Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources

Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources (2022) 60, 305–322 doi:10.1111/1744-7941.12294

What do New Zealanders value at work and is it changing?

Majoreen Amankwah *University of Ghana Business School, Ghana*
Peter Boxall *University of Auckland Business School, New Zealand*

This study interrogates the Work Orientation module of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) across three waves (1997, 2005 and 2015) to understand the job values of New Zealanders. It finds that men and women are more similar than different in their job values, that full-timers are more concerned with income and career prospects than part-timers, and that higher education tends to raise expectations of having an interesting job and a high level of pay. New Zealanders have become somewhat more altruistic at work, confirming the image of the 'helpful Kiwi', but their job values have not shifted much across these surveys and are similar to those of employees in other developed countries. The broad pattern is that a vital extrinsic factor, job security, and the intrinsic quality of work out-rank the value of the extrinsic factors of high income and career prospects for New Zealanders.

Keywords: employment status, gender, job quality, job satisfaction, job values

Key points

1 This study analyses the New Zealand data in the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) across three waves (1997, 2005 and 2015) to understand the job values of New Zealanders.
2 New Zealanders exhibit strong stability in what they value at work: a secure job with interesting features, including intrinsic enjoyment, skill utilization and the ability to serve others.
3 New Zealand men and women are more similar than different in their job values while full-time employees are more concerned with income and career prospects than part-time employees.
4 Higher education tends to raise expectations of having an interesting job and a high level of pay.
5 New Zealanders' work values are mostly very similar to those of employees in other developed countries.

Correspondence: Professor Peter Boxall, Department of Management and International Business, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand; e-mail: p.boxall@auckland.ac.nz

Accepted for publication 4 March 2021.

To understand whether the quality of work is improving, we first need to understand what employees value at work. What are their preferences in terms of the range of intrinsic and extrinsic features that are typically associated with paid work? Job values 'signify what people desire from work and serve as points of reference to assess working conditions' (Hauff and Kirchner 2014, 10). These desires can be thought of as the goals against which employees evaluate their quality of employment (Holman and McClelland 2011). As Kaasa (2011, 853) puts it, work values are 'the desirable outcomes individuals feel they should obtain through work'. In this paper, we investigate the job or work values of New Zealand employees. What do they desire from paid employment and has it changed appreciably over time? In terms of 'drilling down' into variations within the working population, are there significant differences in work values relating to gender, employment status and educational attainment? To answer these questions, we draw on three waves of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP): the 1997, 2005 and 2015 rounds, which each included a set of questions on 'work orientations'. The ISSP, which has been running since the 1980s, offers 'the largest and most accessible body of cross-national social science data available' (Smith 2008, 302). The topics it addresses vary from survey to survey. Its project leaders develop a common stock of questions on each topic to enable cross-country comparisons but individual countries may add some of their own questions. This study interrogates the ISSP surveys for what they reveal about employees' job values in New Zealand, including how they relate to key personal variables and how they may have changed since the late 1990s.

Our intention is not to make a contribution to the theory of job quality. Rather, our aim is to make a contribution to knowledge of the context for HRM in New Zealand by providing an analysis of job values across the workforce that has so far been lacking. Such a goal has implications for how academics describe the characteristics of New Zealand workers and how managers think about how to motivate them. The paper starts with a review of the literature on job values. It then explains our methods and results, leading into our discussion and conclusions.

Job values, employee characteristics and change over time

There is generally much greater research on what workers experience in job quality than on what they value in it. However, if we are concerned about the quality of employment relationships, we should pay attention to the job features that matter to employees. Job values are the 'reasons people have for working and the kinds of rewards and benefits that influence their satisfaction' (Kalleberg and Marsden 2013, 255), which tends to be a 'function of the sum of the discrepancies between workers' wants and the extent to which these wants are met on the job' (Inkson 1980, 46). In addition to helping us understand what drives job quality, the study of job values has economic benefits in helping employers to know how to reorient HR practices to generate greater job satisfaction (Kaasa 2011; Karl and Sutton 1998; Longest et al. 2013). Better job satisfaction is positively correlated with

job performance and negatively related to absenteeism and turnover decisions (e.g. Clark 2005a; Judge 1993).

Job values encompass both intrinsic and extrinsic components (e.g. Daehlen 2007; Kaasa 2011; Kalleberg and Marsden, 2013; Marini et al. 1996). Intangibles such as having interesting work, a job that is useful to society and a good level of employee autonomy are examples of intrinsic values, emphasizing how the individual perceives and experiences the work itself. Extrinsic values relate to the material and social benefits of employment, such as the degree of job security, the level of income and the prospects for promotion. Having an insight into which of these values are more or less important to an individual is the first step to improving the quality of their work (Johri 2005; Kalleberg and Marsden 2013).

To what extent do these work values vary? Research indicates that a wide range of personal variables may be associated, to some degree, with employees' job values, including (among others) gender, race, age, level of education, degree of work experience (Daehlen 2007; Jones et al. 2017; Kalleberg 2011; Longest et al. 2013); life-stage, life-focus, immigration status (Knox et al. 2015); personality, family role (Jones et al. 2017); employment sector (Karl and Sutton 1998); and socioeconomic status, religion, marriage and parenthood (Longest et al. 2013). Our focus in this article is on the role of gender, full-time versus part-time status, and the level of educational attainment, variables whose impact can be analysed in the ISSP data sets.

Gender

Gender is a key variable of long-standing interest. Jurgenson's (1947) study of job values in the USA found that while men prioritized security, advancement and benefits (extrinsic values), women placed a greater premium on having interesting work, cordial relationships with co-workers and supervisors and good working conditions (intrinsic values). The number of dependent children also made a difference. A greater premium was put on job security, working with a company that one was proud of, and having cordial relationships with colleagues and supervisors as the respondent's number of children increased. Fifty years later, Tolbert and Moen's (1998) study in the USA found that women valued altruistic motives for working more highly than men, who placed greater emphasis on extrinsic job values. Similarly, Daehlen (2007), using data from a Norwegian longitudinal database, found that women placed greater importance on helping others, being useful to society and having contact with others than men and Lowe's (2007) study of the Canadian setting showed that whereas men were more likely to put a high premium on income and career prospects, women placed greater emphasis on good management relations and a safe and comfortable work environment.

On the other hand, Clark's (2010) analysis of responses from workers in OECD countries in the ISSP datasets suggests a largely consistent pattern for men and women in job values. This included 7 countries in 1989 (n = 5348), 18 countries in 1997 (n = 13 466) and 15 countries in 2005 (n = 10 943), giving an overview of the OECD rather than

a comparison from country to country. Clark (2010) tabulates the results across the OECD for 1997 and 2005, showing that both men and women place job security and having an interesting job as their highest values, a set of priorities that has not changed over time. Although it increased in importance between 1997 and 2005 for both men and women, having a high income is considerably less important to both. This pattern is confirmed by Esser and Lindh (2018) on the same datasets (with the addition of the 2015 ISSP survey). Clark (2010), like Daehlen (2007) and Esser and Lindh (2018), finds that women place somewhat greater importance on being able to help others and being useful to society. He finds that having flexible hours, which women generally rate as more important than men, given their greater commitment to balancing 'career and care' (van Engen, Vinkenberg and Dickers 2012, 646), increased in importance between 1997 and 2005. Interestingly, this increase was somewhat greater for men, which may provide evidence of a growing proportion of men wanting to enhance work-life balance in the household.

The most comprehensive studies, then, are suggestive of convergence over time in what men and women regard as important at work. Given the sustained growth in female participation in the NZ labour force over the last 40 years (Houkamau and Boxall 2011), we therefore expect that men and women will report few differences in job values. This leads to:

> Hypothesis 1: Male and female New Zealanders will report few differences in job values in the ISSP surveys (1997, 2005, 2015).

Full-time versus part-time workers

Values may also differ between full and part-time workers although there is much less research on this question. According to Sutherland's (2012) analysis of British employees responding to the 2006 *Skills Survey*, part-timers are less likely to place high value on career prospects, good income, and job security than their full-timer counterparts but tend to place greater value on 'convenient hours and choice of hours'. Like Sutherland (2012), Esser and Lindh (2018) find that part-timers have weaker preferences for extrinsic rewards but stronger preferences for working independently and having flexibility over working time. One inference is that having a particular amount of paid work, ideally when they want it during the week, is more important, on average, to part-timers than having a career trajectory. The words 'on average' need to be underlined here because 'the part-time workforce is a complex, variegated social grouping' with a range of motivations, including people who wish to transition out of it into full-time employment (Walsh 1999, 199).

In terms of intrinsic values, Sutherland (2012) finds that full-timers are more likely to place a high value on using their initiative, deploying their abilities and having variety in work. Intrinsic qualities such as skill utilization – the extent to which individuals can deploy their preferred skills in their job – are generally of high importance for personal fulfilment from work (O'Brien 1982, 1983; Rose 1994). Esser and Lindh (2018) find that

part-timers place stronger importance on the more altruistic, but also intrinsic, motives of being helpful to others and being useful to society. The evidence around the intrinsic attitudes of full-timers and part-timers is, thus, rather mixed and this makes the formation of hypotheses problematic. For the sake of testing the data, however, it might be argued that since full-timers have 'greater skin in the game', they are likely, on average, to have more demanding standards for both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. We therefore offer the following hypothesis:

> Hypothesis 2: Compared with NZ part-timers, NZ full-time workers will place greater importance on both intrinsic and extrinsic values at work in the ISSP surveys (1997, 2005, 2015).

Level of education

In relation to education and job values, Jurgensen (1978) found a strong relationship between the level of education and job preferences. Employees who were more highly educated valued advancement, interesting work, pay and working conditions more strongly than the less educated. In addition, the more highly educated valued intrinsic job values (accomplishment) more highly than the less educated who preferred the extrinsic value of income. Similarly, Tolbert and Moen (1998) found that the level of education was a strong determinant of job preferences with the more highly educated placing a higher value on having a sense of accomplishment than the less educated. They also tended to place lower value on job security, promotional opportunities and high income. Similar findings in Kalleberg and Marsden's (2013) study in the USA showed that the more highly educated were more likely to rank intrinsic job values over extrinsic ones. In the UK, Gallie, Felstead and Green's (2012) study found that those with higher levels of education assigned a greater importance to intrinsic job values than those with less education. It may be that the general effect of higher levels of education in wealthier societies has been to make people more concerned about the intrinsic quality of their work and more relaxed about their security, earning potential and advancement prospects (Esser and Lindh 2018). We therefore anticipate some variation in our data along these lines, leading to:

> Hypothesis 3: More highly educated NZ workers will place higher importance on intrinsic job values and show lower concern with extrinsic rewards than less educated NZ workers in the ISSP surveys (1997, 2005, 2015).

Dynamic change in job values

Besides variation across employee characteristics, shifts in the importance placed on job values may occur over time (Jones et al. 2017) due to changes in employee preferences as economic, social, technological and political conditions change (Kalleberg and Marsden, 2013; Karl and Sutton 1998). For instance, Karl and Sutton's (1998) study of US employees found that in the 1970s and 1980s, they attached greater importance to interesting

work, while in the 1990s, they valued good wages first, followed by job security and interesting work. This may reflect a rising sense of insecurity and concern about real income due to restructuring and redundancies in the 1990s. On the other hand, Clark (2005b) and Gallie et al. (2012) have generally found stability in job values over time. For instance, Clark's (1998) study of seven OECD countries in 1989 using the ISSP dataset found that the highest-ranked job values in order of importance were job security, job interest, promotion prospects and working independently. Having a high income, flexible work and lots of leisure time were the lowest ranked. In 2005, using ISSP data for 19 OECD countries, Clark (2005a) found little change in employees' values, as noted above. Job security and having an interesting job still ranked highly while being able to work independently had shifted places with having promotion prospects. Having a high income and flexible working hours were still the lowest ranked. Clark observes that job security and interesting work have been ranked the most important job values over several periods of time with barely any change. This is confirmed by Esser and Lindh's (2018) analysis across the ISSP datasets from 1989 to 2015. Our expectation is that attitudes to what matters most at work will parallel general trends in the OECD and will not have changed much in New Zealand over the last 20 years. Hence:

> Hypothesis 4: What NZ workers value at work will show stability across the ISSP surveys (1997, 2005, 2015).

Data and method

The ISSP process is based on selecting individuals by randomly sampling them from the New Zealand Electoral Rolls. A postal survey was the main method for the three waves. However, in 2015, an online survey was also used. The response rates for the 2005 and 2015 surveys were 59% (n = 1309) and 36% (n = 901), respectively. No rate was provided for the 1997 survey. These datasets, which are openly available (auckland.figshare.com/COMPASS), were weighted using the Census data (2013, 2006 and 1996) to ensure representation of the entire population (Milne 2016). Data on employees' job values were elicited from 316, 875 and 386 respondents for the 1997, 2005 and 2015 surveys, respectively. Our analysis incorporated employed workers within the age range of 16 to 65 years (i.e. excluding the self-employed and the unemployed). Respondents reported their gender. We grouped educational attainment into four categories: primary only, secondary only, vocational qualifications, and degree holders (bachelor and postgraduate levels combined). Part-time workers were those reporting fewer than 30 hours per week.

This non-panel, time-series database includes a variety of intrinsic and extrinsic job values. Employees rate the extent to which the following values are important to them on a 5-point Likert-type scale, anchored from 1 = very important to 5 = not important at all: job security, high income, good opportunities for advancement, interesting tasks, being able to work independently, being able to help other people, doing something that is useful to society, being free to decide times or days of work. In addition, for the 2015

survey in New Zealand, a question was added on 'being able to use your skills and experience'. Thus, in the ISSP scale, the lower the number chosen, the more important the indicator is to employees as a work value. *T*-tests were used to analyse differences in the mean responses of men and women and those of part-time and full-time employees (Field 2009). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test differences among educational groups. However, since ANOVA is an omnibus test, we used pairwise comparisons to identify which pairs of group means were significantly different (Field 2009). All tests were conducted using SPSS software.

Results

Job values and gender

Tables 1–3 report the results of the *t*-tests comparing males and females in terms of their job values across the three surveys. In the 1997 survey, both men and women rank having an interesting job and job security as their highest priorities (i.e. these are rated closest to 1 = very important) and there are no significant differences between women and men in any of the indicators. Differences emerge in the 2005 survey. Here, women place greater importance on job security, on having a job in which they are able to help others, and on the usefulness of their job to society. In 2015, the last two of these differences are still evident and having time flexibility is more highly desired by women. No other values show gender differences. While women do show a greater altruistic motivation than men, they report the same level of interest in having interesting work, in skill utilization, in job security, in being able to work independently and value equally the extrinsic rewards of high income and good career prospects. And while Esser and Lindh (2018, 157) find that, on average, 'women tend to be more concerned with job autonomy than men', based on the survey items for the ability to work independently and to have time flexibility, we find this

Table 1 Differences between men and women in job values (ISSP 1997)

Job values	Total	Men (A) $n = 144$	Women (B) $n = 168$	Mean diff. (A – B)	SE	*p*-value
Job security	1.58	1.65	1.52	0.139	0.083	.095
High income	2.24	2.31	2.13	0.172	0.089	.054
Career prospects	1.94	1.98	1.88	0.092	0.081	.256
Interesting job	1.51	1.54	1.47	0.067	0.065	.303
Independent work	2.03	2.07	1.98	0.081	0.092	.382
Help to others	2.12	2.15	2.09	0.052	0.094	.581
Usefulness to society	2.15	2.16	2.12	0.040	0.097	.684
Time flexibility	2.70	2.82	2.62	0.198	0.115	.085

N for each variable may vary slightly from the total *n*. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 2 Differences between men and women in job values (ISSP 2005)

Job values	Total	Men (A) $n = 404$	Women (B) $n = 471$	Mean diff. (A – B)	SE	p-value
Job security	1.62	1.66	1.56	0.103	0.044	.020*
High income	2.11	2.04	2.11	−0.076	0.057	.182
Career prospects	1.90	1.87	1.87	−0.001	0.053	.991
Interesting job	1.45	1.45	1.45	−0.001	0.040	.985
Independent work	1.89	1.92	1.87	0.050	0.051	.323
Help to others	1.95	2.07	1.85	0.225	0.052	.000***
Usefulness to society	1.99	2.07	1.93	0.140	0.053	.008**
Time flexibility	2.35	2.42	2.30	0.122	0.065	.063

N for each variable may vary slightly from the total *n*. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 3 Differences between men and women in job values (ISSP 2015)

Job values	Total	Men (A) $n = 195$	Women (B) $n = 190$	Mean diff. (A – B)	SE	p-value
Job security	1.56	1.58	1.51	0.077	0.066	.246
High income	2.29	2.22	2.29	−0.067	0.085	.432
Career prospects	2.18	2.21	2.10	0.113	0.087	.193
Interesting job	1.59	1.62	1.59	0.033	0.067	.622
Independent work	1.98	2.07	1.95	0.129	0.081	.112
Help to others	1.87	2.04	1.77	0.270	0.078	.001**
Usefulness to society	1.96	2.10	1.85	0.246	0.080	.002**
Time flexibility	2.40	2.57	2.25	0.318	0.097	.001**
Skill utilization	1.57	1.63	1.51	0.116	0.061	.060

N for each variable may vary slightly from the total *n*. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

to be the case in New Zealand only in relation to the latter. Overall, there are few differences between men and women in job values, so hypothesis 1 is supported.

Job values and employment status

The results in terms of employment status are reported in Tables 4–6. There is only one difference between the values of full and part-time workers in the 1997 survey: the latter are significantly more likely to value a job that enables them to help others. This remains a point of difference in 2005 but full-timers place higher value on high income and having an interesting job while part-timers place greater importance on having a job that is useful to society and on working-time flexibility. The difference in respect of income remains in 2015 and is joined by a difference in career prospects, which full-timers value more highly. There are now no differences in the importance that full-timers and part-timers place on the intrinsic dimensions of jobs. While full-timers' emphasis on having an interesting job

Table 4 Differences between full and part-time workers in job values (ISSP 1997)

Job values	Total	Full-time (A) $n = 157$	Part-time (B) $n = 48$	Mean diff. (A – B)	SE	p-value
Job security	1.58	1.65	1.51	0.135	0.126	.283
High income	2.22	2.19	2.24	−0.058	0.132	.660
Career prospects	1.94	1.97	1.95	0.021	0.124	.869
Interesting job	1.51	1.50	1.45	0.047	0.097	.625
Independent work	2.03	2.05	1.90	0.149	0.133	.264
Help to others	2.12	2.25	1.86	0.387	0.139	.006**
Usefulness to society	2.15	2.23	2.00	0.231	0.145	.113
Time flexibility	2.70	2.78	2.68	0.091	0.168	.589

N for each variable may vary slightly from the total *n*. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 5 Differences between full and part-time workers in job values (ISSP 2005)

Job values	Total	Full-time (A) $n = 528$	Part-time (B) $n = 140$	Mean diff. (A – B)	SE	p-value
Job security	1.62	1.62	1.67	−0.054	0.063	.390
High income	2.11	1.99	2.36	−0.374	0.080	.000***
Career prospects	1.90	1.89	1.99	−0.105	0.076	.167
Interesting job	1.45	1.44	1.56	−0.116	0.057	.044*
Independent work	1.89	1.90	1.84	0.057	0.069	.408
Help to others	1.95	1.99	1.82	0.172	0.072	.017*
Usefulness to society	1.99	2.07	1.90	0.164	0.074	.028*
Time flexibility	2.35	2.45	2.18	0.273	0.086	.002**

N for each variable may vary slightly from the total *n*. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 6 Differences between full and part-time workers in job values (ISSP 2015)

Job values	Total	Full-time (A) $n = 272$	Part-time (B) $n = 72$	Mean diff. (A – B)	SE	p-value
Job security	1.56	1.51	1.64	−0.132	0.084	.118
High income	2.29	2.11	2.68	−0.573	0.106	.000***
Career prospects	2.18	2.06	2.47	−0.419	0.108	.000***
Interesting job	1.59	1.57	1.72	−0.154	0.087	.076
Independent work	1.98	2.03	2.09	−0.060	0.105	.568
Help to others	1.87	1.98	1.80	0.174	0.102	.087
Usefulness to society	1.96	2.04	1.92	0.112	0.105	.288
Time flexibility	2.40	2.48	2.37	0.110	0.129	.395
Skill utilization	1.57	1.55	1.61	−0.057	0.079	.469

N for each variable may vary slightly from the total *n*. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

and part-timers' emphasis on having a job that is helpful to others might be significant in a larger sample, the main points of difference relate to the higher priority that full-timers place on the extrinsic rewards of pay and career prospects. The difference between the two groups on the value of high income (over half a point on the scale) is the greatest difference in any of the surveys and the career difference is among the highest in the surveys. Both are greater than the largest gender difference (which relates to time flexibility in 2015). Overall, then, hypothesis 2 is partially supported: full-timers tend to place greater emphasis on extrinsic rewards but it is not clear that full-timers and part-timers are different in their intrinsic values.

Job values and the level of educational attainment

Tables 7–9 report the ANOVA tests comparing workers with different levels of education across the three surveys. An initial point that must be made is that the 1997 survey cannot be used to draw inferences about the work orientations of people with primary qualifications: there are only five respondents in this category in this year. There are, however, pairwise comparisons in the surveys that reveal differences across educational levels. These are not shown in the tables but are as follows. In the 1997 survey, employees with secondary qualifications placed a higher premium on job security than those with degrees, whereas the latter placed greater importance on good career prospects, on having an interesting job and on high income than the former. This fits the pattern we anticipated in terms of job security (more important for the less educated) and interesting work (more important for the more educated) but not in terms of income and career prospects (which turn out to be more highly valued by graduates).

In 2005, those with primary qualifications attached a higher premium to job security than those with vocational qualifications or degrees while degree holders placed a higher value on high income than those with vocational qualifications. Those with secondary qualifications also placed a higher value on job security than degree holders. Having an interesting job was less important to those with primary qualifications than it was to all

Table 7 Differences in job values by education (ISSP 1997)

Job values	Total	Primary $n = 5$	Secondary $n = 101$	Vocational $n = 183$	Degree $n = 38$	p-value	Partial eta
Job security	1.59	1.80	1.43	1.61	1.92	.003**	0.043
High income	2.26	1.80	2.43	2.23	1.95	.003**	0.043
Career prospects	1.95	1.80	2.13	1.90	1.76	.021*	0.029
Interesting job	1.52	1.80	1.70	1.46	1.29	.000***	0.062
Independent work	2.04	1.80	2.17	2.01	1.92	.219	0.014
Help to others	2.14	1.80	2.21	2.08	2.29	.288	0.012
Usefulness to society	2.14	2.00	2.26	2.10	2.05	.361	0.010
Time flexibility	2.74	2.60	2.88	2.69	2.57	.272	0.012

N for each variable may vary slightly from the total *n*. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 8 Differences in job values by education (ISSP 2005)

Job values	Total	Primary $n = 183$	Secondary $n = 272$	Vocational $n = 302$	Degree $n = 218$	p-value	Partial eta
Job security	1.62	1.49	1.56	1.66	1.77	.000***	0.022
High income	2.11	2.19	2.10	2.18	1.98	.031*	0.009
Career prospects	1.90	1.93	1.83	1.93	1.92	.363	0.003
Interesting job	1.45	1.58	1.41	1.43	1.40	.006**	0.013
Independent work	1.89	1.78	1.94	1.90	1.92	.112	0.006
Help to others	1.95	1.81	1.97	1.92	2.08	.004**	0.014
Usefulness to society	1.99	2.02	1.97	1.99	1.98	.936	0.000
Time flexibility	2.33	2.44	2.24	2.38	2.30	.113	0.006

N for each variable may vary slightly from the total *n*. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 9 Differences in job values by education (ISSP 2015)

Job values	Total	Primary $n = 48$	Secondary $n = 108$	Vocational $n = 104$	Degree $n = 158$	p-value	Partial eta
Job security	1.56	1.27	1.47	1.61	1.67	.001**	0.040
High income	2.28	2.28	2.35	2.41	2.15	.066	0.017
Career prospects	2.17	1.89	2.23	2.34	2.10	.015*	0.025
Interesting job	1.59	1.74	1.66	1.69	1.44	.001**	0.037
Independent work	1.99	1.89	2.06	1.94	1.99	.567	0.005
Help to others	1.88	1.60	1.88	1.92	1.93	.053	0.018
Usefulness to society	1.97	1.89	2.02	2.12	1.85	.030*	0.021
Time flexibility	2.40	2.53	2.36	2.42	2.38	.752	0.003
Skill utilization	1.57	1.40	1.67	1.59	1.51	.035*	0.020

N for each variable may vary slightly from the total *n*. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

groups with higher qualifications although we should still note that it was their second most highly desired job feature. Employees with primary qualifications placed a higher priority on having jobs that allow them to give help to others than those with degrees. Overall, the results fit our predicted pattern more in terms of job security and interesting work than in terms of helping others and income.

In 2015, employees with primary qualifications placed greater importance on job security than those with vocational and degree qualifications, valued good career prospects more highly than those with vocational qualifications, and valued skill utilization more highly than those with secondary qualifications ($p = 0.056$, in this case). Degree holders placed greater importance on having interesting jobs than those with primary, secondary and vocational qualifications, and placed a higher priority on the usefulness of the job to society than those with vocational qualifications. In sum, we can regard hypothesis 3 as supported in terms of the tendency of the less educated to value job security more highly

and the more educated to value interesting work more highly. However, high income is more important to graduates in two of the surveys (1997 and 2005) and the simple split between intrinsic and extrinsic factors is not that helpful. The picture is more complex and the hypothesis deserves qualified support.

Changing job values?

Table 10 reports the data on trends in job values. In the 1997 survey, having an interesting job, job security and good career prospects were the highest ranked variables. Working independently, having a job that allows help to be given to others and the usefulness of the job to society were in the mid-range of importance. High income and time flexibility were the values with the lowest ranking. In the 2005 survey, having an interesting job, job security and working independently were the most highly ranked, while good career prospects, having a job that allows help to be given to others and the usefulness of the job to society were in the mid-range of importance. High income and time flexibility were again the least ranked in importance. In 2015, the skill utilization variable joins job security and having an interesting job as the values of highest importance. This is followed by having a job that allows help to be given to others, the usefulness of the job to society and being able to work independently, which fall in the mid-range of importance. Career prospects, high income and time flexibility are the least ranked in importance.

Taking the long view, the value placed on jobs in which one can help others and be useful to society, and the value placed on time flexibility, are the only features that grew in importance from 1997 to 2015. Having career prospects actually became less important between 1997 and 2015. A key observation is that having an interesting job and job security are the first or second most highly ranked values in 1997 and 2005 and stay in the top three values once skill utilization is included in the 2015 survey. We conclude that there is

Table 10 Ranking of employees' job values: 1997, 2005, 2015

Job values	1997 $n = 316$	Ranking	2005 $n = 875$	Ranking	2015 $n = 386$	Ranking
Job security	1.58	2	1.62	2	1.56	1
High income	2.24[a]	7	2.11[a,c]	7	2.29[c]	8
Career prospects	1.94[b]	3	1.90[c]	4	2.18[b,c]	7
Interesting job	1.51	1	1.45[c]	1	1.59[c]	3
Independent work	2.03[a]	4	1.89[a]	3	1.98	6
Help to others	2.12[a,b]	5	1.95[a]	5	1.87[b]	4
Usefulness to society	2.15[a,b]	6	1.99[a]	6	1.96[b]	5
Time flexibility	2.70[a,b]	8	2.35[a]	8	2.40[b]	9
Skill utilization					1.57	2

Differences in means with the same letter are significant at the 0.05% level; *N* for each variable may vary slightly from the total *n*.

substantial support for hypothesis 4, which argued that we would observe stability over time in job values.

Discussion

What, overall, can we conclude about New Zealanders' values at work and how they might differ by gender, employment status and education, and vary over time? What can we conclude about the extent to which New Zealanders might be different in what they value?

First of all, the ISSP datasets show relatively small variations in employees' job preferences by gender in New Zealand, consistent with hypothesis 1. We do observe women reporting a higher propensity to value altruism, as has been found in other contexts (e.g. Daehlen 2007; Esser and Lindh 2018; Tolbert and Moen 1998). Apart from this, however, men and women look strongly similar in what they want from a job, as in Clark's (2015) analysis. In 2005, women placed greater emphasis on job security but now cease to do so. Security of employment (and, thus, pay) matters to a very high degree to both genders, and men and women place the same emphasis on having interesting work, on being able to work independently and on the extrinsic rewards of high income and good career prospects. In other words, there is a strong demand for the typical blend of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards by both male and female employees. If men and women differed significantly in what they valued in the era of the male as breadwinner (e.g. Jurgenson 1947), they no longer do so in the era of high female participation in paid work and a high incidence of dual-career couples (Haddock et al. 2006; Radcliffe and Cassell 2015). An echo of the greater time commitment of men to paid employment and of women's greater involvement in caregiving is, however, seen in women valuing time flexibility more highly than men in the 2015 survey, something also observed in the UK (Sutherland 2012). This is presently the largest gender difference, but it, too, may decline if, as some signs suggest, we are seeing a growing interest by males in improving the relationship between work and caregiving.

Somewhat provocatively, we tested the notion that full-timers would place a higher priority on both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards (hypothesis 2). We find that there is a greater preference for having an interesting job among full-timers in 2005. However, it is clear from Tables 4–6 that both groups rate having an interesting job as highly desirable. They both rate it as their highest preference in 1997 and 2005 and in their top three in 2015 (when skill utilization was ranked highest by part-timers and second highest by full-timers). There is an expression of greater altruism among part-timers in 1997 and 2005, along with greater preference for time flexibility in the latter but, as of 2015, the main points of difference relate to the much higher priority that full-timers place on the extrinsic rewards of pay and career prospects. This is consistent with Sutherland's (2012) British results in which full-timers placed a higher value on promotion opportunities than part-timers. Overall, then, we have rather better evidence for NZ full-timers placing a greater emphasis on extrinsic rewards than we do for the two groups differing in intrinsic motivations.

The pattern in respect of education is somewhat mixed and not entirely consistent with our predictions in hypothesis 3. As in the studies by Tolbert and Moen (1998) and Gallie et al. (2012), our study suggests that job security is of greater concern to those with lower qualifications, as we anticipated. This supports the view that lower levels of education predict a greater sense of vulnerability in the labour market (Kalleberg 2011). We also observe, as expected, that the emphasis on having intrinsically interesting work tends to be greater amongst graduates than those with lower qualifications. To some extent, then, we find, as Kalleberg and Marsden (2013) and Gallie et al. (2012) do, that those with higher levels of education assign a greater importance to intrinsic job values than those with less education. However, we also see some evidence of a greater concern among degree holders for high levels of pay. This may reflect a concern with achieving a good financial payback from investment in university-level education, which is not only costly but postpones the individual's income-earning years.

Finally, we do not see major changes across the surveys in New Zealanders' job values, thus supporting hypothesis 4. We see broad stability in what is valued across time, confirming the pattern observed across the OECD (Clark 2010) and in the UK (Gallie et al. 2012). Finding the job interesting (and the closely associated variable of using one's skills in 2015), and feeling secure in the job, are the most consistently important values of New Zealand workers. These preferences have not changed over the 22-year period from 1997 to 2015. Job security is the highest ranked job value in New Zealand, as is true across the OECD countries (Clark 2010). This, of course, is to be expected in the wake of the global financial crisis of 2008–9, and recent concerns about job displacement by technology, including robotics and artificial intelligence (e.g. Brougham and Haar 2018). However, we show that this priority is an enduring concern. It sits in the top two values across all surveys. And we also show that job interest consistently sits alongside job security in the top set of priorities, as is observed more broadly in the OECD (Clark 2005a, 2010 and 2015; Esser and Lindh 2018). New Zealand employees, like most elsewhere, value a fundamentally important mix of having an interesting and secure job and have done so for a long time. Of the changes over time, we do see a growing importance attached to a job in which one can help others or be useful to society, which tends to confirm the image of the 'helpful Kiwi', often remarked on by visitors to New Zealand. We also see the rising importance of time flexibility, something that is still more highly valued by women.

It is interesting to note that having high income and career prospects sit at the other end of the preference scale with the latter actually declining in importance over the long period from 1997 to 2015. In terms of comparisons, New Zealanders are again like those in other developed economies who accord a lower priority to high income (Clark 1998, 2005a, 2010; Kalleberg and Marsden, 2013). A possible explanation for this low ranking may be the nature of the question asked in ISSP, which refers to 'high' rather than fair income. Were employees to be asked about the *fairness* of their income, we might anticipate that this factor would rate more highly. To some extent, of course, the pay variable is captured by job security, which is important for delivering reliable or consistent income.

Practical implications

What implications does this study have for how managers should think about how to motivate the New Zealand workforce? First of all, the study implies that it would be unhelpful to assume that men and women are, on average, seeking different things from their paid employment. It would be better to assume that they, very largely, share the same motivations. Second, managers would be unwise to assume that the average part-time worker is not concerned about intrinsic job quality. They actually place a very high priority on this. What can be safely assumed, however, is that full-timers are generally more concerned about their pay level and their career prospects. Third, managers can expect less educated workers to have a greater concern with their job security whereas graduates are likely to have higher expectations of both intrinsic job quality and their level of pay. Finally, despite talk of 'generational differences', the idea that people are fundamentally changing in what they expect from paid employment should be taken with a grain of salt. The vast majority of people continue to value having an interesting and secure job that uses their skills.

Limitations

The kind of question available to us in ISSP is clearly a limitation in a study like this. This is evident in the question about pay, as noted above, and in the question around time flexibility, which is too broad to tease out the components of time flexibility. Is time flexibility related to starting and finishing times or to choice over the days of work? These are quite different and there are other dimensions of flexibility (such as time off for caregiving) that we know really matter to people (Houkamau and Boxall 2011). A solution would be splitting this question into multiple parts but this is often considered undesirable in a survey that enables comparisons over time. In relation to that point, the dataset we have analysed is a time series of cross-sectional surveys rather than a longitudinal or panel dataset, which would enable us to make stronger conclusions about change over time.

Conclusion

Using the ISSP surveys, this is the first study focusing specifically on New Zealanders' job values, on how they might vary by gender, employment status and educational level, and on how they may be changing over time. We find that men and women are very similar in what matters to them in paid employment, that full-timers are much more concerned with income and career prospects but otherwise broadly similar to part-timers, and that the effect of degree-level education is probably to raise expectations of both job interest and pay. New Zealanders exhibit strong stability in what they value at work over time: a secure job with interesting features, including intrinsic enjoyment, skill utilization and the ability to serve others (the 'helpful Kiwi'). The broad pattern is that a vital extrinsic factor, job security, and the intrinsic quality of work out-rank the value of the other extrinsic factors of high income and career prospects for New Zealanders. Were the question on

income about fair pay rather than high pay, we might see its importance rise. New Zealanders are, in most respects, very similar in what they value to employees in other developed countries.

Acknowledgements

We thank Martin von Randow, Gordon Cheung and Meng-Long Huo for their statistical support and advice.

Dr Majoreen Amankwah (PhD, Auckland) is a lecturer in human resource management at the University of Ghana Business School. Her research focuses on the quality of work.

Professor Peter Boxall (PhD, Monash) is a professor in human resource management at the University of Auckland Business School. His research is concerned with strategic HRM, job quality and employee well-being.

References

Brougham D and J Haar (2018) Smart technology, artificial intelligence, robotics, and algorithms (STARA): employees' perceptions of our future workplace. *Journal of Management & Organization* 24(2), 239–257.

Clark A (1998) *Measures of job satisfaction: What makes a good job? Evidence from OECD countries (No. 34)*. OECD Publishing, Paris, France.

Clark A (2005a) What makes a good job? Evidence from OECD countries. In: Bazen S, Lucifora C, Salverda W (eds) *Job quality and employer behavior*, 11–30.Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.

Clark A (2005b) Your money or your life: changing job quality in OECD countries. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 43(3), 377–400.

Clark A (2010) Work, jobs and well-being across the millennium. In *International differences in well-being*, 436–468.Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Clark A (2015) What makes a good job? Job quality and job satisfaction. IZA World of Labor. wol.iza.org/uploads/articles/215/pdfs/what-makes-good-job-job-quality-and-job-satisfaction.pdf (accessed 25 March 2020).

Daehlen M (2007) Job values, gender and profession: a comparative study of the transition from school to work. *Journal of Education and Work* 20(2), 107–121.

van Engen M, C Vinkenburg and J Dikkers (2012) Sustainability in combining career and care: challenging normative beliefs about parenting. *Journal of Social Issues* 68(4), 645–664.

Esser I and A Lindh (2018) Job preferences in comparative perspective 1989–2015: a multidimensional evaluation of individual and contextual influences. *International Journal of Sociology* 48 (2), 142–169.

Field A (2009) *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.

Gallie D, A Felstead and F Green (2012) Job preferences and the intrinsic quality of work: the changing attitudes of British employees 1992–2006. *Work, Employment and Society* 26(5), 806–821.

Haddock S, T Zimmerman, K Lyness and S Ziemba (2006) Practices of dual earner couples successfully balancing work and family. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 27(2), 207–234.

Hauff S and S Kirchner (2014) Changes in workplace situation and work values. Relations and dynamics within different employment regimes. *Management Revue* 25(1), 27–49.

Holman D and C McClelland (2011) Job quality in growing and declining economic sectors of the EU. WALQING Working Paper 2011.3.

Houkamau C and P Boxall (2011) The incidence and impacts of diversity management: a survey of New Zealand employees. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 49(4), 440–460.

Inkson J (1980) Job satisfaction and work orientations in four manual occupations. PhD thesis, University of Otago.

International Social Survey Program (ISSP) (1997/2005/2015), 'International Social Survey Program: Work Orientations, II, III and IV; 1997, 2005, 2015'.

Johri R (2005) *Work values and the quality of employment: a literature review*. Department of Labour, Wellington, New Zealand.

Jones W, R Haslam and C Haslam (2017) What is a 'good' job? Modelling job quality for blue collar workers. *Ergonomics* 60(1), 138–149.

Judge T (1993) Does affective disposition moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and voluntary turnover? *Journal of applied Psychology* 78(3), 395–401.

Jurgensen C (1947) Selected factors which influence job preferences. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 31(6), 553–564.

Jurgensen C (1978) Job preferences (What makes a job good or bad?). *Journal of Applied psychology* 63(3), 267–276.

Kaasa A (2011) Work values in European countries: empirical evidence and explanations. *Review of International Comparative Management* 12(5), 852–862.

Kalleberg A (2011) *Good jobs, bad jobs*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, NY, USA.

Kalleberg A and P Marsden (2013) Changing work values in the United States, 1973–2006. *Social Science Research* 42(2), 255–270.

Karl K and C Sutton (1998) Job values in today's workforce: a comparison of public and private sector employees. *Public Personnel Management* 27(4), 515–527.

Knox A, C Warhurst, D Nickson and E Dutton (2015) More than a feeling: Using hotel room attendants to improve understanding of job quality. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 26(12), 1547–1567.

Longest K, S Hitlin and S Vaisey (2013) Position and disposition: the contextual development of human values. *Social Forces* 91(4), 1499–1528.

Lowe G (2007) *21st century job quality: achieving what Canadians want*. Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa.

Marini M, P Fan, E Finley and A Beutel (1996) Gender and job values. *Sociology of Education* 69(1), 49–65.

Milne B (2016) Weighting of ISSP data-sets. Retrieved from: http://auckland.figshare.com/CAMPASS)

O'Brien G (1982) The relative contribution of perceived skill utilisation and other perceived job attributes to the prediction of job satisfaction. *Human Relations* 35, 219–237.

O'Brien G (1983) Skill utilization, skill variety and the job characteristics model. *Australian Journal of Psychology* 35(3), 461–468.

Radcliffe L and C Cassell (2015) Flexible working, work–family conflict, and maternal gatekeeping: the daily experiences of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 88(4), 835–855.

Rose M (1994) Job satisfaction, job skills, and personal skills. In: Penn R, Rose M, Rubery J (eds) *Skill and occupational change*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

Smith T (2008) General social survey (GSS). In: Lavrakas P (ed) *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*, 300–302.Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.

Sutherland J (2012) Job attribute preferences: who prefers what? *Employee Relations* 34(2), 193 221.

Tolbert P and P Moen (1998) Men's and women's definitions of "good" jobs: similarities and differences by age and across time. *Work and occupations* 25(2), 168–194.

Walsh J (1999) Myths and counter-myths: an analysis of part-time female employees and their orientations to work and working hours. *Work, Employment and Society* 13(2), 179–203.