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1. Introduction

An introduction to the topic of this research is here presented. It begins with a background of the core subject; employer branding, and then a problem discussion that problematizes the chosen field is applied. The purpose of this study is presented in the end of the chapter.

1.1 Background

Employer branding denotes the activities directed towards influencing the opinion of a brand and it also signifies a company’s image as an employer. Backhaus and Tikoo (2004) describe the basic idea of employer branding as the action of combining traditional branding principles with the human resource department. As employer branding has developed, it has become an independent concept within the field of brand management and marketing, and is now a crucial part for companies who want to remain competitive (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004). Bach (2005) further emphasizes on the increase of action among brands, and how brands have become centralized in the field of marketing. He defines employer branding as a new and expanding phenomenon that has become popular in the field of human resources. This expanding phenomena stresses, according to Bach (2005) how a company’s brand correspond to potential and existing employees. According to Parmar (2014) employer branding aim to create an environment where the image of a company is an admirable place to work. The concept is to develop an emotional association with the best talents and by offer potential employees tangible benefits. Parmar (2014) means that the assurance and the fulfillment of employer branding enable the motivation, retention and attraction of the most suitable talents for the company.

Confirmed by Myrby (2015, today is the first time in the history that employers need to cope with four generations on the labor market. The definition of a generation is, according to Kupperschmidt (2000, p. 66): “a group of people or cohorts who share birth year and experiences as they move through time together, influencing and being influenced by a variety of critical factors”. She continue by explaining how a generation is divided by a five to seven years into the first wave, core group and last wave (Kupperschmidt, 2000). Characteristics and work values of generations is also shaped by events occurring during their lifetime (Dries, Pepermans & De Kerpel, 2008). Baby boomers are those who were born between 1946-1964 (Dries, Pepermans & De Kerpel,
Baby boomer’s work values indicate challenge, workaholism, criticism and innovativeness (Dries, Pepermans & De Kerpel, 2008). Generation X were born between 1961-1981 (Dries, Pepermans & De Kerpel, 2008; DeVange, 2015; Hays, 2015). Dries, Pepermans and De Kerpel (2008) and DeVange (2015) classify Generation X’s work values to be learning, curious, entrepreneurship, materialism and balance. The third generation, Millennials are born within early 1980’s to late 1990’s, and is often referred to as “digital natives” and they strive for values such as: balance, passion, learning, security and willingness to work are at their workplace (Dries, Pepermans & De Kerpel, 2008; Gayeski, 2015; Steinmetz, 2015).

Dries, Pepermans and De Kerpel (2008) explain that these generations are labeled by our society and the years they represent are not always consistent by researchers. Researchers have not yet determined the name of the newest generation. Both Steinmetz (2015) and Gale (2015) describe how they have been labeled iGeneration, App Generation, Homelanders, Founders, Plurals, but the most common used name for the new cohort is Generation Z. Generation Z are currently young adults in the age 21 or younger (Gale, 2015; Steinmetz, 2015; Myrby, 2015).

One of the most substantial challenges in the coming years are the huge number of retirements of Baby boomers and the replacements consisting of young individuals who will enter the workforce (Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman & Lance, 2010; Twenge, 2010; Gayeski, 2015). In order to effectively attract the new generation of people, organizations need to understand their work values and how they will distinguish from previous generation (Twenge et al., 2010). Ye (2015) explain that work values are the goals of what individuals pursue in their work and it is a direct influence on individual’s choice and abilities. Smola and Sutton (2002) classify work values as the individual's evaluative standards. Ye (2015) further state that work values predict what kind of attitude individuals have towards different work positions and work values differ from generation to generation and to individual to individual (Kowske et al., 2010; Ye, 2015; Jaskyte, 2014).

1.2 Problem discussion

According to Lyons et al. (2006) work values are something that is enduring but not immutable and it is learned early and persists fairly constantly over an individual's
lifetime. One of the earliest and most frequently used research have studied the most common work values. Elizur’s (1984) study bring up two of the most common work values; extrinsic (e.g. salary and job security) and intrinsic work values (e.g. motivations and challenges). More previous research focus on the altruistic values (e.g. contribution and helping people), status-associated values (e.g. skills, achievement and career) and on social values (e.g. good co-workers and leisure time) (Borg, 1990; Ros et al. 1999; Lyons, 2006).

Several scholars have emphasized on how work values differ between generations (Dries, Pepermans & De Kerpel; 2008; Kowske et al., 2010; Ye, 2015). However it is important to understand that work values can differ between individuals within the generation itself (Jaskyte, 2014). Balsamo, Lauriola, Saggino (2012) explain how the choice of major plays an important role in how people form their work values. They further state that specific patterns of students work values could be the explanation to what type of major they choose (Balsamo et al., 2012). Frieze, Olson, Murrell and Selvan (2006) claim that many researchers have reported that there are differences in work values concerning females/girls and men/boys. They continue stating that men are more likely to value being ambitious, being capable, receiving social recognition and having a sense of accomplishment than females (Frieze et al., 2006). Men have a sense to value self-expression whereas females value extrinsic work values. Frenze et al. (2006) also mention that men place more value on salary and the opportunity for promotions, while females place more value on having flexible hours and good co-workers. Jaskyte (2014) state that employees may choose a specific workplace based on the individual's needs, how it fits the individual's own personal values, and if the workplace provide benefits that are important to them. Since the work values influence the employee's activity and performance through attitudes and goals, it is vital to explore the differences within different groups of the generation in order to create a good person-environment fit, which will create effective human resource practices, provide job satisfaction and improving employee performance (Karl & Sutton, 1998).

Gale (2015) emphasize on how companies still are trying to comprehend the Millennials, meanwhile they are trying to retain Generation X and the Baby Boomers. Both Trees (2015) and DeVaney (2015) have acknowledged the same behaviour from companies. They argue that companies only aim to find new ways to attract and retain the best and most suitable employees from the Millennial generation (Trees, 2015;
DeVaney, 2015). Gale (2015) think companies should redirect their attention to Generation Z, which is rapidly emerging on the labour market. Gayeski (2015) claims it is too early to know how the new cohort will relate to their future workplace, but the problem also lies in that the relationship between work values and Generation Z is sparsely researched (Ye, 2015).

Twenge et al. (2010) and Jaskyte (2014) argue for how the empirical evidence of generational differences and individual differences in work values are terse. Twenge and colleagues further explain that much of the existing literature use non-empirical sources such as anecdotes or extrapolations established on different generation’s life experience and events; at best the research relies on an qualitative interview (e.g Steinmetz, Move over Millennials, 2016; Gale, Forget the Millennials, Are you ready on Generation Z?, 2015; Dupont, Move over Millennials - Here comes Generation Z, 2015) (Twenge et al., 2010). This indicates that there are a lack of scientific knowledge published about Generation Z. Due to this, a quantitative study will be completed in order to increase the awareness of which work values the new generation value and how they differ between different groups of Generation Z. This is essential for companies to know in order to be adapted and able to attract the most suitable employees.

1.3 Purpose
The purpose of this research is to explain how the work values differ within different groups of Generation Z.
2. Theoretical Framework

This chapter will present the foundation of this study: the theoretical framework. This chapter is centered on the different work value dimensions that is identified in the problem discussion; intrinsic, extrinsic, altruistic, status-associated and social (Lyons, 2006; Ros et al. 1999; Borg, 1990; Elizur, 1984). An explanation of these five common work values that scientific researchers’ have discussed up to now in scientific research based on precedent generations is presented here.

2.1 Intrinsic work values

Sengupta (2015) describes intrinsically oriented individual’s values with the terms; development, self-actualization, challenging projects and growth. Vanteenkiste et al. (2007) are consistent with Kasser and Ryan’s (1993) perception on intrinsic work values. Where they acknowledge the intrinsically individuals to those who develop and build meaningful relations in their workplace. Vanteenkiste et al. (2007) continue by describing employees reflecting intrinsic work values as having a natural desire to grow and develop. Intrinsic values is also associated with an increased well-being since their ambition to satisfy psychological needs such as competence and autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Intrinsic work values center on the process of work, the rewards that are intangible and reflects the inherent interest of the work. Such rewards could be the opportunity to be innovative and the given learning potential (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

2.2 Extrinsic work values

Extrinsically oriented individuals’ values with terms such as: power, focus on status, hierarchical positions and reward (Sengupta, 2015). Twenge et al. (2010) believe that extrinsic work values reward payments, material possessions and prestige. Extrinsic employees are perceived as pursuits of a career, status and power (Kasser & Ryan, 1993; Vanteenkiste et al., 2007). Work values that pursuits of career, status and power reflects extrinsic work values since the most important values most commonly lies within the personal esteem and self worth (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Carlson et al., (2000) argue for that employees with extrinsic work values promote negative experiences in the workplace, where the work takes over and affects the family-life. Extrinsically oriented employees have shown to be more satisfied in their workplace when they receive a higher income (Malka & Chatman, 2003).
2.3 Altruistic work values
Twenge et al. (2008) describes altruistic values as individuals who work to help others and get triggered by helping the society through their work. Altruistic work values involves the ambition to helping others while contributing to the society (Twenge et al., 2008). According to Lyons et al. (2006) the altruistic values are espoused by individuals who supports the public service. In other words, individuals who are stimulated to have a career within the public service. Individuals who share altruistic values are often morally compelled and are more motivated towards a job within the public sector even though the economic rewards are below the private sector (Lyons et al., 2006). Pursuant to Perry et al. (2010) the key motivation for individuals who work within the public sector is the extensive interest to serve the public. A study done by Frank and Lewis (2004) showed that employees with altruistic work values frequently valued helping others as well as making contributions to the society and where the private sector lacked these types of values. Lyons and colleagues’s (2006) findings confirms the importance of contributing to the society, it also showed that employees within the public sector honor the altruistic essence of their work and not the economic rewards or benefits of the work itself.

2.4 Status-associated work values
According to Ros et al. (1999) individuals that perfer status-associated work values value workplaces that gives people achievement, advancement, status, recognition, independence, but also makes them proud of working at a specific job. They further describe how these values makes people compare themselves with others and the aim is to achieve personal superiority (Ros et al., 1999). Cennamo and Gardner (2008) explain that if a person have a strong focus on hard work and achievements it may mean that they value status and extrinsic values such as; recognition for loyalty and commitment, and pursuant to Smola and Sutton (2002) these people have tendency to balance work and family.

2.5 Social work values
According to Lyons et al. (2006) and Twenge (2010) social values concern the relationship a person have with co-workers, supervisors, and other people, but it also
pertain other facets, such as: leisure time, nurturing/fun environment and work-life balance. If individuals are used to be assigned to group projects and presentations they are more likely to emphasize on the social aspects of work, such as preferring friendly co-workers or work in a fun environment (Lyons et al., 2003 cited in Ng et al., 2010; Lowe et al., 2008 cited in Ng et al., 2010). Johanson (2002) describes leisure as the opportunity for free time, vacation and freedom from supervision. A person who prefer leisure time strives to get a job which gives them more time for other things in their lives, makes them free from supervision by others, a job where they have more than two weeks vacation and a job with an easy pace where they can work slowly (Johnson, 2002). Strömberg and Karlsson (2009) state that a nourish and fun environment is characterized by humor and laughter, and will increase the quality of a individual’s work life. A workplace which enriches humour and “fun at work” will enhance and infuse energy and motivation to their employees (Strömberg & Karlsson, 2009).

Levenson (2010) emphasize on the facet “work-life balance”, which comprises the understanding of how people balance their job situation with their personal lives. He further discuss that the work-life balance considerations plays an vital role in people’s attitudes about jobs (Levenson, 2010). People’s attitudes will have an impact on their career path and what kind of jobs they choose. A central conflict is the work-family conflict, where the person need to balance work with its family and could it affect the choice of career or job. This conflict is very common, especially for women, since they have the primary responsibility of child fostering (Levenson, 2010). Levenson (2010) suggest that to be able to examine people’s work-life balance, one could simply observe a person’s family situation. Interpret by Zhang et al. (2007) work-life balance is determined on early events in a generation’s lifetime and out of that, they shape an attitude on how they balance their work with their personal life. There are two perspectives on how people view their work-life balance, either they “making a life” or “making a living”. The differences are that if people choose “making a life” they prioritize freedom, leisure and jobs that are less under supervision, while “making a living” means that people prefer working long hours and prioritize working (Zhang et al., 2007).
### 2.6 Theoretical summary

The researchers have compiled a summary table that shows which scientific author(s) that are specified on which indicator. The indicators belongs to a specific theory/category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic work values</strong></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td><em>Kasser and Ryan, 1993; Vanteenkiste et al., 2007; Sengupta, 2015.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td><em>Twenge et al., 2010.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrinsic work values</strong></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td><em>Sengupta, 2015.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status</td>
<td><em>Sengupta, 2015; Twenge et al., 2010.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career</td>
<td><em>Kasser &amp; Ryan, 1993; Vanteenkiste et al., 2007; Carlson et al., 2000.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Altruistic work values</strong></td>
<td>Help others</td>
<td><em>Frank and Lewis, 2004; Twenge et al., 2008.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribute to</td>
<td><em>Frank and Lewis, 2004; Perry et al., 2010.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status-associated work values</strong></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td><em>Ros et al., 1999; Smola and Sutton, 2002; Cennamo and Gardner, 2008.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>superiority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social work values</strong></td>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td><em>Johansson, 2002; Lyons et al., 2003 cited in Ng et al., 2010; Lowe et al, 2008 cited in Ng et al., 2010; Lyons et al. 2006; Strömberg and Karlsson, 2009; Twenge, 2010.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td><em>Lyons et al. 2006; Twenge, 2010.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td><em>Lyons et al. 2006; Zhang et al., 2007; McDonald and Hite, 2008; Levenson, 2010; Twenge, 2010.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.1 Theoretical summary [Own]*
3. Hypothesis & Conceptual model

What is already known is that work values differ within generations (Dries, Peppermans & De Kerpel, 2008; Deal, Altman & Rogelberg, 2010; Trees, 2015). It has come to the researchers knowledge that the different work values could differ between different groups of Generation Z. Through the three stated hypotheses (major, gender and year) the researchers will explain if they differ in work values.

3.1 Major hypothesis
Balsamo, Lauriola, Saggino (2012) explain how the choice of major plays an important role in how people form their work values. They further state that specific patterns of students work values could be the explanation to what type of major they choose (Balsamo et al., 2012).

H1: Depending on major individuals value different work values.

3.2 Gender Hypothesis
Frieze, Olson, Murrell and Selvan (2006) claim that many researchers have reported that there are differences in work values concerning females/girls and men/boys. They continue stating that men are more likely to value being ambitious, being capable, receiving social recognition and having a sense of accomplishment than females (Frieze et al., 2006). Men have a sense to value self-expression whereas females value extrinsic work values. Frieze et al. (2006) also mention that men place more value on salary and the opportunity for promotions, while females place more value on having flexible hours and good co-workers.

H2: Depending on gender individuals value different work values.
3.3 Conceptual model
4. Methodology

This chapter explains what type of methodology this research is using in order to complete this study. A description of what research approach, research purpose, research design, sample, operationalization, data sources and data collection this study is using is presented in this chapter. This chapter also includes how the data analysis is conducted.

4.1 Research Approach

According to Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) research approach determine how the study will be conducted and how it will be applied relies on the purpose of the study, and is influenced by the researcher’s background. The approach will also describe the connection between methods, data and theories (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

4.1.1 Deductive vs Inductive research

There exist two central approaches to use when conducting a research; inductive and deductive (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005; Saunders et al., 2009). Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) explain that these approaches will help the researcher to establish what is true or false and to draw conclusions. They further state that inductive is predicated on empirical evidence, while deductive is predicated on logic (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). Each approach have different characteristics that classifies the field of application (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). The deductive approach is presented as the most common approach when explaining the correlation between theory and research (Saunders et al., 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2011). Saunders et al. (2009) denotes the deductive to be the approach where theory is being testing. Explained by Bryman and Bell (2011) and Ghauri & Grønhaug (2005) the process of deductive begins by theories are tested by defining hypothesis based up on the theory, which will either be confirmed (accepted) or rejected determined by the collected empirical data. A hypothesis is used in the deductive approach as a specific type of research question. It is used as an informed speculation, which will be set up to be tested about the relationship between two or more variables (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Ghauri & Grønhaug (2005) describe the deductive reasoning as the logical process of determining a conclusion from a known hypothesis or something known as true. In order for the hypothesis to be tested empirically, the hypothesis need to be well
designed, and this is done through an operationalization, that indicates precisely how the concepts or variables are to be measured and are applicable to the reality (Saunders et al., 2009).

Seen in Saunders et al. (2009) the inductive approach is where theory is built. The inductive process is the opposite of the deductive process, where the data collected is broken down into codes, and later developed into categories and concepts, which will generate new theories (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Bryman and Bell (2011) claims that, while the outcome of an inductive process is the theory, the theory of an deductive approach is the foundation. According to Bryman and Bell (2011) a common strategy within inductivism is; iterative. Iterative means that the data collection and analysis is created continuously and constantly repeated back to each other. The researcher can always collect further data in order to establish the conditions in which the theory will or will not sustain (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This strategy is observable particularly in Grounded Theory. The inductive reasoning is described by Ghauri & Grønhaug (2005, p. 16) as “the systematic process of establishing a general proposition on the basis or particular facts”.

Since the purpose of this study is to explain how work values differ within different groups of Generation Z, a deductive research approach were applied. Two hypotheses were created based on the already existing theory, this to be able to see if the hypotheses will be rejected or accepted. As a result, this study might contribute to reveal if different groups within Generation Z differ concerning their work values.

4.1.2 Qualitative vs Quantitative research strategy

The empirical material, explained by Ghauri & Grønhaug (2005) can either be collected through a qualitative or a quantitative research strategy. Bryman and Bell (2011) clarifies the meaning of research strategy and how it is simply a general orientation to conduct the business research. They also point out the fundamental differences between the strategies, such as how qualitative research strategy want to understand the meaning of something and have a low ability to replicate, while quantitative research strategy want to examine behaviors and have a high ability to replicate. Furthermore, they explain how the quantitative strategy is commonly associated with the deductive research approach and qualitative strategy is usually associated with the inductive research approach (Bryman & Bell, 2011).
McCusker and Gunaydin (2014) explain how the quantitative strategy aims to measure features, count them and create statistical models in an attempt to explain what have been observed. Moreover, McCusker and Gunaydin (2014); Bryman and Bell (2011) explain how quantitative usually generate results in numbers rather than in words. Ghauri & Grønhaug (2005) state that a quantitative strategy is intended to collect data that could be generalized and applied to an expanse population. The quantitative approach often, according to McCusker and Gunaydin (2014) use tools such as surveys or questionnaires to collect numerical data, which will be used in statistical models. This strategy is seen as more efficient than the qualitative, since the data collection and gathering of data is faster and the researcher tends to remain objective to the subject in matter (McCusker & Gunaydin, 2014). Contrary to quantitative approach, the qualitative approach is seen to gather empirical material and present the results in words rather in numbers (Saunders et al., 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2011; McCusker & Gunaydin, 2014). In a qualitative approach the respondents can provide more in-depth and detailed answers, which makes it easier to create a deeper understanding of the investigated subject. In addition, Bryman and Bell (2011) state that unstructured observations, unstructured/semi-structured interviews and focus groups are used as tools to collect data through the qualitative approach. This approach is less formalized and structured and also use fewer respondents than the quantitative approach (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

This study was conducted with the aim to explain if groups within Generation Z differ concerning their work values. Since work values is already widely explored, a quantitative research was seen as most suitable for this study and it will be used to either accept or reject the existing theory.

4.2 Research purpose and design

4.2.1 Research purpose

Pursuant to Saunders et al. (2009) a research purpose is divided into three different research forms: exploratory, explanatory and descriptive. These three are the most common research purposes within business related research (Saunders et al., 2009). Aaker et al. (2010) explains that an exploratory purpose is used in a research where the problem lies under the actual investigation and where the purpose has a qualitative nature. An exploratory study examines a field that previously was unknown (Stebbins,
Stebbins (2001) continues by explaining that an exploratory research empathizes flexibility, it can be described as a brief preliminary stage of a research process in regards to a subject (Stebbins, 2001). Bryman and Bell (2011) highlights the importance of knowing how to code answers and how to analyze the empirical data since it is challenging in a quantitative study. An exploratory purpose emphasizes the phenomena of exploring which therefore compel special research skills (Shukla, 2008). An explanatory purpose is, constraining to an exploratory purpose conducted with a quantitative approach (Saunders et al., 2009). It is used to investigate the relationship between different variables, with the aim to examine the cause and effect between them. Along with an explanatory purpose, a descriptive research purpose is conducted through a quantitative approach (Saunders et al., 2009). A descriptive research purpose is relevant when the aim of the research is to be well defined and clear (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In a descriptive research, the analysis is able to ask questions like, who, when, what, where and how (Aaker et al, 2010). To be able to successfully answer such questions with a descriptive purpose, Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005) emphasizes on the significance of involving a detailed plan on how the study will be accomplished. By having rules that concerns how questionnaires and interviews should be conducted, the research can be successfully conducted (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005).

This research purpose is to explain how the work values differ within different groups of Generation Z. This research therefore have an explanatory research design. An explanatory approach can investigate if there is an difference between the groups of Generation Z or not.

4.2.2 Research design

Research design is an approach used to reach an answer to the investigated research problem (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). By having an explicit and clear view of the research design, the research can provide proper answers to the examined research problem (Shukla, 2008). The most frequently used research designs in business related research are: case studies, cross-sectional studies, comparative studies, longitudinal studies and experiments (Bryman & Bell, 2011). A case study involves an in-depth interest in one specific case where the researcher investigates new theoretical fields (Saunders et al, 2009). Bryman and Bell (2011) describes comparative research design as an approach that is used when a research is conducted in multiple occasions, which makes it possible to compare the different results. This research design along with
longitudinal and experiments is according to Saunders et al. (2009); Bryman and Bell (2011) the most time consuming approaches. A longitudinal research design analyzes the differences from one sample over a long period of time, whereas an experiment compares a control group to an experimental group with the aim to expose the experimental group (Saunders et al., 2009).

Within this research a cross-sectional design with a questionnaire is used to be able to gather as much data as possible. When using a cross-sectional design the researchers can examine the relationship between different variables. The data of the variables can also be collected more or less at the same time (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

4.3 Data sources

When gathering data to use as empirical material, two different sources can be applied; primary and secondary data (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005; Saunders et al., 2009). Primary data is collected by the researcher and is used with the aim to clarify a specific problem in the research that is unknown (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Currie, 2005). Currie (2005) further clarifies that primary data is conducted when the concerned data does not exists and requires to be retrieved directly from customers or organizations in topic. There exist different types sources that provide primary data, Bryman and Bell (2011) mention for example, surveys, case studies, interviews and focus groups as primary data sources. Considering that primary data is conducted for one specific purpose, it contributes with an exact information to the research topic (Saunders et al., 2009).

Secondary data is, in contrast to primary data, statistics already collected for another purpose (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). It is beneficial when conducting a comparable study, because it is easier to conduct data from both cases (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2005). According to Bryman and Bell (2011) secondary data can be both external and internal. External data gather information from sources outside the organization like websites and newspapers, whereas internal data gather information within the organization itself (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Secondary data is pursuant to Saunders et al. (2009) and Shukla (2008) less time consuming since it is less expensive compared to primary data, but considering that the data already have been conducted for another purpose, the data collected may not be applicable on a specific research.
This research will only make use of primary data. By choosing primary data, the researchers will not have issues with the disadvantages by using secondary data where the data might not be applicable to the research. The primary data allows the researchers to gather data and information that can help the researchers fulfill the purpose and hypotheses of this research.

4.4 Data collection method

Bryman and Bell (2011) stresses that there are two elements that needs to be considered when collecting data. Firstly, the method need to be consistent with the research and secondarily, the research is dependent on whether the study is using a qualitative or quantitative approach. Since this study was using a quantitative approach, qualitative data collection methods can be excluded from this research; these methods was mentioned earlier under the “qualitative vs quantitative” headline. This study is qualified to use either structured observations, structured interviews, questionnaire or experiments (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

4.4.1 Questionnaire

Bryman & Bell (2011) explain that questionnaire is a research method that use a cross-sectional design and data it collected through either structured interviews or by questionnaires. These methods follow the same structure of how the data is collected. Interpret by Saunders et al. (2009) each respondent receives and answer an identical set of questions in a planned order.

The fundamental differences between structured interviews and questionnaires are that the researcher/interviewer need to be more present when the conducting the interview than he/she needs to be when using a questionnaire (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Patel and Davidson (2011) explain how the meaning of interviews often lies in that the interviewer meets the interviewee in person and conduct the interview. They add that this technique could also be done as a telephone interview (Patel & Davidson, 2011). Yin (2014) state the benefits of using a questionnaire. He indicates that questionnaires are easier to distribute to a broader quantity of respondents and it is also a more rapid way to collect data, especially online questionnaires (Yin, 2014). Patel and Davidson (2011) mention that when conducting a questionnaire it is also possible for the interviewer to bring the questionnaire to the individuals whom are going to fill it out, in order to assist and help if any misinterpretations occur. The disadvantages of using
questionnaires could be, explained by Bryman & Bell (2011) that the respondents misinterpret the questions, since the interviewer/researcher is not present and cannot explain the questions. Yin (2014) therefore suggest that it is crucial to have understandable questions to avoid misinterpretations and misunderstandings (Yin, 2014).

The researchers of this study chose to use an online questionnaire as the method for collecting data, because it was a fast way to gather data and easier to distribute the questionnaire to a large portion of respondents. The reason why the researchers did not chose structured interviews was because it would have been less efficient, since one-third of the respondent did not live in Växjö. It would have become more costly and uneffecient.

4.4.2 Questionnaire design

Bryman and Bell (2011) suggests that in order to make a questionnaire easy to follow and understandable it is important to have an attractive design. There are several ways to prevent receiving a low response rate (Saunders et al., 2009; Bryman and Bell, 2011). Bryman and Bell (2011) state five important aspects that needs to be considered when constructing a questionnaire and these are: (1) operationalization, which are the key and the questionnaire relies on the operationalization, (2) measurement scales, which included nominal, ordinal, interval and ratio scale, (3) question format, (4) question wording and lastly, (5) question sequence. They further explain that question format refers to how the questionnaire will be answered by the respondents, either it has open ended/unstructured questions or partially closed question (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Explained by Saunders et al. (2009) it is an advantage to use closed questions, since they can be numerically analysed and encoded. Question wording refers to how the researchers chooses to formulate the questions. Bryman & Bell (2011) suggest that it should be formulated in a short and concise way, it should not include two questions in one question and it should not be formulated as an indication that a certain question is correct (Patel & Davidson, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). Question sequence could, according to Bryman and Bell (2011) affect the the results, they suggest that researchers use a funnel approach when creating the questionnaire. By funnel approach they mean, they one should start off with engaging and interesting questions, then continue with sensitive and qualification questions, questions for all eligible respondents, questions
for specific eligible respondents and lastly, the respondents personal information is places in the end of the questionnaire (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The questionnaire design of this research’s questionnaire started with a cover letter in order to inform the respondent about the purpose of the questionnaire and important concepts that was needed to understand in order to complete the questionnaire. Then three questions that the researchers named “control questions” was created and they asked about (1) what year they were in, (2) what major they and (3) if they had work experience or not. After these control questions a total of 33 questions that were asked. In the end of the survey it appeared one last control questions which asked what gender the respondent had. A likert scale was applied in order for the respondents to answer the questionnaire. The scale had answering options from 1-5, where 1 was strongly disagree and 5 was strongly agree. The questionnaire that was sent out to the pupils was made in Swedish, since the it was sent to Swedish high schools, however, the stated questions were directly translated from the questions designed in the operationalization. To see the complete questionnaire, see appendix 8.1

4.4.3 Operationalization

According to Bryman & Bell (2011) an operationalization is created in order to provide a measure of the (five) different concepts (intrinsic, extrinsic, altruistic, status-associated and social). Ghauri and Gronhaug (2005) emphasize on how important it is to design an accurate operationalization that show how the theory was developed into more sharper concepts that can be studied and measured. A theoretical definition of each concept is applied to get an understanding of what they stand for. Bryman and Bell (2011) claim that it is a necessity to have indicators, therefore are each concept broken down into indicators. The researchers have created an appropriate measurement scale that is used to answer the stated questions available in the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Theoretical definition</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic work values</td>
<td>Intrinsic work values are values such as: development, self-actualization, challenging projects and growth. Sources that support this variable is available in the theoretical summary.</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>[1= \text{Strongly disagree} ] [2= \text{Disagree} ] [3= \text{Neutral} ] [4= \text{Agree} ] [5= \text{Strongly agree} ]</td>
<td>1. When I apply for a job I value challenging work tasks as important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. When I apply for a job I value the opportunity to build meaningful contacts as important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. When I apply for a job I value to grow as a person as important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Extrinsic work values | Power | 1. When I apply for a job I value high positions (e.g. manager positions) as important.  
2. When I apply for a job I value a workplace where I can work independently as important.  
3. When I apply for a job I value a workplace where I have a lot of responsibilities as important. |
|---|---|---|
| Extrinsic work values | Status | 1. When I apply for a job I value material things as rewards as important.  
2. When I apply for a job I value the company’s status as important.  
3. When I apply for a job I value the salary as important. |
| Extrinsic work values | Career | 1. When I apply for a job I value the opportunities to grow within the company as important.  
2. When I apply for a job I value the opportunities to a long career as important.  
3. When I apply for a job I value the company's career benefits as important. |
| Altruistic work values | Help others | 1. When I apply for a job I value shared knowledge as important.  
2. When I apply for a job I value a workplace where I can be helpful as important.  
3. When I apply for a job I value a helpful working environment as important. |
| Altruistic work values | Contribute to society | 1. When I apply for a job I value a company who contributes to the society as important.  
2. When I apply for a job I value volunteer jobs as important. |
### Status-associated work values

Status-associated work values concern values which gives people achievement, advancement, status, recognition, independence, but also makes people proud of working at a specific job.

Sources that support this variable is available in the theoretical summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal superiority</th>
<th>1 = Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 = Disagree</th>
<th>3 = Neutral</th>
<th>4 = Agree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. When I apply for a job I value a company who I can be proud of as important.

2. When I apply for a job I value to fulfill achievements as important.

3. When I apply for a job I value competition between me and my co-workers as important.

### Social work values

Social values concern the relationship a person have with co-workers, supervisors, and other people, but it also pertain other facets, such as “leisure time”, “nurturing/fun environment” and “work-life balance”

Sources that support this variable is available in the theoretical summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure</th>
<th>1 = Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 = Disagree</th>
<th>3 = Neutral</th>
<th>4 = Agree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. When I apply for a job I value flexible-hours as important.

2. When I apply for a job I value independent tasks that does not require supervision at my workplace as important.

3. When I apply for a job I value leisure time as important.

### Co-workers

1. When I apply for a job I value a good relationship with my co-workers as important.

2. When I apply for a job I value working in a fun environment as important.

3. When I apply for a job I value the possibilities of working together with my co-workers as important.

### Work-life balance

1. When I apply for a job I value balance in my work and personal life as important.

2. When I apply for a job I value to have control over my work-life balance as important.

3. When I apply for a job I value to work in an environment where humor exist as important.

#### 4.4.4 Pre-test

Ghauri & Gronhaug (2005) suggest that a pre-test of the questionnaire should be performed in order to gain valuable information about if the questionnaire design was easy and understandable for the respondents. If doing a pre-test the results from it could help improve mistakes which could be of importance for the real questionnaire (Bryman & Bell, 2011). If the moderator is not able to help the respondent with self-completing
questions it is even more important that a pre-test is completed to reduce the risk of misunderstandings and misinterpretations (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This study have chosen to conduct a pre-test before sending out the real questionnaire with the intention to test if the questions were understandable for the respondents.

The pre-test was first tested on a lecturer that are an expert in the area during a tutoring session. This generated a change in the formulation of the questions and new control questions were added. When the changes was done from the tutoring session, the questions were translated into Swedish (appendix 8.1) and sent back to the lecturer. When this was done 13 randomly chosen individuals in the same generation, Generation Z were asked to respond to the survey and provide with feedback. The survey was then ready to be conveyed to the real respondents.

4.5 Sampling

When examining the research problem, two various types can be applied: a sample study and a census study (Aaker et al., 2010). In a sample study one segment of the population is analyzed, whereas the entire population is analyzed in a census study (Bryman & Bell, 2011; Aaker et al., 2010). According to Bryman and Bell (2011) a census study is more costly and time consuming, however the results have the ability to be more precise compared to a sample study. Due to impossibility of targeting everyone in the Generation Z population, the researcher of this paper have decided to limit themselves to a total of six schools, and that is why this study will focus on a sample study.

Within a sample study the sampling method needs to be decided (Bryman & Bell, 2011). When gathering a sample from the population a probability sample or a non-probability sample technique can be used (Esaiasson et al., 2012). Bryman & Bell (2011) describes a probability sample as a method where all the individuals of a population have the same probability of being chosen. Esaiasson et al. (2012) advocates that the results from the probability sample more commonly can be generalizable compared to a non-probability sample, hence more difficult to collect since it require more time. Due to the limited possibility to reach all the individuals in the population, the authors decided to use a non-probability sample. It will generate individuals within the population that have the highest probability of being selected (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Within a non-probability sample, Bryman and Bell (2011) explains that three
different types exist: convenience sample, snowball sample and quota sample. The authors of this research have decided to use convenience sampling, were the target group is high school students members of Generation Z (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

4.5.1 Sampling frame
Sample frame is according to Patel and Davidson (2011) a framework of different characteristics that a respondent need to acquire to be able to participate in the sample. It needs to be both general and exact for the sample to be considered representative (Bryman & Bell, 2011). To be able to determine if the respondents are appropriate for the research, the first question needs to be asked so that the researchers can identify the relevance of the respondents.

Since this research target individuals born within Generation Z, it is important that only members of this generation is included in the study. Representatives of the Generation Z are born 1995 and younger. Therefore, the questionnaire was only sent out to high school students. Because of this, the researchers know that it was only memebers of Generation Z that had answered the questionnaire. Due to that, the credability of the study increased. The questionnaire was either published on the participated high school’s pupil e-platform where they got access to the questionnaire or the questionnaire was sent to the pupil’s school e-mail.

4.5.2 Sampling procedure and sample size
The sample was collected through one distribution channel. The researchers contacted principals at S:t Ragnhilds Gymnasium, Rönninge Gymnasium, Gislaveds Gymnasium, Kungsmads Gymnasium, Teknikum Gymnasium och Katedral Gymnasiet. All high school’s are located in Sweden. Three of these high schools published the questionnaire on their school e-platforms while three send it out to the pupils school e-mails. The questionnaire was distributed to the different principals through e-mail with a cover letter that explained the purpose of the questionnaire and the study. The total amount of students that had access to the questionannaire was 4500 students. In order to get an estimation of how many respondents that were needed in this study this sample size formula was applied:

\[ z^2 \times p(1-p) / e^2 / 1 + (z^2 \times p(1-p)) / e^2 N = \text{sample size} \]

\[ P = \text{population size} \]
The calculation shows an appropriate sample that was estimated to 355 respondents (Surveymonkey, 2016).

However, according to Bryman & Bell (2011) a precise number on the size of a sample does not exist, it is dependent on various variables, such as time, money and precision. Hence studies conducted to describe relationships between two or more variables is, according to Van Voorhis and Morgan (2007), a justifiable sample size around 50 responses. The researchers had a population size of 4500 and received 364 answers on the questionnaire. The collected sample size is both larger than 50, which Van Voorhis and Morgan (2007) argued for and larger than Surveymonkey (2016) formula that indicated a sample size of 355.

4.6 Data analysis

The collected data from the questionnaire was analysed in SPSS and the analysis were conducted in the following steps: data coding, descriptive statistics, cluster analysis and Independent sample T-test.

4.6.1 Data coding

Ghauri and Gronhaug (2005) argue for the essence of classification and comparison when it comes to any type of data analysis. They further explain that coding can be seen as one type of classification and the first step is to specifying the categories into which the responses are to be placed (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005). Bryman and Bell (2011) says it is important to code the questionnaire answers with numbers in order to calculate the mean, median and mode. There is no right number of categories, because they usually depend on the research problem and the actual data (Ghauri & Gronhaug, 2005).

To accomplish the results the researchers used the statistical program SPSS. In order to analyze the data, the transmission of data needed to be translated into numbers from the respondent’s answers. The respondent’s answers got the same number as they had answered in the survey. For example, if the respondent answered a 5 on a question, it was coded 5 in SPSS. When it comes to the control questions used in the survey, such as gender, year, program and working experience, a nominal scale were used and was coded in a different way compared to the likert scale. Gender was coded as 0 = male, 1=...
female. Year was coded as 0 = year 1, 1 = year 2, 2 = year 3. The respondent could choose between 12 different programs in the questionnaire, when this information was transferred into SPSS the programs was clustered into two different faculties and was then coded 1 = Practical 2 = Theoretical. This is how the programs were stated in the questionnaire:

1. Children and recreation program
2. Build and construction program
3. Economy program
4. Arts program
5. Vehicle program
6. Trade and administration program
7. Hotel and tourism program
8. Humanics program
9. International baccalaureate
10. Science program
11. Social science program
12. Technique program

And they got clustered into practical and theoretical majors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practical: 1</th>
<th>Theoretical: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children and recreation program</td>
<td>Economy program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts program</td>
<td>Trade and administration program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build and construction program</td>
<td>Hotel and tourism program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle program</td>
<td>Humanics program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique program</td>
<td>Science program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science program</td>
<td>International baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, work experience was coded 0 = yes and 1 = no.

4.6.2 Descriptive statistics

According to Nardi (2003) descriptive statistics are a standardized approach to summarizing data frequency or measures central tendencies such as mean, median and mode. Frequency analysis is a descriptive statistical method that indicate the number of occurrences of each answer chosen by the respondent (Nardi, 2003). This numbers can be put into e.g. tables, pie shorts and bar charts (Malhotra & Birks, 2003; Bryman & Bell, 2011). In order to analyze the result and draw conclusions, SPSS Statistics were used to calculate the mean, median, mode, and also the cumulative percent. To present the four control questions, such as gender, program, level of education and work experience, pie charts were used.
4.6.3 Cluster analysis

Aldenderfer and Blashfield (1984) is the basic name for a range different of procedures that can be used to create classification. They continue to explain that these procedures empirically shape clusters (or groups) of highly similar entities. Everitt, Landau, Leese and Stahl (2011) supports Aldenderfer and Blashfield’s understanding of clusters, and explain cluster as a method that mainly focusing on discovering groups in data and the aim is to create rules for classifying new individuals into one or other of the known groups. Aldenderfer and Blashfield (1984, pp. 7) state that “clustering method is a multivariate statistical procedure that starts with a data set containing information about a sample of entities and attempts to recognize these entities into relatively homogeneous clusters (groups)”. In this study, a twostep cluster were used to create different clusters. A twostep cluster analysis procedure is, according to IBM Knowledge Center (2012) an exploratory tool to find groupings or clusters within a dataset. The algorithm has by this procedure several useful features that differentiate it from the traditional clustering techniques, such as twostep is handling both categorical and continuous variables, automatic selection of number of clusters and scalability (IBM Knowledge Center, 2012). The researchers find seven different interesting clusters connected to the control questions (gender, level of education, major and work experience).

4.6.4 Independent sample T-test

An independent sample T-test is usable when one want to see if there is a difference between two groups means that is measured at the same time (Investopedia, 2016). T-test is one of a number of different hypothesis tests. The t-test view the t-statistic, t-distribution and degrees of freedom in order to determine the p-value (probability value), which is used to determine if the population mean differ (Investopedia, 2016). A t-test also show the group statistic, which involve number of participants, mean, standard deviation and standard error mean.

4.7 Quality Criteria

The most important quality criterion when executing measurement instruments of a research is pursuant to Bryman and Bell (2011) reliability and validity. Reliability controls the stability of the measurement instrument, whereas validity controls that the measurement instruments measures what it is intended to measure (Bryman & Bell, 2011).
4.7.1 Reliability
Reliability measures, according to Bryman & Bell (2011) a specific concept. The specific concept is within reliability explained by three different factors; internal reliability and inter-observer consistency (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Internal reliability view the different variables, if they are associated with each other or if the questions are connected to each other. Internal reliability also refers to if the questions are of relevance and if they measure what they intended to (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In order to be able to determine the internal reliability, Bryman and Bell (2011) discusses the tool Cronbach’s alpha. It is a frequently used tool that determines the internal reliability. If the value is over 0.7 it counts as reliable. The inter-observer consistency denotes the topic where multiple observations in a research exist or where there is a change of subjective judgments.

To be able to avoid subjective judgments the researchers have chosen to only use closed questions in the questionnaire. The researchers have also used the Cronbach’s alpha to be able to decide the internal reliability. The variables with a value over 0.7 was considered as reliable.

4.7.2 Validity
Content validity indicates if the measures reflect the content in the intentional questions. It also acknowledges the researchers to master the measurement reflections (Bryman & Bell, 2011). To be able to assure the content validity in this research the researchers received critical thoughts and opinions from a lecturer at Linnaeus University regarding the conducted operationalization. This showed whether the theoretical concepts and measurements are deliberated correctly. Moreover, a pre-test with 13 respondents was conducted to be able to see if the collected respondents understood the questions of the questionnaire.

Construct validity is defined as to what degree the operationalization measures the concept it is meant to measure (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The validity for this research was established through the operationalization and studied categories. By having an operationalization the researchers can assure that the data collected is measured in the right way. Factors that could have affected the construct validity in the questionnaire is the translation to Swedish.
4.8 Ethical principles

Bryman and Bell (2011) empathizes the importance of taking the ethical principles in consideration when conducting a research. The data gathered for the research need to be used in the way it originally was supposed to (Aaker et al., 2010). It cannot mentally or physically harm the participants in the research and it cannot invade on the participants’ privacy (Nardi, 2003; Bryman & Bell, 2011).

These ethical principles was taken in consideration when conducting the questionnaire. The questionnaire started with a presentation of the study where the participants could find information about the study. It also informed the participants that the questionnaire was anonymous and that there are no right/wrong answers to the questionnaire, this to assure that the participants felt comfortable answering the questionnaire. The first three questions in the survey asked questions such as, level of education, what program they study and if they have any work experience. These types of questions could be perceived as sensitive, but since all the participants was anonymous, the researchers believe that the questions did not invade on the participant’s privacy.

To be able to participate in the survey the respondents needed to open the online survey themselves. This can indicate that all the participants were conscious of the choice of being in the questionnaire. The researchers do not believe that any of the participants in this survey has been harmed physically or through participating, and they assure that the collected data only was used for the purpose of this research.

Since the sample requires participants younger than 18 the researchers need to get a parental permission before handing out the survey. The researchers contacted the principle of each participated school and got their permission to send out the survey. Since the principals were the intermediary of the survey and because the survey was anonymous and optional for the students, the parental permission was not necessary.

4.9 Methodology summary
Model 4.1 Methodology summary [Own].
5. Results

In this chapter the researchers will collect and report the data they find in SPSS. It will report the descriptive statistic, cluster analysis and lastly, the t-tests.

5.1 Descriptive statistics
The pie charts below show the distribution of the respondents from the questionnaire. The charts represent gender, level of education, major and if the respondents had any work experience. The questionnaire received 364 responses and out of that, 65.4% were female and 34.1% were men. The last pie chart shows that 93% of the respondents had work experience and 7% did not have any work experience. The 12 available majors are presented in table 5.1.2 as well the division of practical and theoretical majors.
Table 5.1 Gender, Work experience & Major descriptives

Table 5.2 Descriptive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic</strong></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.646</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.63698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrinsic</strong></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.107</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.80086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Altruistic</strong></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.409</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.77851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.604</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.63643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.555</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.71563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Descriptive

The table 5.3. Descriptive shows the number of valid/missing questions from the questionnaire. The table also shows the results of the mean, median, mode and standard deviation from the different variables summed questions. The mode shows that all the variables have an equal value of 3.00, whereas the median shows that the extrinsic values are lower than the other tested work value, intrinsic, altruistic, social and status.
Table 5.4 descriptive

The descriptive table 5.4 shows the mean, median, mode, standard deviation as well as the skewness and curtosis of all the questions asked in the questionnaire. Out of all the questions from the questionnaire, five questions (Intrinsic 5, Intrinsic 6, Altruistic 2, Altruistic 3, Social4) had a higher value $\pm 1$, which indicates that there is a skewness within these questions (Hair et al., 2006). However, since the Cronbach’s alpha showed that the all questions except one were reliable they were still kept in the research. The question that the researchers decided to delete was status question number 3, which is not included in the table above. The question was deleted due to the fact that the value on the Cronbach’s alpha was lower than acceptable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Std. Error Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Std. Error of Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic 1</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,0443</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic 2</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,819</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,0576</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic 3</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,931</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9221</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic 4</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,0129</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-3.34</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic 5</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.9998</td>
<td>-1.115</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic 6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.9143</td>
<td>-1.279</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>1.522</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic 1</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,1885</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-5.49</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic 2</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,697</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,0534</td>
<td>-3.99</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic 3</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,0720</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-5.07</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic 4</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,1685</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-7.72</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic 5</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,0984</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-5.30</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic 6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,083</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.9254</td>
<td>-0.795</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic 7</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,0425</td>
<td>-0.360</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-3.12</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic 8</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,1415</td>
<td>-3.330</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic 9</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,0197</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic 1</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,0627</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-3.14</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic 2</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,182</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.9837</td>
<td>-1.179</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic 3</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.9122</td>
<td>-1.198</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic 4</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,2580</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-8.74</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic 5</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,1974</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-7.82</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic 6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,475</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,1315</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status 1</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,1330</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status 2</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,849</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9698</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 1</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,0791</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-5.48</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 2</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,470</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.9772</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-3.35</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 3</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,0706</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-5.57</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 4</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.9184</td>
<td>-1.377</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>1.959</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 5</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,0034</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 6</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1,0780</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 7</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,154</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9526</td>
<td>-0.927</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 8</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1,0382</td>
<td>-0.626</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social 9</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,841</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1,0944</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Reliability and Validity

5.2.1 Reliability

The reliability test was used to assure that the questions from the questionnaire was corresponding with the determined concept. To reach an acceptable reliability, the researchers had the intention of receiving a Cronbach’s alpha equal or higher than 0.7 for the separate variables (Bryman & Bell. 2011). Table 5.3 demonstrates the Cronbach’s alpha value for each of the separate variables along with the number of questions that was applied to determine the different variables. The variable with the least questions had the minimum amount of three questions. Due to the results of the Cronbach’s alpha, the researchers needed to analyze the construct if item deleted to see what question(s) that could be deleted to reach an acceptable Cronbach’s alpha. The result showed that question 3 from the variable Status had a lower Cronbach’s alpha than what Bryman and Bell (2011) believe is acceptable. By deleting question 3 the Cronbach’s alpha increased and reached an acceptable value over 0.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha based on standardized items</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4. Reliability

After deleting question 3 within the Status variable:

| Status | 0.724 | 0.720 | 2         |

5.1.2 Validity

The validity was tested to see if the measures reflected the content of the intentional questions (Bryman & Bell, 2011). Table 5.4 shows the correlation between the variables in the research. Neither of the five variables had a correlation value over 0.584 which pursuant to Nolan and Heinzen (2008) is in line with the value of Pearson Correlation. Nolan and Heinzen (2008) claim that the correlated value needs to be >.9. It can
therefore be confirmed that intrinsic, extrinsic, altruistic, status and social work values
does not test the same theoretical area. The Sig (2-tailed) shows that the P-value was
0.000 on all the variables which shows that it has a significance level over 95 % for all
the variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrinsic Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
<th>Altruistic</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>,575**</td>
<td>,575**</td>
<td>,500**</td>
<td>,500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,454**</td>
<td>,494**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,335**</td>
<td>,335**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,584**</td>
<td>,584**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,530**</td>
<td>,530**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5.5. Validity

5.2 Hypothesis testing with independent sample T-test

The questionnaire was constructed with a likert scale (1 to 5) and to be able to accept or
reject the hypotheses of the research the clusters were evaluated individually. The five
variables was tested individually in each of the clusters.

The two t-tests are created to be able to answer the two hypotheses connected to the
research purpose. The t-test consist of two tables. The first table show the mean,
standard deviation and standard error mean. The second table show the signficance of
the cluster. N represent the number of participants, means represent the average answer
from the participants, Std. Deviation shows how far away from the mean each answer
is. If the results show a low standard deviation it indicates that the answers tend to be
close to the mean, while if the standards deviation is high it indicates that the answers is
spread out wider (Bryman & Bell, 2011). The standard error measures the exactness
with which a sample represent the population. A sample mean vary from the actual
mean of a population and the variation is the standard error (Investopedia, 2016b).
5.3.1 Hypothesis 1 - Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.8252</td>
<td>0.66993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.7800</td>
<td>0.78543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.2947</td>
<td>0.62620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.3117</td>
<td>0.71365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.5132</td>
<td>0.75286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.5417</td>
<td>0.83086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.6677</td>
<td>0.91390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.7275</td>
<td>0.96782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.8198</td>
<td>0.64463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.7622</td>
<td>0.67628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Practical major
2 = Theoretical major

In this t-test it shows that major 1, which is practical. Practical had a total of 164 participated and their answers generated different means, standard deviation and standard error depending on the different variables. Major 2 represent theoretical were 200 participated and it also got different results depending on the different variables. The different results does not vary a lot, but due to the minor differences it still reveals what group that value each variable more than the other. It could be seen through the means that individuals that study a theoretical major value values such as; extrinsic, altruistic and status more than individuals studying a practical major. While individuals studying a practical major valued intrinsic and social work values.
Table 5.6. Major Hypothesis

As mentioned above, table 5.6 represent the significant of the cluster. In order to know if the hypothesis should be accepted or rejected, the clusters need to be determined if they are significant or not. If the Levene’s test for equality of variance is not significant the significant (Sig in the table) should be p > .05 and the top row of data should be used. If the Levene’s test for equality of variance is significant p < .05 and the bottom row of data should be used. Noticeable in the table is that all values in the Sig column is
that p is larger than .05, which means means that the researcher should use the bottom row, and look at Sig 2-tailed. Sig 2-tailed gives the result if the variable is significant or not. In this case all variables are rejected. This means that hypothesis 1 - major: “Depending on major individuals value different work values.” is rejected.

5.2.2 Hypothesis 2 - Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.6988</td>
<td>0.79083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.8603</td>
<td>0.69485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.3457</td>
<td>0.69318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.2795</td>
<td>0.66403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.2901</td>
<td>0.85178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.5596</td>
<td>0.72604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.5852</td>
<td>0.93550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.7696</td>
<td>0.94296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.6527</td>
<td>0.70827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.8680</td>
<td>0.62087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = Male
1 = Female

In this t-test it shows that gender 0, which is males were a total of 135 participated and their answers generated different means, standard deviation and standard error depending on the different variables. Gender 1 represent females and had 229 participated. This cluster also got different results depending on the different variables. The different results does not vary a lot, but due to the minor differences it still reveals what group that value each variable more. It could be seen that females values all variables more than males, except extrinsic work values, which males value more than females due to the different means.
As mentioned above, Table 5.7 represents the significance of the cluster. In order to know if the hypothesis should be accepted or rejected, the clusters need to be determined if they are significant or not. If the Levene’s test for equality of variance is not significant (Sig in the table) should be \( p > 0.05 \) and the top row of data should be used. If the Levene’s test for equality of variance is significant \( p < 0.05 \) and the bottom row of data should be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Hypothesis</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-1.967</td>
<td>252,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-0.894</td>
<td>271,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.397</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-4.330</td>
<td>246,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-1.801</td>
<td>382,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-2.931</td>
<td>252,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
row of data should be used. In this case the researchers should used the bottom row since the p-value is larger than .05. Noticeable in the table is that intrinsic, altruistic and social work values are significant while extrinsic and status is not significant. Since the majority is significant it means that hypothesis 2 - gender: “Depending on gender individuals value different work values.” is accepted.

6. Discussion

A discussion of the results from the online questionnaire in relation to the hypotheses will be applied in this chapter. The discussion is connected to the purpose of the paper as well as the theory in the literature review.

6.2 Hypotheses

6.2.1 Hypothesis 1 - Major cluster

H1: Depending on major individuals value different work values.

The aim of this study was to explain if there is a difference between individuals that study a theoretical or practical major in concern to their work values. Due to the significant level stated in the results table 5.6 the p-value for all the variables tested was > .05 this indicates that the “Sig 2-tailed” was insignificant and therefore was this hypothesis rejected.

Even though the Sig 2-tailed indicated that all variables were insignificant, the differences between the major’s means still reveals a minor diff in data. The individuals with a theoretical major valued status associated, altruistic and extrinsic work values higher than the participants who had a practical orientation, which according to Frank and Lewis (2004) indicates that they value helping others as well as making contributions to the society. Individuals with a theoretical orientation can also be identified as employees within the public sector who honor the altruistic essence of their work and not the economic rewards or benefits of the work itself (Lyons et al. 2006). The extrinsic work values indicates a higher interest in career, status and power, these are valued as the most important ones due to the personal esteem and self worth (Kasser & Ryan, 1993; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Vanteenkiste et al., 2007). This indicates that the theoretical oriented individuals values development, self-actualization, challenging projects and growth higher than power, career and status (Sengupta, 2015).
Whereas the individuals with a practical orientation value intrinsic and social work values higher. These individuals can therefore be associated with an increased well-being since their ambition to satisfy psychological needs such as competence and autonomy is higher (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

However, even though there were mean differences between the majors, they are too small to be significant and can therefore not be accepted. There is no difference between practical and theoretical majors in Generation Z.

6.2.2 Hypothesis 2 - Gender cluster

H2: Depending on gender individuals value different work values.
The aim of this study was to explain if there is a difference between males and females in concern to their work values. Due to the significant level stated in the results table 5.6 the p-value for all the variables tested was > .05 which showed in the “Sig 2-tailed” that three of the variables, intrinsic, altruistic and social work values was significant and extrinsic and status-associated work values was insignificant. There is a not a difference between all variables, but since the majority of the variables was significant this hypothesis is accepted.

Even though the Sig 2-tailed indicated that not all variables were insignificant, all variables differed in means and it can be explained that the biggest difference between the females and males means was within the altruistic work values. Females had a mean of 3,67 and males 3,29, which is a difference of 0,33. This explains that females value a workplace that involves helping people and the society (Twenge et al., 2008). Altruistic work values are also associated with the desire to work and have a career within the public sector (Lyons et al., 2009). An interesting aspect is that males got a low mean on altruistic and a high mean on extrinsic, since these work values are the opposite to each other. Extrinsic work values represent values in terms of focus on status, power, hierarchical positions and rewards such as payments, material possessions and prestige (Twenge et al., 2010; Sengupta, 2015). These values are most commonly connected to personal esteem and self worth and do not have the intentions to help others nor the society (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The difference in mean concerning social work values was also significant and noticeable, since they differ on 0,22, which indicates that
females value social work values as more important than males. Females value good relationships with coworkers, supervisors as well as a workplace with humor and laughter as more important than males (Lyons et al., 2006; Strömberg & Karlsson, 2009; Twenge, 2010). The result also indicate that women prefer a better balance between their job situation and personal life (Levenson, 2010).

The majority of the variables was significant and the mean values also differed, which results in that this hypothesis is accepted. There is a significant difference between females and males work values in Generation Z.
7. Conclusion

This chapter present the conclusion, which answers the purpose of this study.

The findings of this research suggested that there was not a difference between individuals in practical and theoretical majors, hence H1 is rejected. The results concerning gender suggested that there was a significant difference between males and females. Therefore H2 is accepted. What can be concluded is that when managers is creating their employer brand and recruiting new employees to their company they should focus on what type of gender they are looking for instead of what major their future employees has. However, since the means of the results showed minor differences, it points to that there is still a research gap that could be more explored.

When testing the significance level for the reliability of the five variables, extrinsic, intrinsic, altruistic, status and social, they all had a value of 0.00. Which indicated that the results from this research are statistically significant and can be replicable. The t-test also showed that one of the conducted hypotheses was supported, and one was rejected.
8. Implications and Further Research

This chapter consists of implications, both academical and managerial. These implications are developed from the results of this research. Lastly, suggestions for further research are presented.

8.1. Academic/Theoretical implications
The largest academical implication of this research is that contributes to fulfill the theoretical gap in regard to Generation Z, in which a lack of scientific research exists. The constructed t-tests showed that there is no difference between majors in Generation Z, while there is a difference depending on the gender in Generation Z. The research results also showed that Generation Z valued the different variables differently depending on gender and major. Despite the somewhat low differences between the different clusters, the researchers could still see a difference between the different clusters. The cluster result from the year indicated a different result than Lyons et al., 2003 cited in Ng et al., 2010; Lowe et al., 2008 cited in Ng et al., 2010 who stated that individuals who are used to be assigned to group projects and presentations are more likely to emphasize on the social aspects of work, such as preferring friendly coworkers or work in a fun environment.

To summarize the academical implications, this research explained if the work values differ within different groups of Generation Z and contributes with a framework for future studies to fill the research gap connected to the new generation Z.

8.2 Managerial implications
Since a scientific study about Generation Z and work values never has been carried out before and with the awareness that Generation Z is the new generation that will enter the labor market, it is extremely important for manager to consider the results in this study. Even though the differences between the explored groups did not receive a large variety, the results are still valid and trustworthy. In relation to the first hypothesis, the researchers suggest managers with the aim to employ a person from either a practical or theoretical major should market their employer branding in concern of the work values depending on who they are targeting. Regarding the second hypothesis, managers that are targeting either of the gender should take the specific work values in consideration when creating their employer branding.
8.3 Further Research
The results of this study adds to a theoretical gap that exists on Generation Z, but the results only explains the generational differences based on the five independent variables: extrinsic, intrinsic, altruistic, status and social associated work values. A further research could therefore include a broader perspective to test if other work values can be applied on generation Z. This could for example be done in a quantitative study. To be able to see if there is more differences within Generation Z, a further research that focuses on different clusters could be done. Another suggestion for further research is to utilize a larger sample and not only focus on the individuals that are in high school.

Since employer branding itself is a fairly new concept within the field of marketing, it could be interesting if generation Z have different work values in different industries/companies. Where the focus of the study could be reversed and seen from a company’s perspective.
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8. Appendix

8.1 Pre-test

Hej gymnasieelever!

Vänligen läs igenom instruktionerna innan du besvarar enkäten.

Vi är två studenter från Linnéuniversitetet i Växjö som läser marknadsföringsprogrammet. Just nu genomför vi vår kandidatuppsats inom varumärkningsforskning, där vi riktar in oss på arbetsgivarvarumärkning (employer branding). Det vill säga, hur företag väljer att marknadsföra sig till sina potentiella anställda.

Anledningen till varför vi vänder oss till just dig är för att du är en del av den nya generationen (Generation Z) som snart ska inta arbetsmarknaden inom de närmsta åren. Vår studie handlar huvudsakligen om att ta reda på vilka arbetsvärderingar du besitter, det vill säga vad du prioriterar, i form av exempelvis lön, arbetskamrater eller fritid när du kommer att söka jobb i framtiden.


Tack för er medverkan,
Evelin Gimbergsson & Sandra Lundberg

* = Obligatorisk

Jag går i årskurs…*

Årskurs 1
Årskurs 2
Årskurs 3
Jag läser… *

Barn –och fritidsprogrammet
Bygg – och anläggningsprogrammet
Ekonomiprogrammet
Estetiska programmet
Fordons –och transportprogrammet
Handels – och administrationsprogrammet
Hotell – och turismprogrammet
Humanistiska programmet
International Baccalaureate
Naturvetenskapliga programmet
Samhällsvetenskapsprogrammet

Annat program:

Jag har tidigare arbetserfarenhet (exempelvis extra jobb, sommar jobb eller praktik).*

Ja
Nej

Arbetsvärderingar.
Välj det alternativet som du anser stämmer bäst överens med påståendet.

1. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag utmanande arbetsuppgifter som viktigt.*
   Stämmer inte alls   Instämmer helt

2. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag att ha möjligheten till att bygga meningsfulla kontakter som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls   Instämmer helt

3. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag möjligheten till att växa som person som viktig.*
   Instämmer inte alls   Instämmer helt

4. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag självförverkligande belöning istället för materiella ting som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls   Instämmer helt

5. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag att arbeta i en motiverande miljö som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls   Instämmer helt

6. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag ett företag som motiverar mig positivt till att uppnå bra resultat som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls   Instämmer helt

7. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag tjänster som sätter mig i chefspositioner.*
   Instämmer inte alls   Instämmer helt

8. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag att ha eget ansvar som viktigt. *
9. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag företag som låter mig bestämma som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

10. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag materiella ting som belöning som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

11. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag ett företagets status som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

12. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag lönen som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

13. När jag ska söka ett jobb värderar jag möjligheterna att växa inom företaget som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

14. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag möjligheterna till en lång karriär som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

15. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag företagets karriärsförmåner som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

16. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag att kunna dela med mig av min kunskap med andra i företaget som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

17. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag att ses som hjälpsam. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

18. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag en hjälpsam arbetsmiljö som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

19. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag ett företag som bidrar till samhället (exempelvis företag som tar ansvar för sina koldioxidutsläpp) som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

20. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag volontärarbete som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

21. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag företag som värnar om samhället som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt

22. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag ett företag som jag är stolt över som viktigt. *
    Instämmer inte alls                 Instämmer helt
23. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag ett företag där jag kan prestera på som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

24. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag att vara bättre än mina kollegor som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

25. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag flexibla arbetstider som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

26. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag eget arbete som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

27. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag ett företag som lämnar mycket tid till fritid som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

28. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag bra relationer till mina arbetskollegor som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

29. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag ett företaget som har en rolig miljö som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

30. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag möjligheten till att samarbeta som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

31. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag att det finns en balans mellan jobb och fritid som viktigt.*
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

32. När jag ska söka jobb värderar jag att jag själv kan kontrollera balansen mellan jobb och fritid som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

33. När jag ska söka ett jobb värderar jag att humor på min arbetsplats som viktigt. *
   Instämmer inte alls | Instämmer helt

Jag är… *
☐ Man
   ☐ Kvinna

Tack för din medverkan.