using Blau and Ryan's (1997) work values scale and its four dimensions: hard work, nonleisure, independence and asceticism. All construct measures used a five-point Likert response scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree, except for variables that were otherwise indicated.

#### 4.3. Research Model

In this research we plan to investigate the differences between two different generations of Uzbekistan in work ethic and personality traits. There is a lack of previous researches conducted in the post soviet union countries, especially in Uzbekistan and therefore we cannot be sure on upcoming outcomes. In order to evaluate the difference of work ethic and personality traits (independent variables) on the two different generations (dependent variable), 44-item personality scale were measured using John, Naumann and Soto's (2008) The Big Five Inventory and 18 work ethics items were measured using Blau and Ryan's (1997) Work Values Scale. This is a quasi-experimental design with two matched groups. Using this design it is possible to see differences between groups. The questionnaire was distributed among employees of different private and state companies in three biggest cities of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Samarkand and Bukhara and they were administered the 44 items The Big Five Inventory (John O. P., 2008) and 18-work ethic items Work Values Scale (Blau & Ryan, 1997). All the measures were translated into Russian by the author.

#### 4.4. Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using the "SPSS 20.0" program. The data was subjected to frequency analysis, descriptive statistics analysis, normality test, Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis, Spearman's rank correlation analysis, Mann-Whitney U test and Fisher r-to-z transformation were used.

#### 4.5. Results

##### 4.5.1. Reliability Analysis

Reliability analysis was examined using Cronbach's Alpha method. Cronbach's Alpha value is tied to the question of correlation between compliance. Cronbach's Alpha value indicates the total level of reliability factor of the questions below. According to the Cronbach's Alpha values of scale, 0.70 or higher is considered to be reliable. Reliability test results for the Work Ethic questionnaire scale Hard work is  $\alpha = 0.94$ , Nonleisure is  $\alpha = 0.80$ , Independence is  $\alpha = 0.84$ , Asceticism is  $\alpha = 0.71$ , and the reliability test results for Big Five Personality inventory scales are: Extraversion  $\alpha = 0.73$ , Agreeableness  $\alpha = 0.75$ , Conscientiousness  $\alpha = 0.71$ , Neuroticism  $\alpha = 0.72$ , and Openness  $\alpha = 0.78$ . For both, Work Ethic and the Big Five Personality Inventory questionnaires, Cronbach's Alpha values are acceptable.

##### 4.5.2. Normality Test Analysis

First of all normality distributions were examined with Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality with Lilliefors Significance Correction, and it was found that data of all scales (for older and younger generation separately) do not have a normal distribution because the level of significance (p) in all cases is lower than .01 or .05. Therefore, the non-parametric test for analysis of difference was used for further data analysis.

##### 4.5.3. Hypothesizes and Analysis Results

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to examine the differences in Work Ethic between the older and younger generation groups.

Table 3: Descriptive and Inferential Statistics of Scales of Work Ethic for old and young generation group

	Old generation group (N = 120)		Young generation group (N = 120)		Mann-Whitney U test	sig. (2-tailed)
	Mdn	SD	Mdn	SD		
<i>Work ethic scales</i>						
Hard work	3.83	1.05	3.67	0.92	6612.50 <sup>NS</sup>	.27
Nonleisure	3.20	0.89	3.20	0.85	6804.50 <sup>NS</sup>	.46
Independence	3.63	0.97	3.50	0.99	6428.00 <sup>NS</sup>	.15
Asceticism	3.33	0.92	3.00	0.96	6243.50 <sup>NS</sup>	.07

p > .05



**H1. There is a difference in work ethic between the older and young generations.**

The differences between groups in work ethic scales were tested. According to the Mann-Whitney U test there are no statistically significant differences between the older and younger generation in any of the four scales of Work Ethic because the level of significance (p) in all cases was higher than .05.

**H2. There is a difference in personality traits between the older and young generation.**

The differences between groups in the Big Five scales were tested. According to the Mann-Whitney U test statistically significant differences between the older and younger generations were found in two of the five scales of the Big Five because in these scales the level of significance (p) was lower than .05.

**Table 4: Descriptive and Inferential Statistics of Scales Big Five Personality inventory for old and young generation group**

	Old generation group (N = 120)		Young generation group (N = 120)		Mann-Whitney U test	sig. (2-tailed)
	Mdn	SD	Mdn	SD		
<i>Big Five scales</i>						
Extraversion	3.38	0.64	3.50	0.52	6118.00*	.04
Agreeableness	3.33	0.56	3.33	0.56	6915.50 <sup>NS</sup>	.59
Conscientiousness	3.44	0.53	3.44	0.45	7107.00 <sup>NS</sup>	.86
Neuroticism	3.00	0.64	3.00	0.67	7179.50 <sup>NS</sup>	.97
Openness	3.50	0.69	3.60	0.57	5926.50*	.02

Note. \*p < .05; <sup>NS</sup>p > .05

Spearman's rank correlations among the Work Ethic scales and the Big Five inventory scales were conducted separately for each group. In both groups, most of the correlations among measurements are statistically significant (see Table 14). Statistically significant correlation coefficients vary in the range from .19 to .62, p < .05 in the older generation group and in the range from .22 to .73, p < .05 in the younger generation group.

**H3. There is a difference in the relationship between work ethic and personality traits in the older and younger generations.**

**Table 5: Work Ethic scale Spearman's rank correlations with Big Five inventory scales in older and younger generation groups**

	Older generation group (N = 120)				Younger generation group (N = 120)			
	Hard work	Non leisure	Independe nce	Asceticism	Hard work	Non leisure	Independe nce	Asceticism
<i>Big Five scales</i>								
Extraversion	.57**	.15	.48**	.13	.63**	.17	.66**	.30**
Agreeableness	.48**	.21*	.42**	.17	.49**	.26**	.47**	.24**
Conscientiousness	.43**	.19*	.31**	.20*	.52**	.14	.41**	.22*
Neuroticism	.56**	.11	.62**	.26**	.54**	.25**	.61**	.35**
Openness	.65**	-.03	.61**	.03	.66**	.12	.73**	.29**

Note. \*\*p < .01; \*p < .05

The comparison of correlation coefficients in the two samples converting them to z values and testing  $H_0: \rho_{x1y1} = \rho_{x2y2}$  shows that the z values vary in range from -2.06 to 0.39. Some differences in the relationship between work ethic and personality traits in the older and younger generation groups were reported. Statistically significant differences (p < .05) in correlation coefficients of the older generation and younger generation group were found in Extraversion vs. Independence (z = -2.06, p < .05), Openness vs. Independence (z = -1.68, p < .05 and Openness vs. Asceticism (z = -2.05, p < .05). Respectively, extraversion is related to independence, openness is related to independence and openness is related to asceticism in a different way in the older generation group and in the younger generation group.

In the younger generation group there is a stronger correlation (rs = .66, p < .01) between extraversion and independence than in the older generation (rs = .48, p < .01), in other words, in the younger group there is a stronger correlation - the higher the extraversion, the higher the independence.

In the younger generation group there is a stronger correlation (rs = .73, p < .01) between openness and independence than in the older generation (rs = .61, p < .01), in other words, in the younger group there is a stronger correlation - the higher the openness, the higher the independence.

In the younger generation group there is a correlation (rs = .29, p < .01) between openness and asceticism, but no significant relationship between openness and asceticism was found in the older



generation ( $r_s = .03, p > .05$ ), in other words, only in the younger group is there a correlation- the higher the openness, the higher the asceticism.

Spearman's rank correlations among Work Ethic scales and Gender, Work experience and Education level were conducted separately for each group. In both groups most of the correlations among measurements are not statistically significant (see Table 15).

**Table 6: Gender, work experience and education level Spearman's rank correlations with Big Five inventory scale in older and younger generation groups**

	Older generation group (N = 120)			Younger generation group (N = 120)		
	Gender	Work experience	Education level <sup>a</sup>	Gender	Work experience	Education level <sup>a</sup>
<i>Work ethic scales</i>						
Hard work	.09	-.32**	-.14	.08	-.17	-.16
Nonleisure	.02	-.05	-.11	-.03	-.11	0
Independence	-.02	-.42**	-.17	.11	-.28**	-.18*
Asceticism	-.07	-.07	-.22*	-.03	-.08	-.07

Note. \*\* $p < .01$ ; \* $p < .05$ ; <sup>a</sup> education level was recorded from 4 into 2 categories (1 – High school and BA; 2 – MA and PhD).

**H4. There is a difference in the relationship between work ethic and demographic variables in the older and younger generation.**

The comparison of the correlation coefficients in two samples converting them to z values and testing  $H_0: \rho_{x_1y_1} = \rho_{x_2y_2}$  shows that the z values vary in range from -1.22 to 0.46. In general, there are no statistically significant differences between the correlation coefficients of the older and younger generation groups.

**5. CONCLUSION**

Work ethic and personality features are very valuable factors in evaluating an employee's performance as well as in the recruitment, hiring, firing and promoting processes in most contemporary organizations around the globe. Such organizations are constantly seeking for employees with excellent work ethic and reliable personality qualities, in order to improve company's performance and productivity as well as make personnel turnover less intense. In the case of Uzbekistan, managers would be able to better evaluate and communicate with the representatives of different generations and their work ethic values and personality types, and thereby improve the company's performance and corporate culture. The country's significant social and economic change during the transition period may have influenced the people's worldview, personality and principles such as hard work and attitude towards work.

The objective of this research was to investigate the differences in work ethic and personality between two generations in Uzbekistan. We have asked several questions in order to find out that difference. The questions were tested and the following results were confirmed. Firstly, we asked whether there is any difference in work ethic between the older and younger generations. In order to evaluate the work ethic we tested four work ethic dimensions. We asked sub-questions and tested each of them as well. The Mann-Whitney U test did not show statistically significant differences in any of the four (hard work, non-leisure, independence and asceticism) scales of Work Ethic between the groups. As a result we assume that there is not any significant difference in work ethic between the older and younger generations of Uzbekistan.

Secondly, we asked whether there is any difference in personality between the older and young generations. Again, we asked sub-questions and tested each of the five personality traits (neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). The analysis revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the two generations in 2 out of 5 of the Big Five Personality inventory scales: Extraversion and Openness was statistically significantly higher in the younger generation group than in the older generation group.

The third question was trying to answer whether there is a difference in the relationship between work ethic and personality traits in the older and younger generation. Statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) in correlation coefficients of the older generation and the younger generation group were reported in



Extraversion vs. Independence ( $z = -2.06$ ,  $p < .05$ ), Openness vs. Independence ( $z = -1.68$ ,  $p < .05$  and Openness vs. Asceticism ( $z = -2.05$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

The fourth question was trying to answer whether there is any difference in work ethic scales and demographic valuables between the older and young generations. From the analysis results we can assume that work ethic between the older and younger generations did not in fact change and it remains the same as it was during the Soviet period. Despite the idea, that after the transition to the market economy, people's consciousness and attitude towards work should have been changed, in fact it has not. The reason for this could be a rooted mentality and an old attitude towards work from the Soviet periods or still insufficient legal or economic changes during the twenty-five years of independence of Uzbekistan. But as we see from the analysis, the country's significant social and economic change during the transition period has influenced to the people's personality. The younger generation become more outgoing, socially confident, energetic, and they are now better in abstract thinking, creativity, and more open to the new ideas than the older generation.

## REFERENCES

- Allport, G. Willard (1937). *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*. New York: NY: Henry Holt and Company.
- Arslan, Mahmut (2001). The Work Ethic Values of Protestant British, Catholic Irish and Muslim Turkish Managers. *Journal of Business Ethics* no 31, 4:321-39.
- Beyer, M. Janice (1981). *Ideologies, Values And Decision Making In Organizations*. In Handbook of Organization Design, ed. Paul C. Nystrom and William H. Starbuck. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blau, Gary, & Ryan, Jack (1997). On Measuring Work Ethic: A Neglected Work Commitment Facet. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol 51, 435-448.
- Blood, Milton (1969). Work Values and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 33, 456-459.
- Bond, Michael; Nakazato, Hiroaki & Shiraiishi, Daisuke (1975). Universality and Distinctiveness in Dimensions Of Japanese Person Perception. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 6,346-355.
- Cattell, B. Raymond (1943). The Description of Personality: Basic Traits Resolved into Clusters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 476-506.
- Chan, Y. T. (1996). *The Relationships between Demographic Data, Personality Traits and Intrinsic Motivations, Extrinsic Motivations - An Empirical Study of the Employees of Data Communication Institute*. MA Thesis, Hsinchu: Department of Management Science, National Chiao Tung University.
- Doing Business in Uzbekistan* (n.d.). Retrieved 10 02, 2016, from ASIABIZNEWS: <http://www.asiabiznews.net/project-contracts-tenders-rfp-rfq-resources/how-to-do-business-in/Uzbekistan.html#Work-Culture>
- Eagly, H. Alice & Chaiken, Shelly (2007). The Advantage of an Inclusive Definition of Attitude. *Social Cognition*, 25, no., 5: 582-602.
- Goldberg, Lewis (1993). The Structure of Phenotypic Personality Traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.
- Hamman, M. Chloé (2011). An Exploration of New Zealand Work Value Orientations, Gender, and Personality Traits. Manawatu, New Zealand: Psychology at Massey University.
- John, P. Oliver (2008). Paradigm Shift to the Integrative Big Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, And Conceptual Issues. R. W. O. P. John, *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, (s. pp. 114-158). New York: NY: Guilford Press.
- John, P. Oliver; Naumann, P. Laura & Soto, J. Christopher (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative big five trait taxonomy. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 3.2: 114-158.
- Keldiyarova, G., Temirova, E., Temirov, E., & Temirova, L. (2014). The Role of Youth in Modern Conditions of Development of Society, №15. *Young Scientist*, 225-227.
- Leiter, P. Michael; Jackson, J. Nichole & Shaughnessy, Krystelle (2009). Contrasting Burnout, Turnover Intention, Control. *Value Congruence and Knowledge Sharing Between Baby Boomers and Generation X. Nursing Management*, 17(1):100-9
- Lipset, Martin (1992). *The Work Ethic, Then and Now*. George Mason University.
- McCrae, R. Robert (1989). *Why I Advocate the Five-factor Model: Joint Factor Analyses of the NEO-PI with Other Instruments*. C. N. Buss DM, *Personality Psychology: Recent Trends and Emerging Directions*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- McCrae, R. Robert; Costa, Paul & Del Pilar, H. Gregorio (1998). Cross-cultural Assessment of the Five-Factor Model: The revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 171-188.
- McCrae, R. Robert; Costa, Paul & Busch, Catherine (1986). Evaluating Comprehensiveness in Personality Systems: The California Q-Set and the Five-factor Model. *Journal of Personality*, 54, 430-446.
- McCrae, R. Robert & John, P. Oliver (1992). An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model and Its Applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175-215.
- Meglino, M. Bruce; Ravlin, C. Elizabeth & Adkins, L. Cherly (1989). A Work Values Approach to Corporate Culture: A Field Test of the Value Congruence Process and Its Relationship to Individual Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, no., 3:424-23.
- Miller, J. Michael; Woehr, J. David & Hudspeth, Natasha (2002). The Meaning and Measurement of Work Ethic: Construction and Initial Validation of a Multidimensional Inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60, no., 3:451-89.
- Parks, Laura & Guay, P. Russell (2009). Personality, Values, and Motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 675-684.
- Payne, W. John (1980). Contingent Decision Behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92, no, 2:382-402.
- Pereira, N. G. O. & Pereira, H. Linda (2003). *Work Ethics and the Collapse of the Soviet System*. Canadian Slavonic Papers.
- Rogers, T. Daniel (1978). *The Work Ethic in Industrial America, 1850-1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rojansky, Mathiew (2011). *Engaging the Post-Soviet Generation in Russia*. Retrieved August 5, 2016, from The National Interest: <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/engaging-the-post-soviet-generation-russia-6061>
- Weber, Max (1958). *The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit Of Capitalism*. Trans. T. Parsons, (Orig. pub. 1904-1905.), New York: Scribners.
- Ziyaeva, Diara (2006). *Changing Identities among Uzbek Youth: Transition from Regional to Socio-Economic Identities*. Generational Change and Leadership Succession in Uzbekistan, Washington D.C.: The National Bureau of Asian Research. (s. 5-6).